Comments and Council's response by Consultation Document

CLP2 - Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options)
### 11 The Places of Craydon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref No</th>
<th>Representor Company or Organisation</th>
<th>Participation at EIP</th>
<th>Object or Support</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Policy, Site or Paragraph</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
<th>Summary of Proposed Changes</th>
<th>Council's Response</th>
<th>Council's Proposed Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0092/02/001/Non-specific/O</td>
<td>Riddlesdown Residents Association</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The RRA are again extremely disappointed to note that very little mention is made of Riddlesdown within the proposed Plan and it would appear from various plans published in the proposed documents, that we are located in the three &quot;Places&quot; of Purley, Sanderstead and Kenley/Old Coulsdon! A small area in the centre of Riddlesdown is also in a blank area on the &quot;Places&quot; plan. Riddlesdown might not be large enough to be a &quot;Place&quot; but it has the largest secondary school in the Borough (Riddlesdown Collegiate with 2,000 children plus 250 staff), a railway station, eleven retail frontages on two sites (6 &amp; 5), including a vital sub post office, a chemist, two convenience stores, a church, a large Common and associated adjoining Green Belt land, arable land and woodland. It is surprising then, that the Council have again made very little reference to Riddlesdown's existence! The topography of Riddlesdown, with local infrastructure, clearly makes it an important area within the Borough. We would ask that more reference is made to Riddlesdown within the Plan!</td>
<td>Riddlesdown should be referenced in the Plan and on the Places Maps.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>The following changes were made to the text in order to reflect on the specific comment about Riddlesdown: (1) in Kenley and Old Coulsdon section to read: &quot;11.95 Kenley and Old Coulsdon is a suburban area with green wooded hillsides (Dollyears Hill, Roydons Wood) and green open spaces (Kenley Common, Riddlesdown, Kenley Aerodrome) located within and around it. There is a strong link between the green infrastructure and the built environment. This creates a feeling of spaciousness or openness can be seen in the layout of the built environment,&quot; and &quot; 11.97 Kenley and Old Coulsdon's shopping and community facilities are concentrated in the area between the Godstone Road and Kenley station. The area is flamed by green space of Riddlesdown to the north and railway to the south.&quot; (2) in Sanderstead section to read: &quot;11.127 Sanderstead is a suburban Place located on a hilltop, with residential areas of Purley Downs, Riddlesdown, Hamsey Green and Sanderstead surrounded by large scale green open spaces such as Mitchley Wood, Riddlesdown and Kings Wood.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 0092/02/012/Non-specific/O | Riddlesdown Residents Association | Object | | | | There is no mention in "movement" section in both Purley & Sanderstead "Places" of the poor transport links for both staff and pupils attending Riddlesdown Collegiate which is effectively located in a cul-de-sac. The large size of this Collegiate means traffic and pupil/staff movement is high, especially in the morning and midlade afternoon. | The Purley and Sanderstead Places should reference movement around Riddlesdown college. | Not Duly Made | Only marked up changes to the adopted Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies are subject to consultation and therefore this comment is not duly made. |
I appeal to you to re-visit the analysis of sites for travellers and to confirm the mechanism and weightings of scores conforms to a national policy, not something invented by Croydon Council without any accreditation.

The Scoring set out in the table in the Gypsy and Traveller sites selection evidence document was incorrectly applied to sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land as +5 when it should have been -5. The scoring for individual sites affected will be corrected and republished with the Croydon Local Plan Proposed Submission drafts of the Detailed Policies and Proposals and the Strategic Policies- Partial Review.

Leisure, Recreation and Sports: It is important to see the Green Belt opened up to the public with new bridle paths, footpaths, a circular bridle path for walkers, cyclists and horse riders. The diversion of the London Loop from Lion Green Road through Cane Hill via the Ancient Monument Surrey Iron Railway embankment site so that people can be made aware of its importance to Coulsdon's local transport history.

The London Loop section 6 from Coulsdon South to Banstead should be diverted at Brighton Road onto the Cane site to run past the Ancient Monument of the Surrey Iron Railway embankment.

Borough Character - assurances in delivering intensification

Resoned justification and guidance in relation to intensification in the areas with different character type is provided under paragraphs 11.11 - 11.18.
We are pleased to note that the supporting evidence indicates that the potential additional education need likely to be generated by the planned new housing development will be met within the borough. We would like to continue to be consulted as the Croydon Local Plan progresses to seek to ensure that new development does not impact on education provision for Surrey. We therefore would anticipate future engagement with you to ensure that any potential cross-boundary pressure on Surrey schools is appropriately mitigated and that strategic education infrastructure needs are met in accordance with the statutory Duty to Cooperate.

The division of the Borough into "Places" is, to start with, utterly arbitrary and, upon inspection, palpably absurd. Take, for instance, the so-called "Addiscombe Place" (this is seen, it seems, as homogenous but it is, in reality, an immensely varied urban/suburban landscape, and one still blessed with nice open spaces, gardens, trees and greenery). There is already a massive, out-of-scale, overbearing "edge of town centre"-development of flats (the awful Menta, or whatever it is now called) in progress at one location — is the Council now going to say that the rest of the "Place" is OK for this, as well?

Other than for East and West Croydon Stations why are there no detailed proposals for improving accessibility to and within railway stations and the improvement of the immediate areas around them?
In addition I object, particularly relating to the apparent lack of consideration given to associated issues relating to proposed significant increases in housing. Examples are pressure on schools and doctors, and traffic flows on the already overburdened Wickham Road, which at times is gridlocked.

The London area is already overcrowded. It would surely be better to encourage the Government to concentrate on other areas of the country for new housing, business and related services or at least concentrate on less densely populated parts of Croydon for new housing.

No change

The Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals is planning for sustainable growth in the context of the 16 Places. Croydon has to align with the London Plan which has identified the need for growth in all the London Boroughs. Croydon is in discussions with neighbouring local authorities regarding the Duty to Cooperate and has approached them regarding the need to provide more housing. All Places will change to some degree, some more than others, reflecting the need to provide more homes and jobs for a growing population. There are existing Green Grid policies in the Croydon Local Plan that protect Croydon’s open spaces including the Metropolitan Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Local Green Spaces. The Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies—Partial Review, in paragraph 5.31 refers to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which provides the evidence of needs for additional infrastructure including school, and SP8.4 requires that major development proposals will be required to be supported by transport assessments, travel plans, construction logistics plans and delivery/servicing plans.

No change

A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along London Road in Norbury.

No change

The District Centre designation in combination with the physical gate of the railway line and historic character of the Local Heritage Area sufficiently marks entrance to the borough from the residential areas of the London Borough of Lambeth. Policy SP1 read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework provide sufficient policy support for enhancement and distinctiveness of Places of Croydon, including Norbury.
Councillor Jason Perry
London Borough of Croydon

Comment Soundness - Effective

A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along London Road in Norbury.

No change

The District Centre designation in combination with the physical gate of the railway line and historic character of the Local Heritage Area sufficiently marks entrance to the borough from the residential areas of the London Borough of Lambeth. Policy SP1 read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework provide sufficient policy support for enhancement and distinctiveness of Places of Croydon, including Norbury.

Councillor Mario Creatura
London Borough of Croydon

Comment Soundness - Effective

A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along London Road in Norbury.

No change

The District Centre designation in combination with the physical gate of the railway line and historic character of the Local Heritage Area sufficiently marks entrance to the borough from the residential areas of the London Borough of Lambeth. Policy SP1 read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework provide sufficient policy support for enhancement and distinctiveness of Places of Croydon, including Norbury.

Mr David Page
Mid Croydon Conservation Area A

Object

The Panel is concerned at the concentration of residential development in the centre of Croydon with particular concern at the lack of facilities and the local of recreational space particularly green recreational space. The Panel is also concerned at the quality of development and conversion being permitted and how this will impact on the quality of the street scene.

No change

Croydon Local Plan secures protection to the existing Local Green Spaces serving Croydon Opportunity Area such as: Wandle Park, Duppas Hill, Park Hill and The Queens Gardens. New sites for schools, cultural and healthcare facilities are proposed, see Table 11.9.

Cllr Steve O'Connell AM

Comment

There is a need for the officers to consult other Residents Associations, groups in the Local History Forum and the members of the Area Conservation Committees as to whether amendments need to be made, to ensure more accurate descriptions.

The character descriptions should be more accurate, working with local stakeholders.

No change

The Borough Character Appraisal was originally prepared in 2011 and was a part of consultation packages and subsequent adoption of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (2013). The current document was updated only in areas relating to local character typology which was extended to cover all uses, not only residential. The document was widely consulted and constitutes an evidence base to the local plan.
Cllr Steve O'Connell AM

Comment

There is a need for greater protection of District Centre employment buildings and sites to ensure that new jobs can be based across the Borough. More sites need to be added with the tag 'retain use' and not alternatives listed.

More sites need to be added with the tag 'retain use' and not alternatives listed.

No change

Employment sites within the District Centre will be protected by SP3.2 and do not require an allocation.

Mr Rod Davies

East Croydon Community Organis

Support

ECCO supports in principle the creation of sites for travellers as means to address reported anti-social activity and to promote engagement between the traveller and settled communities. The caveat that ECCO applies to this support is that it expects the Council to provide active management to ensure that the sites are well maintained and do not become venues of anti-social behaviour. ECCO notes the lack of factual communication regarding this issue by the Council, particularly with the affected communities.

The allocations are supported but the Council should provide active management to ensure the sites are well maintained.

Welcome support

Mr Clark Dunstan

Object

South Norwood Country has many vistas and views to the City, Canary Wharf, Shirley Hills and Croydon Town Centre. The recent building of Arena School has had a negative impact upon the locality and when completed the building will be obtrusive and distract from the character of the Victorian/Edwardian terraced homes. Any further development that will have an effect upon this valuable green resource and ecological habitat needs greater protection. The trails in south Norwood Country Park could be improved to encourage Croydon's Heart Borough policy and embed the Olympic Legacy that they promised to do when developing the school yet have failed to deliver.

The allocations are supported but the Council should provide active management to ensure the sites are well maintained.

No change

Green spaces are protected under policy SP7 of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies and DM24 of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals.

Andy Stranack

Croydon Council

Comment Soundness - Effective

A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into Norbury.

The District Centre designation in combination with the physical gate of the railway line and historic character of the Local Heritage Area sufficiently marks entrance to the borough from the residential areas of the London Borough of Lambeth. Policy SP1 read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework provide sufficient policy support for enhancement and distinctiveness of Places of Croydon, including Norbury.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Support/Object</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2571/01/004/C</td>
<td>Jennifer Radford</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would also like to be provided with further details of the following matters that have been used as reasons to discount many of the proposed sites that scored significantly higher than the Site and site no. Site 324. Employment and proposed residential use in the Proposal: <strong>Unsure of where this site is since there is no Site No 324 in the proposals doc</strong></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Details of the assessment of site 324 can be found in the “Gypsy and Travellers assessment and selection sites for Gypsy and Travellers sites * can be be found on the intranet on the Local Plan Evidence base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2619/01/006/Non-specific/S</td>
<td>Ross Holdgate</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Places of Croydon This section contains the proposed site allocations. We note that none of the allocations under consideration would appear to result in direct impacts to SSSIs within the Borough.</td>
<td>Welcome support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2683/01/004/Non-specific/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Iles</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>There are many, many empty sites in Croydon that are not mentioned. For example a large site near the Three Penny Bit by East Croydon station has been empty for as long as we can remember. There are a cottage was pulled down, the occupants evicted just so that we could look at another undeveloped area for years to come. What is wrong with Croydon Council and the people who think up such crazy plans. I would lay an even bet that they don't live in or near any of the areas designated in the Plan. It is unfair, unjust and must be rethought.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The area around East Croydon Station is covered by the East Croydon Masterplan and all sites have valid planning permissions. Construction works commenced on the majority of sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2713/02/002/Non-specific/O</td>
<td>Mr Alan Magrath</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I am most concerned at the changes proposed in the Local Plan. Croydon spends much of its time being kicked in the teeth. The last thing it needs is for the Council to join in. The Council should not spend its time ruining the lives of people who live in the borough. Do not build on green-belt land when there are plenty of brown-field sites. Do not build tower blocks in places where it is inappropriate. For goodness sake! Have a bit of sensitivity. Do the people proposing these changes actually live in the borough?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>There is no reference to a specific paragraph, policy or site within the representation and so it cannot be considered in shaping the Local Plan in that regard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Soundness - Effective

A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along London Road in Norbury.

No change

The District Centre designation in combination with the physical gate of the railway line and historic character of the Local Heritage Area sufficiently marks entrance to the borough from the residential areas of the London Borough of Lambeth. Policy SP1 read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework provide sufficient policy support for enhancement and distinctiveness of Places of Croydon, including Norbury.

Cllr Tim Pollard
London Borough of Croydon

Cllr Helen Pollard
London Borough of Croydon

Mr Ken Baker

I was genuinely elated to see the Local Plan proposals for Croydon generally - and particularly for our own area here in South Norwood - elation not being easy to summon up after 10 years membership of 'People for Portland Road' (half of that as Chair of our Planning Watch group) and often feeling part of a losing battle when Planning decisions would still allow monstrous decisions on Portland Road and when our thoroughly researched and consulted Regeneration Strategy was 'shelved' over 7 years ago. These current proposals, however, do appear very positive and encouraging and I, for one, am grateful for your work.

Welcome support
A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along London Road in Norbury.

The District Centre designation in combination with the physical gate of the railway line and historic character of the Local Heritage Area sufficiently marks entrance to the borough from the residential areas of the London Borough of Lambeth. Policy SP1 read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework provide sufficient policy support for enhancement and distinctiveness of Places of Croydon, including Norbury.

No change

The District Centre designation in combination with the physical gate of the railway line and historic character of the Local Heritage Area sufficiently marks entrance to the borough from the residential areas of the London Borough of Lambeth. Policy SP1 read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework provide sufficient policy support for enhancement and distinctiveness of Places of Croydon, including Norbury.

No change

The District Centre designation in combination with the physical gate of the railway line and historic character of the Local Heritage Area sufficiently marks entrance to the borough from the residential areas of the London Borough of Lambeth. Policy SP1 read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework provide sufficient policy support for enhancement and distinctiveness of Places of Croydon, including Norbury.

No change

IT is unclear which policy or what proposal site the comment relates to. References to Policy Map 43 does not relate to a particular site, therefore this comment is considered as not duly made.

No change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2982/01/038/O</td>
<td>Mrs Jeanne Driscoll</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I wish to add my objections made on this document by our local M.P. Chris Philp. “DM35.8”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Duly Made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3166/01/003/O</td>
<td>Maria Linford</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I totally object to the proposal of the gypsy development I thought that the site was allocated to build a new Archbishop Tennison school and playing field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3396/01/013/Non-specific</td>
<td>Ms A Pavon-Lopez</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Can you send me a copy of the impact assessment on surrounding properties in the areas around the proposed development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3396/01/012/O</td>
<td>Ms A Pavon-Lopez</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>What consideration are you required to give to local character, and how did you decide that this was not important in this case?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3430/01/037/Non-specific</td>
<td>Mr Donald Speakman</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along London Road in Norbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3430/01/058/Non-specific</td>
<td>Mr Donald Speakman</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Purley Library site: (not currently discussed in local plan): The existing listed building should be retained but converted to offices. (AFTER new library has opened on site 30 above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3699/01/037/Non-specific</td>
<td>Cllr J Cummings</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along London Road in Norbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>3711/01/003/Non-specific/O</td>
<td>Ms J Powell</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>3746/01/002/Non-specific/O</td>
<td>Jay Luthra</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>3862/01/009/Non-specific/O</td>
<td>Mr M Blount</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>3896/01/003/Non-specific/O</td>
<td>Mr M Veldman</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vaughan Pomeroy

Object

I have a concern about the security of open spaces, where the change in designation appears to reduce the level of protection. However, there does seem to be an intention to increase the land under protection by taking into the total land bank areas that presently are not designated as open spaces. Particularly in the south of the Borough the open space is highly valued and a resource to be treasured. I am encouraged by some of the recent work carried out in local open spaces in improving the facilities but I can see no clear intention to upgrade and transform some of the less attractive open spaces for greater facility.

No change

The comment is noted regarding upgrading areas.

Councillor M Fisher

Comment

Soundness - Effective

A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along London Road in Norbury.

No change

The District Centre designation in combination with the physical gate of the railway line and historic character of the Local Heritage Area sufficiently marks entrance to the borough from the residential areas of the London Borough of Lambeth. Policy SP1 read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework provide sufficient policy support for enhancement and distinctiveness of Places of Croydon, including Norbury.

Mr Graham Saunders

Historic England

Support

Table 11.3

In general we support the approach taken by the Council and throughness illustrated in details provided in order to deliver intensification.

Welcome support
2764/12/005/11.011/O Mr Derek Ritson
Monks Orchard Residents Associa

Object 11.011

This negates and undermines the NPPF and London Plan Policy on the presumption of not allowing Back Garden Development. What is the definition of "significant" change of an area's character? This policy at 11.11 d negates any presumption of NOT allowing Back Garden Development as it gives credence to change of character of an area as an evolutionary excuse and allows "Beds-in-sheds". The policy undermines all the statements to resist back garden developments and removes them from greenfield to brownfield sites against the NPPF and London Plan presumptions against garden land development. It allows developers to quote 'evolution' as a reason for allowing developments in back gardens as a part of an evolutionary change to an area. This could fundamentally change the character of any Croydon residential area. This policy could place Housing Blight on properties in the designated areas for years ahead up to 2036. The general proposition of this Croydon Council administration's policies to relax planning policies and to give a green light for developers to concrete over most of Croydon will be a negative epitaph for this Council's Administration. "They concreted over Croydon!". It seems that the Spatial Planning Team will not be satisfied until Croydon is completely concreted over with developments. Every little in-fill or back garden - nook and cranny is up for grabs!

No change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Gradual renewal of housing stock is led by individual developers. Policy 31.1 in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework will guide design solutions.

1993/01/014/11.012/O Graham & Kate Marsden

Object 11.012

Object most strongly where these proposals will fundamentally damage the nature of the designated area in Shirley. It is difficult to see how para 11.16 and 11.12 are compatible.

No change

Paragraphs 11.12 and 11.16 are not meant to be compatible as they are referring to different parts of the borough.

1993/01/015/11.016/O Graham & Kate Marsden

Object 11.016

Object most strongly where these proposals will fundamentally damage the nature of the designated area in Shirley. It is difficult to see how para 11.16 and 11.12 are compatible.

No change

Paragraphs 11.12 and 11.16 are not meant to be compatible as they are referring to different parts of the borough.

2846/01/001/11.026/C Alison and Kemal Hairettin

Comment 11.026

11.26 to 11.31 falls to address the area around East Croydon Station/off Cherry Orchard Road which lies in the intersection between Croydon Development Area and Addiscombe Area and is a stark transition zone from Office developments into Victorian and Edwardian low-rise terrace houses.

Change

Paragraph 11.26 was amended to read "Addiscombe is a suburban residential settlement, framed by green areas on the eastern side and the high density Croydon Opportunity Area to the west. This Place is influenced by and evolved as an extension of the Croydon Metropolitan Centre. (...)"
Alison and Kemal Hairettin

Support 11.038
11.32 to 11.39 Addiscombe District Centre: we support these proposals including proposals for maximum height of 5 stories on specific corner plots
Welcome support

Alison and Kemal Hairettin

Support 11.041
11.40, 11.41 Agree that current character has become fragmented and needs sensitive development
Welcome support

Alison and Kemal Hairettin

Comment 11.042
11.33 to 11.42: fails to address needs of Cherry Orchard Road/Lower Addiscombe road shopping parade, plus the transition zone of Cherry Orchard Road between the Croydon Opportunity Area and the streets of Oval Road, Cedar Road, Cross Road, Colson Road, Cedar Road and Addiscombe Road west from number 35
No change The transition area is addressed in the Opportunity Area Planning Framework and is referred to as 'Edge Area'.

Mr Charles King
East Coulsdon Residents' Associates

Support 11.060
6.50 A well-designed, cared for and high quality public realm plays an important role in reinforcing the perception of Croydon as a welcoming, safe and accessible place. Croydon's aspirations for its public realm are outlined in the Croydon Local Plan Strategic Policies SP4.6 to SP4.10.
We support and believe this applies equally to the outer district town centres.
Welcome support

Mr Charles King
East Coulsdon Residents' Associates

Comment 11.060
Leisure, Recreation and Sports: It is important there are good leisure and recreational facilities for all age ranges especially young people. Coulsdon is blessed with great open spaces such as Farthing Downs, Happy Valley, the Cane Hill site and two sections of the London Loop starting at Coulsdon South Station. There are adequate parks and open spaces with recreation facilities such as football pitches, pitch and putt, bowls, open air gym and children’s playgrounds with swings and other equipment within walking distance. It also has a long established Harriers Running Club, Children’s Gymnastic Club and many other clubs operating in the area.
The particular qualities of Coulsdon are documented in the Borough Character Appraisal which is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
No change

Mr Charles King
East Coulsdon Residents' Associates

Comment 11.070
Croydon town Centre should remain a strategic centre of employment, education, culture retail and local government for the whole of the borough and for those outside the borough who come to Croydon for work, education and entertainment.
Place specific policies are designed to manage local character, the appearance of the area. Croydon's status as the Metropolitan Centre is recognised by the Policies SP3 of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies and Policy DM4 of the Croydon Local Plan: detailed Policies and Proposals.
No change
Comment 11.070
11.70 & 11.71: Also Fails to address issues around East Croydon Station and the transition zone into Addiscombe Area: Oval Road, Cherry Orchard Road, Cedar Road Cross Road, Colson Road and Addiscombe Road west from number 35.

No change
The transition area is addressed in the Opportunity Area Planning Framework and is referred to as ‘Edge Area’.

Comment 11.078
2.DM36.1, DM36.2 DM36. Fails to develop a policy on Residential Skyscrapers. Current Tall Building policy of appropriate for edge of Croydon Opportunity Sites. Maximum height should be set for Cherry Orchard Road and Addiscombe Road. Current Maximum height should be based on Number One Croydon (NLA Tower). Also in order to reflect that it borders a low rise residential areas of Cross Road/Colson Road/Oval Road/Cedar Road/Cherry Orchard Road/Addiscombe Road.

We Propose that only the central area of Croydon Opportunity Area is allowed tall Office Buildings and no tall buildings over 25 floors on Cherry Orchard Road due to proximity to low rise residential building and no building on South Side of Addiscombe Road at 30-38 higher than 5 floors due to proximity and relative position (to the south) to low rise residential housing.

No change
The transition area is addressed in the Opportunity Area Planning Framework and is referred to as ‘Edge Area’.

Object 11.079
11.78 to 11.85: fails to specifically address the East Croydon area as a distinct area in its own right. We disagree in particular that the area lying to the west side of East Croydon Station Cherry Orchard Road, Addiscombe Grove, Addiscombe Road and Colson Road can be “successfully managed by General policies” (11.79) unlike London Road and Sydenham Road and Lansdowne Road areas. This area is also unique given the proximity to low rise traditional housing.

No change
The transition area is addressed in the Opportunity Area Planning Framework and is referred to as ‘Edge Area’.

Comment 11.085
11.78 to 11.85: fails to address Network Rail proposals for a new East Croydon Station north of current site. Need to protect new entrances into Lansdowne Road and Cherry Orchard Road/Cross Road. Also fails to designate land owned by Menta Ltd as the new access route into the new pedestrian bridge from Cherry Orchard Road.

No change
The planning guidance for the area around East Croydon Station can be found in the East Croydon Masterplan, an adopted Interm Planning Guidance, included in policy DM36.1.
There is a need for the officers to consult other Residents Associations, groups in the Local History Forum and the members of the Area Conservation Committees as to whether amendments need to be made to ensure more accurate descriptions.

The summary of the general character of Norbury in paras 11.104-11.110 is only a partial description. It does not:
- highlight the existence of the Norbury Park and the Norbury Hall Park as important open spaces;
- understand the special character and heritage of the whole of the Pollards Hill area;
- mention the importance of Norbury Brook which flows through the area;
- discuss the incidence of employment buildings among the largely residential nature of the area around London Rd.

Further it does not accurately reflect aspects of the history of the area, which are now better understood as a result of the work of David Clark, the local historian and long-term resident on Norbury, who successful negotiated with Network Rail for aspects of Norbury history to be on display at the Railway Station, who maintains the planted areas in front of the Station by the London Rd pedestrian lights, and re-stocks the Cancer Research bookcases at the railway station which have raised several thousand pounds from passengers. The proposed amendments below reflect David’s research.

The JPC is concerned at the failure of the Local Plan to recognise the special character and heritage of the whole of the Pollards Hill area. The current planning application for 18 Pollards Hill West is a classic example of how new residential development can adversely change the character, as well as potentially aggravating existing problems of flooding affecting other properties.

Add at end of para 11.104:
'It has been going through a process of change involving an increase in the number of new homes through conversions of large houses, new build, conversion of offices to residential, and backland development increasing the population density and the demand on local services. It has only a few important community facilities left including the Harlow Hall and Norbury Library, but has recently Somley Dance Hall and the Police Station. It has also been losing employment with the departure of office tenants from Astral and Windsor Houses and their conversion into flats. There is growing use by Norbury Station by commuters creating stresses for residents with respect to car parking and increased number of passengers using the Railway Station and buses.'
There is a need for the officers to consult other Residents Associations, groups in the Local History Forum and the members of the Area Conservation Committees as to whether amendments need to be made to ensure more accurate descriptions.

The summary of the general character of Norbury in paras 11.104-11.110 is only a partial description. It does not:

- highlight the existence of the Norbury Park and the Norbury Hall Park as important open spaces;
- understand the special character and heritage of the whole of the Pollards Hill area;
- mention the importance of Norbury Brook which flows through the area;
- discuss the incidence of employment buildings among the largely residential nature of the area around London Rd.

Further it does not accurately reflect aspects of the history of the area, which are now better understood as a result of the work of David Clark, the local historian and long-term resident on Norbury, who successful negotiated with Network Rail for aspects of Norbury history to be on display at the Railway Station, who maintains the planted areas in front of the Station by the London Rd pedestrian lights, and re-stocks the Cancer Research bookcases at the railway station which have raised several thousand pounds from passengers. The proposed amendments below reflect David’s research.

The JPC is concerned at the failure of the Local Plan to recognise the special character and heritage of the whole of the Pollards Hill area. The current planning application for 18 Pollards Hill West is a classic example of how new residential development can adversely change the character, as well as potentially aggravating existing problems of flooding affecting other properties.

Add:

‘11.105A Norbury has important open spaces: Norbury Park through which Norbury Brook flows, Norbury Hall Park and Pollards Hill Park and the former allotments area next to it, Norbury Manor Primary School field. Just over the border in Merton is the former National Westminster Bank playing fields.’

Change

Paragraph 11.105 is changed to read: ‘Norbury has a residential character that predominantly consists of ‘Terraced Houses and Cottages’, ‘Large Houses on Relatively Small Plots’ and ‘Local Authority Housing with Public Realm’, enriched by green spaces of Norbury Park through which Norbury Brook flows, Norbury Hall Park and Pollards Hill Park.’
Object Soundness - Justified

There is a need for the officers to consult other Residents Associations, groups in the Local History Forum and the members of the Area Conservation Committees as to whether amendments need to be made to ensure more accurate descriptions.

The summary of the general character of Norbury in paras 11.104-11.110 is only a partial description. It does not:
- highlight the existence of the Norbury Park and the Norbury Hall Park as important open spaces;
- understand the special character and heritage of the whole of the Pollards Hill area;
- mention the importance of Norbury Brook which flows through the area;
- discuss the incidence of employment buildings among the largely residential nature of the area around London Rd.

Further it does not accurately reflect aspects of the history of the area, which are now better understood as a result of the work of David Clark, the local historian and long-term resident on Norbury, who successful negotiated with Network Rail for aspects of Norbury history to be on display at the Railway Station, who maintains the planted areas in front of the Station by the London Rd pedestrian lights, and re-stocks the Cancer Research bookcases at the railway station which have raised several thousand pounds from passengers. The proposed amendments below reflect David’s research.

The JPC is concerned at the failure of the Local Plan to recognise the special character and heritage of the whole of the Pollards Hill area. The current planning application for 18 Pollards Hill West is a classic example of how new residential development can adversely change the character, as well as potentially aggravating existing problems of flooding affecting other properties.

The summary of the general character of Norbury in paras 11.104-11.110 is only a partial description. It does not:
- highlight the existence of the Norbury Park and the Norbury Hall Park as important open spaces;
- understand the special character and heritage of the whole of the Pollards Hill area;
- mention the importance of Norbury Brook which flows through the area;
- discuss the incidence of employment buildings among the largely residential nature of the area around London Rd.

Change
Paragraph 11.105 is changed to read: "Norbury has a residential character that predominantly consists of 'Terraced Houses and Cottages', 'Large Houses on Relatively Small Plots' and 'Local Authority Housing with Public Realm', enriched by green spaces of Norbury Park through which Norbury Brook flows, Norbury Hall Park, and Pollards Hill Park."
Other points will be considered during the review of Borough Character Appraisal.
There is a need for the officers to consult other Residents Associations, groups in the Local History Forum and the members of the Area Conservation Committees as to whether amendments need to be made to ensure more accurate descriptions.

The summary of the general character of Norbury in paras 11.104-11.110 is only a partial description. It does not:
- highlight the existence of the Norbury Park and the Norbury Hall Park as important open spaces;
- understand the special character and heritage of the whole of the Pollards Hill area;
- mention the importance of Norbury Brook which flows through the area;
- discuss the incidence of employment buildings among the largely residential nature of the area around London Rd.

Further it does not accurately reflect aspects of the history of the area, which are now better understood as a result of the work of David Clark, the local historian and long-term resident on Norbury, who successful negotiated with Network Rail for aspects of Norbury history to be on display at the Railway Station, who maintains the planted areas in front of the Station by the London Rd pedestrian lights, and re-stocks the Cancer Research bookcases at the railway station which have raised several thousand pounds from passengers. The proposed amendments below reflect David’s research.

The JPC is concerned at the failure of the Local Plan to recognise the special character and heritage of the whole of the Pollards Hill area. The current planning application for 18 Pollards Hill West is a classic example of how new residential development can adversely change the character, as well as potentially aggravating existing problems of flooding affecting other properties.

Para 11.07 to read
"11.107 The Norbury Cottage Garden Estate Conservation Area represents the unified and consistent residential character type of ‘Local Authority Built Housing with Public Realm’. This dense development is the first outer London cottage estate built by the London County Council between 1914 and 1921 in two phases 1906-1910 and 1920-1922. This distinctive grouping represents a unique example of individual Arts and Crafts terraces laid out to appear as large U-shaped buildings with a number of distinctive architectural features."

Change
"The Norbury Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan provides in-depth information about the Estate, which do not need to be repeated in the Plan. For clarity the text has been altered to read: "The Norbury Estate Conservation Area represents the unified and consistent residential character type of Local Authority Built Housing with Public Realm. This dense development from 1914-1921 represents a unique example of Arts and Crafts terraces and is the first outer London cottage estate built by the London County Council.""
There is a need for the officers to consult other Residents Associations, groups in the Local History Forum and the members of the Area Conservation Committees as to whether amendments need to be made to ensure more accurate descriptions.

The summary of the general character of Norbury in paras 11.104-11.110 is only a partial description. It does not:
- highlight the existence of the Norbury Park and the Norbury Hall Park as important open spaces;
- understand the special character and heritage of the whole of the Pollards Hill area;
- mention the importance of Norbury Brook which flows through the area;
- discuss the incidence of employment buildings among the largely residential nature of the area around London Rd.

Further it does not accurately reflect aspects of the history of the area, which are now better understood as a result of the work of David Clark, the local historian and long term resident on Norbury, who successful negotiated with Network Rail for aspects of Norbury history to be on display at the Railway Station, who maintains the planted areas in front of the Station by the London Rd pedestrian lights, and re-stocks the Cancer Research bookcases at the railway station which have raised several thousand pounds from passengers. The proposed amendments below reflect David’s research.

The JPC is concerned at the failure of the Local Plan to recognise the special character and heritage of the whole of the Pollards Hill area. The current planning application for 18 Pollards Hill West is a classic example of how new residential development can adversely change the character, as well as potentially aggravating existing problems of flooding affecting other properties.

Para 11.08 to read:

11.108 The London Road Norbury Local Heritage Area is an example of an 'Urban Shopping Area' character type. The shopping parades represent a high quality cross-section of architectural styles from the early part of the 20th Century, second half of the 19th century, with the unified form of shopfronts at ground floor level and rhythms of red brick facades with decorative brick and sandstone features above.’

Change:
The paragraph 11.108 was amended to read:

11.10811.77 The London Road Norbury Local Heritage Area is an example of an ‘Urban Shopping Area’ character type. The shopping parades represent a high quality cross-section of architectural styles from the second half of the turn of the C19 and C20th century, with the unified form of shopfronts at ground floor level and rhythms of red brick facades with decorative brick and sandstone features above.’
There is a need for the officers to consult other Residents Associations, groups in the Local History Forum and the members of the Area Conservation Committees as to whether amendments need to be made to ensure more accurate descriptions.

The summary of the general character of Norbury in paras 11.104-11.110 is only a partial description. It does not:

- highlight the existence of the Norbury Park and the Norbury Hall Park as important open spaces;
- understand the special character and heritage of the whole of the Pollards Hill area;
- mention the importance of Norbury Brook which flows through the area;
- discuss the incidence of employment buildings among the largely residential nature of the area around London Rd.

Further it does not accurately reflect aspects of the history of the area, which are now better understood as a result of the work of David Clark, the local historian and long-term resident on Norbury, who successful negotiated with Network Rail for aspects of Norbury history to be on display at the Railway Station, who maintains the planted areas in front of the Station by the London Rd pedestrian lights, and re-stocks the Cancer Research bookcases at the railway station which have raised several thousand pounds from passengers. The proposed amendments below reflect David’s research.

The JPC is concerned at the failure of the Local Plan to recognise the special character and heritage of the whole of the Pollards Hill area. The current planning application for 18 Pollards Hill West is a classic example of how new residential development can adversely change the character, as well as potentially aggravating existing problems of flooding affecting other properties.

Para 11.09 to read

11.109 Beatrice Avenue Local Heritage Area (The Norbury Court Estate) predominantly consists of ‘Terraced Houses and Cottages’. It has a good range of well-preserved late Victorian suburban houses laid out between 1900 and 1936, with many original and bespoke Arts and Crafts inspired features. The prominent St Philip’s Church terminates views from the tree-lined residential street.”
There is a need for the officers to consult other Residents Associations, groups in the Local History Forum and the members of the Area Conservation Committees as to whether amendments need to be made to ensure more accurate descriptions.

The summary of the general character of Norbury in paras 11.104-11.110 is only a partial description. It does not:
- highlight the existence of the Norbury Park and the Norbury Hall Park as important open spaces;
- understand the special character and heritage of the whole of the Pollards Hill area;
- mention the importance of Norbury Brook which flows through the area;
- discuss the incidence of employment buildings among the largely residential nature of the area around London Rd.

Further it does not accurately reflect aspects of the history of the area, which are now better understood as a result of the work of David Clark, the local historian and long-term resident on Norbury, who successful negotiated with Network Rail for aspects of Norbury history to be on display at the Railway Station, who maintains the planted areas in front of the Station by the London Rd pedestrian lights, and re-stocks the Cancer Research bookcases at the railway station which have raised several thousand pounds from passengers. The proposed amendments below reflect David’s research.

The JPC is concerned at the failure of the Local Plan to recognise the special character and heritage of the whole of the Pollards Hill area. The current planning application for 18 Pollards Hill West is a classic example of how new residential development can adversely change the character, as well as potentially aggravating existing problems of flooding affecting other properties.

In the UDP the Norbury Hall parkland was classified as a ‘Site of Nature Conservation Importance.’ The ‘Review of Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation’ for the Council by Thomson Ecology (September 2013) clearly indicates that Norbury Park and Norbury Brook, Norbury Hall and Pollards Hill are Local Sites of Nature Conservation Importance. This is designation is hidden within Detailed Policies and Proposals Appendix 7. Proposed Green

Para 11.110 to read
11.110 The Pollards Hill South Local Heritage Area consists of terraced, semi-detached and detached character Houses has a character of ‘Planned Estates of Semi-Detached Houses’ built between 1900 and 1922. It provides a green oasis in the uniformly laid out Northern Suburb, one that is enjoyed by residents and many visitors in pursuit of leisure. This distinctive grouping represents a unique example of individual Arts and Crafts terraces laid out to appear as large U-shaped buildings with a number of distinctive architectural features. The well preserved and distinctive 1930’s townscape is an example of an innovative approach to defining street frontages through sequence of courtyards.

Add Para 11.110A The wider area of Pollards Hill has its own special character which is being comprised by new housing developments.

Add Para 11.110B. Norbury has several important Local Green Spaces: Biggin Wood, Green Lane Sports Group, Norbury Hall, Norbury Park, Northwood Rd Recreation Group and Pollards Hill. Among their other functions Biggin Wood, Norbury Hall and Norbury Park are described as sites of nature conservation importance, while Norbury Hall and Pollards Hill are described as historic park and garden.

Add Para 11.110C. Norbury Hall is re-named as Norbury Hall Park.
Spaces. It should be explicit in the more public Detailed Policies and Proposals section describing the character of Norbury.

There is confusion about the relationship between what residents call Norbury Hall Park and the Norbury Hall Care Home land. Recent signs omit the word park and just state Norbury Hall. This is confusing to visitors to Norbury Hall Care Home who now mistakenly turn into the entrance to the park, and confusing to visitors to the Park who can turn into the entrance of the Care Home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>11.121</th>
<th>We fully support the guidance set out in paragraph 11.121.</th>
<th>Welcome support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polaksa Developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for intensification which is a euphemism for more building. This will change the character of those areas and should be opposed.

Change Croydon’s subburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM31 (Table 11.2)</th>
<th>We would make the following objections to the proposed Draft Local Plan which is a poorly disguised attack on the southern part of the Borough.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area between Kenley station and Godstone Road (subject to development being safe from flooding for the lifetime of the Plan)</td>
<td>Policy DM 31.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object: Soundness - Justified

DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where there may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two-storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and instead show the following boundaries: Kenley and Old Coulsdon, page 163, Godstone Road, Hayes Lane up to Kenley Lane and Station Road.

Change: Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this the designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Kenley and Old Coulsdon, page 163, Godstone Road, Hayes Lane up to Kenley Lane and Station Road.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries:

- Kenley and Old Coulsdon, page 163,
- Godstone Road, Hayes Lane upto Kenley Lane and Station Road

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries:

- Kenley and Old Coulsdon, page 163
- Godstone Road, Hayes Lane upto Kenley Lane and Station Road

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
DM31 (Table 11.2)  
**Area between Kenley station and Godstone Road** (subject to development being safe from flooding for the lifetime of the Plan)

The text describes how DM 31.4 is applied to the area within Kenley as: “Area between Kenley Station and Godstone Road”.

A graphical representation is also provided that is intended to define the outer limits of the DM31.4 zone for “focused intensification” as shown below.

KENDRA fails understand how the graphical and textual definition of how DM31.4 are consistent? By reference to the available maps we can ascertain that the graphical representation (above) includes the following within zone for “focused intensification”:
- Approx. half of Church Road
- Parts of Foxley Road
- Houses up Hayes Lane as far as #2 Abbots Lane
- A large part of Hermitage Road
- A large part of Kenley Lane
- All of Oaks Way
- All of Oaklands
- Nearly all of Park Road
- All of Ravenswold
- All of Roke Road
- A large part of Valley Road.

It is observed that NONE of the roads identified above can reasonably be described as being within the “Area between Kenley Station and Godstone Road”.

Given the poor definition of the area for the DM31.4 “focused intensification” within Kenley we asked that Kenley is removed from this policy.

**DM31 (Table 11.2)**  
Area between Kenley station and Godstone Road (subject to development being safe from flooding for the lifetime of the Plan)  

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Kenley and Old Coulsdon, page 163, Godstone Road, Hayes Lane upto Kenley Lane and Station Road.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Kenley and Old Coulsdon, page 163, Godstone Road, Hayes Lane up to Kenley Lane and Station Road.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am particularly concerned, as a Kenley Councillor, that the intensification zone details are hidden in the muddled presentation and that the very rural nature of Kenley will be destroyed by your proposals. Welcomes Road, Kenley Lane, Abbots Lane are just some of the beautiful green areas which will be damaged by your proposals and you must think again. Kenley is shared by residents from all over Croydon. They visit us for the healthy walks, safe outdoor activities for children and the joy of the spaces. All these benefits could be lost if you go ahead with these plans, together with many others.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
2812/01/002/DM31
(City Jan Buttinger
London Borough of Croydon

Object Soundness - Effective
DM31 (Table 11.2)
Area between Kenley station and Godstone Road (subject to development being safe from flooding for the lifetime of the Plan)

I am particularly concerned, an a Kenley Councillor, that the Intensification zone details are hidden in the muddled presentation and that the very rural nature of Kenley will be destroyed by your proposals.

Welcomes Road, Kenley Lane, Abbots Lane are just some of the beautiful green areas which will be damaged by your proposals and you must think again.

Kenley is shared by residents from all over Croydon. They visit us for the healthy walks, safe outdoor activities for children and the joy of the spaces.

All these benefits could be lost if you go ahead with these plans, together with many others.

Change Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Cllr Jan Buttinger  
London Borough of Croydon

Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Kenley and Old Coulsdon, page 163, Godstone Road, Hayes Lane upto Kenley Lane and Station Road

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where there may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Kenley and Old Coulsdon, page 163, Godstone Road, Hayes Lane upto Kenley Lane and Station Road.

The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
| Object | Soundness - Justified | DM31 (Table 11.2) Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification. The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Kenley and Old Coulsdon, page 163, Godstone Road, Hayes Lane upto Kenley Lane and Station Road | Change | Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this the designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan. |

Area between Kenley station and Godstone Road (subject to development being safe from flooding for the lifetime of the Plan) |
As part of your consultations, please note my objections to the following in your Local Plan:

DM31.4 ‘protection less intensification’. I am a Kenley resident and feel the loss of the character of the area would not best be served by this – Kenley is a pleasant, residential area that already has its fair share of excessive traffic with small rural roads already crammed with fast moving traffic and on kerb parking. Kenley does not have the infrastructure to contain more cars, parking, or development. Certainly it is already destroying local wildlife and what green open space are still left. Those of us who live in Kenley must have access to a car because we have no access to public transport so I would like to register my objections and wish you to take them on board when you make your decisions.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I strongly object to the areas listed being earmarked for ‘intensification’ as this will dramatically change the character of these areas.

Objective

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Area between Kenley station and Godstone Road (subject to development being safe from flooding for the lifetime of the Plan)

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr John Morgan

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Area between Kenley station and Godstone Road (subject to development being safe from flooding for the lifetime of the Plan)

Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are identified for "intensification" - or more building. This will change the character of those areas and I strongly oppose.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Stephen Woodward  

Object  

DM31 (Table 11.2)  

Area between Kenley station and Godstone Road (subject to development being safe from flooding for the lifetime of the Plan)  

We have lived in Sanderstead for over 40 years, and have thoroughly enjoyed the areas to the south of Croydon being unspoilt. In our view these ill conceived proposals will change this area beyond recognition and take away that for which it is well known and valued. Please rethink, and do not continue with the proposed policies set out below and which can be found in your Local Plan:

- The loss of Local Area of Special Character protection for many roads such as West Hill, Campion and Spencer Roads, the Woodcote Estate and Hartley Farm will open these roads up to inappropriate development. Roads such as Oakwood Avenue in Purley should also be included as new Local Heritage Areas. In Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for "intensification" — which is a euphemism for more building. This will change the character of those areas beyond all recognition and I am strongly opposed to any of it.

Change  

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, the designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Richard Veldeman Object DM31 (Table 11.2) In Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for “intensification” which is clearly a euphemism for more building.

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Kenley and Old Coulsdon, page 163, Godstone Road, Hayes Lane upto Kenley Lane and Station Road.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am concerned that the areas which have been earmarked for ‘intensification’ will suffer as a result of over-building, which will destroy the character of these areas.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where there may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Kenley and Old Coulsdon, page 163, Godstone Road, Hayes Lane up to Kenley Lane and Station Road.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this the designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr J Lemanski Object I would like you to note my strong objection to the granting of any Planning Application relating to the following Policy Ref. DM31.4.

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM31 (Table 11.2) Area between Kenley station and Godstone Road (subject to development being safe from flooding for the lifetime of the Plan)</td>
<td>Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for “intensification” – which is a euphemism for more building. This will change the character of those areas and should be opposed.
Mr Nick Peiris

DM31 (Table 11.2)  More protection, less "intensification"

Area between Kenley station and Godstone Road (subject to development being safe from flooding for the lifetime of the Plan)

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Mott object to this site allocation.

Area between Kenley station and Godstone Road (subject to development being safe from flooding for the lifetime of the Plan)

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 – 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
In Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for "intensification", in other words, more building, and this will change the character of those areas.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3861/01/008/DM31 (Table 11.2)</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area between Kenley station and Godstone Road (subject to development being safe from flooding for the lifetime of the Plan)</td>
<td>Any more building in these areas will have an adverse effect on the locality.</td>
<td>Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are identified for "intensification" - or more building. This will change the character of those areas and I strongly oppose.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon's local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Below is a list of our objections:

4. Policy DM31.4 - Intensification of development in South Croydon, Kenley, Purley, Sanderstead - more new developments on these sites will change character of the areas and put local communities at risk.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Cllr M Neal

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2) Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where there may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification. The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries:

Kenley and Old Coulsdon, page 163, Godstone Road, Hayes Lane upto Kenley Lane and Station Road;

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Crane

We are life-long residents of Croydon. With reference to the local plan, we would like to object to the following proposals:

• DM40.1 - A skyscraper in Purley is totally out of character for the town. Purley needs development but this is not the way to go about it.

• DM40.4 - Purley Pool - whilst not objecting to this area being redeveloped it should include a swimming pool. Our children learnt to swim here and it is an important facility to the community. For instance our Farther uses it regularly. It has been vital to maintaining his health and he would not be able to travel to more distant pools.

• DM44.2 - It is not appropriate to have a Travellers site on Green Belt land. We believe it is important to protect all Green Belt land from development.

• DM31.4 - We are opposed to the intensification of these areas.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this the designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
dm31 (table 11.2) 

area between kenley station and godstone road (subject to development being safe from flooding for the lifetime of the plan)

i strongly object to the areas listed being earmarked for 'intensification' as this will dramatically change the character of these areas.

change: croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. the challenge for the croydon local plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. to achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. the objective of policy dm31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. the proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. the policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. it would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of croydon local and neighbourhood centres. the complete review is available on the council's website on the evidence base pages which support the croydon local plan.
Mr & Mrs Kaczanowski

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2) Area between Kenley station and Godstone Road (subject to development being safe from flooding for the lifetime of the Plan)

Below is a list of our objections:

4. Policy DM 31.4 - Intensification of development in South Croydon, Kenley, Purley, Sanderstead - more new developments on these sites will change character of the areas and put local communities at risk.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include schools, the pumping station and homes on smaller plots of land. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and instead show the following boundaries: Kenley and Old Coulsdon, page 163, Godstone Road, Hayes Lane upto Kenley Lane and Station Road.
Mr Bob Sleeman

Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

focused intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks?

Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennets Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Addiscombe Residents Association

Object DM31 (Table 11.2)

Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

The intensification is on the border of Addiscombe and Shirley Place and it seems to have been chosen with no underlying evidence as to why. There are no detailed plans in the presented consultation documents. The traffic along Shirley Rd and Wickham Rd is at the standstill in rush hour. Access to Central Croydon is by car or by bus. This area has a distinct character, is predominantly residential with semi-detached and detached homes. The policy would lead to piece meal development— which has always lead to the area becoming run down as residents lose motivation to keep up with maintenance of their homes in the uncertainty of what will happen next door when the property comes up for sale.

The area should not be identified as being suitable for intensification.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
4 focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Focusing on 2 areas for "focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character". Replacing smaller buildings with larger ones. This would completely change the character of the area and I object.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon's local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Amanda Stretton

We are happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but we are objecting to building on precious open space. Finally, the draft Local Plan identifies two other areas of Shirley as locations where the Council wants to see "focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character" under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). It goes on to describe what this means: "New development located in designated areas would be significantly larger than existing and may be associated with merging smaller properties. The promoted character types are: 'Medium-rise blocks with associated grounds', 'Large buildings with spacing' and 'Large buildings with strong frontages'. Their gradual introduction will alter over time the predominant character of intensified areas" (page 132, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The two areas are the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the Shirley local centre (the area around Shirley Library) (page 166, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and we are objecting to it.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

The local draft Plan identifies two other areas of Shirley as locations where the Council wants to see “focused intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character”. The two areas around Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the Shirley Library which have been targeted are roads of semi-detached houses where families have lived for years. It is completely unacceptable that family houses should be replaced by medium-rise blocks of flats. The character of the area would change completely and would mean neighbours in conflict with each other.

The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Annette and Robert Butler

We strongly object to the following:

Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character under policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for future development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr. Sadao Ando</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM31 (Table 11.2) Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre.</td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM31 (Table 11.2) Objection to focussed intensification of Shirley Local Centre (Policy DM31.4 and Shirley Shopping parade (Wickham Road Shopping Parade))</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851/01/02</td>
<td>DM31</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon Policy DM31.4 sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. As this is a new designation it will need to be shown on the Policies Map. Details of each designation are:
- Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade - Shirley
- Setting of the Shirley Local Centre - Shirley

I object to the relaxation of the planning regulations to allow the building of significantly larger structures in close proximity to the existing housing stock, comprising mainly bungalows and two storey semi-detached houses in residential roads in the area described as Shirley Local Centre, i.e. around the Shirley Library and the area around the Shirley Road/Shirley Shopping Parade including the Green Triangle and the Trinity School educational open space. The promoted character types of Medium rise blocks with associated grounds; large buildings with spacing; and Large buildings with strong frontages; in this location would look out of character and is unacceptable. These types of developments in the wrong locations would adversely affect the character of Shirley both now and for future generations.

1. In the case of the Shirley Road/Shirley park parade shops, the area behind the shopping parade is a site of Nature Conservation Importance (locally called the Green Triangle) which should be preserved for future generations and the area of Educational Open Space for future Trinity School children.
2. If High density residential accommodation were provided there would be insufficient area for communal open space allocation.
3. The local side road network and width could not cope with high residential density proposals and the likely car ownership and on street parking.
4. If these proposals were to become the Croydon Plan adopted policy, it would place Planning blight on all properties as defined in DM31.4 until the year 2036.

I object to the development plans for the Shirley (Wickham Road) Shopping Parade and the intensification of Wickham Avenue.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Derek &amp; Sue Reeves</td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade</td>
<td>We would make the following objections to the proposed Draft Local Plan which is a poorly disguised attack on the southern part of the Borough Policy DM 31.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Gareth Champion

Object Soundness - Justified
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change
Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object: Soundness - Justified
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

Object most strongly where these proposals will fundamentally damage the nature of the designated area in Shirley. It is difficult to see how para 11.16 and 11.12 are compatible.

Change: Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Ronald H. Street

2131/01/007/DM31
(Table 11.2)

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

I also object to Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of areas’ local character under DM31/4 of the Shirley Road shopping Parade.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am writing to record my objection to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s loyal character under policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Local Centre.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs E Abdul-Nabi

Object Soundness -

Justified

Area of the Shirley
Road Shopping
Parade

Object to focussed intensification with
the gradual change of the area's local
character.

Change Croydon's suburbs will have
sustainably grown to accommodate homes to
contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge
for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and
regeneration in the local context while recognising the
local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this
designation will be amended so that it applies to
the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road
(combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key
corner plots and excludes the majority of residential
streets away from the main roads. The objective of
policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing
growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable
locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the
borough. Spatially, additional growth would
strengthen the potential for further development of public
transport and other uses which require a certain level
of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria
referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility;
deliverability of growth based on local character. The
policy opens up opportunities for more intensive
development in selected areas and enables
gradual change of character over time. It would also
positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of
Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The
complete review is available on the Council's website on
the evidence base pages which support the Croydon
Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Jeffrey

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>DM31 (Table 11.2) Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The plans for intensification of residential development are unacceptable and will change the character of the area and also overburden the already problematic local road infrastructure.</td>
<td>Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms Ellie London

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2) Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

I object to his policy regarding Shirley Road Shopping Parade.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Anna Bannon

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

The areas in Shirley should not be zones for intensification as this type of development would be totally out of keeping with the character of the area.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Table 11.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM31 (Table 11.2)</th>
<th>Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Object to focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and especially Shirley local Centre. Shirley local centre area in particular houses a large proportion of elderly residents, including two sheltered housing complexes, and those living there are doing so for the convenience of transport, shops, doctors, library etc. If you take their property where do they all go? Not everyone will find another property with such convenience on their doorstep.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object: DM31 (Table 11.2)

Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

The intensification is on the border of Addiscombe and Shirley Place and it seems to have been chosen with no underlying evidence as to why. There are no detailed plans in the presented consultation documents. The traffic along Shirley Rd and Wickham Rd is at the standstill in rush hour. Access to Central Croydon is by car or by bus. This area has a distinct character, is predominantly residential with semi-detached and detached homes. The policy would lead to piecemeal development—which has always lead to the area becoming run down as residents lose motivation to keep up with maintenance of their homes in the uncertainty of what will happen next door when the property comes up for sale.

The area should not be identified as being suitable for intensification.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object: DM31 (Table 11.2) Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

The two areas of Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the local centre around Shirley Library would affect not just Wickham Road but other roads including Devonshire Way and would completely change the character of Shirley which I do not agree with.

Change: Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Caroline Porter

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

Object: Objections to the proposed Intensification of Shirley Local Centre and Shirley Shopping Parade as outlined in table 11.2 on page 129 of Croydon Local Plan Detailed Proposals and Policies and extensive development in other areas of Shirley that are affected by road congestion and poor PTAL scores.

Lack of Communication re Consultation

Many residents in the Shirley area only learnt about Croydon Council’s proposed local plan first through an email sent out by Gavin Barwell, MP and secondly through documents he delivered to each property.

There were no notices put up on lamp posts, in the library or on public noticeboards in Shirley’s main shopping parade or any prominent place in the Shirley Local Centre.

The consultation period commenced on 5 November but the three large books containing the Croydon Plan and associated consultation documents were only delivered to Shirley Library on 11 December – after the consultation meeting had taken place and one week before the closing date of 18 December.

The Consultation meeting that covered the Shirley area was not held in Shirley (even though there are many suitable venues there – particularly Shirley Library or the Parish Hall) but miles away in Selsdon so that fewer people could attend.

For this reason Croydon Council, with regard to the transparency it claims for itself, should extend the closing date so that all residents can have a say and that this time the plans and proposals be widely advertised.

Shirley Road Area

I am writing to object to the proposals to intensify development in many roads around this centre for the following reasons:

• Poor transport accessibility

The Shirley character assessment notes that Shirley has some of the poorest public transport links in the borough. There is no railway or tram station in the built up area. The nearest railway station is 1½ miles away.

The bulk of the proposed intensification area has a PTAL score of only 2, some parts as low as 1a.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The A232 Wickham Road leads into the A215 at the Methodist Church, this has been identified as one of the most congested roads in Europe (Source: Daily Telegraph)

The council already knows there are existing traffic problems in Shirley even before any houses are built - see page 253 of transport strategy document which notes high car dependency due to poor public transport and peak time congestion. 

There is no evidence (beyond a mere pious hope in section 7.76 that people will use public transport more) that the council has considered the effect of the intensification of development on local transport networks. This is contrary to London Plan policy 6.3 which states assessments must be undertaken, and in particular the cumulative effects of development considered. Paragraph D of the policy contains the presumption that development should be directed to areas with good transport links. See London Plan paragraph 6.15 “In practical terms, this means ensuring that new developments that will give rise to significant numbers of new trips should be located either where there is already good public transport accessibility with capacity adequate to support the additional demand or where there is a realistic prospect of additional accessibility or capacity being provided in time to meet the new demand.”

- Increased car usage

The effect of the poorer transport links can be seen in increased car ownership in Shirley ward.

| Table – Car ownership in Shirley and Croydon Borough (Source 2011 census) |
| Shirley Croydon |
| All Households | 5886 145010 |
| No Cars or Vans in Household | 88% 66% |
| 1 Car or Van in Household | 23% 27% |
| 2 Cars or Vans in Household | 4% 3% |
| 3 or More Cars or Vans in Household | 1% 0.4% |

This is further reflected in modes of travel to work. Only about 10% of
people who don't work at home work in Central Croydon, the rest have to work further afield.

54% of all journeys to work from Shirley are by motor. Even in the narrow corridor along the A232 there are as many car journeys as bus/tram. Outside of there it is no contest. Even in the remainder of Croydon itself, three times as many journeys are made by car as by tram/bus/train. 70% of journeys to work to the second placed borough of Bromley are by car.

This table shows the 20 most popular locations in 2011 for Shirley residents to work and the mode of travel to work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Work</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Tram/bus</th>
<th>Motor</th>
<th>Train</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Croydon (all)</td>
<td>3028</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder</td>
<td>2190</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster, City of London</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate and Banstead</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonbridge</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawley</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All journeys to work</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: these are journeys to work from the 3 Middle Layer Super Output areas which make up most of Shirley (Croydon 18, 25, 26). Central Croydon is defined as MSOA Croydon 20, 24, 27. Source: Nomis based on 2011 census.

- **Sustainability**

National Planning Policy Framework (page 6) has a presumption against development in locations that are non-sustainable, which includes where environmental damage such as increasing greenhouse gases would result from actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible...
use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable”.

The poor transport links in Shirley is reflected in a significantly higher level of car ownership than the borough as a whole.

Individual applicants have to carry out transport assessments, why has the council not done the same for the areas they propose to designate as suitable for development?

- Council has underestimated the amount of empty houses coming forward

We note that the council assume only 190 empty houses will be reoccupied during the period 2016-36. However this appears to be at variance London Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (2009). In that Croydon stated that in the period 2011-2021 they would return 91 long term vacant properties per year to housing, plus a further 20 per annum for non-self contained units. This means that you have already stated that the borough will gain 555 homes this way in the period 2016-21, why then is a figure of 190 given for empty homes only for the whole period 2016-36? Omitting non-self contained units conflicts with the GLA SHLAA 2009.

The 2011 census Croydon had 3,814 empty properties, and as well as that there were over 1,500 commercial sites in 2010 that were vacant, many would have flats over shops, or would be capable of conversion to residential.

- Effect on local character

Sections 11.140 and 11.141 of the Detailed Policies document emphasises the pleasing uniformity of Shirley with its predominately 1930s housing in planned estates. New buildings have tended to be designed to fit into the existing streetscape.

You have stated in your report to Cabinet that development should only complement and enhance character.

This conflicts with your reasons given in paragraph 3.46 of the Report to Cabinet of 21 September 2015 (select 7.2 Main Report then find pages 15-16). Then this is used to argue Shirley has no dominant character and can therefore be the host for more intensive development.

This is clearly not the case with one exception the shopping centre is consonant with the surrounding architecture, that of 1930s suburbia, creating a homogenous whole. In no sense can intensified development with dense house
building up to 4 stories high in suburban side roads be in keeping with the inter-war single and two storey houses with gardens.
• Inability of development to occur
  We have ordered a number of registers for properties in the proposed expanded Shirley Centre and it appears that large swathes are incapable of intensified development because they contain restrictive covenants which limit the number of houses to 1 per plot.

We note you have rejected a number of proposed development sites because of the unlikelihood that they can be developed (e.g. A181 - 45 to 61 Church Street, A465 - 234 The Glades, A476 - 1 to 19 Craven Road and many others). We would particularly refer you to A354 (118-148 Tennison Road) which was rejected as a site because of replacing the existing function. This is precisely the situation here.

Please find attached the following registers:
10 Hartland Way Title number SGL553297
Shirley Library Title number SY77794
19 Westway Title number SGL568004
5 Wickham Avenue Title number SGL629833
7 Devonshire Way Title number SY2606

Detrimental effect on residents of merging two smaller properties re intensification

On page 132, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies and Proposals, it is explained that intensification involving building of medium rise blocks of flats (up to 4 storeys) could be achieved by merging smaller properties.

As noted on page 84 of Croydon Local Plan Policies and Proposals, appendix 4, there is a higher than average proportion of older people living in Shirley. And some of these may be quite vulnerable.

If a developer succeeds in buying up a semi-detached property, which could potentially be used for building flats on, what pressures could be brought to bear on an elderly owner of the adjoining semi if he or she refuses to sell? What sort of tenant could the developer obtain that might change the mind of the elderly owner? This policy has the potential to result in harassment and substantial distress. It is troubling that the Council could propose such an approach.
Caroline Porter Object Further objections to the proposed intensification of Shirley Local Centre and as outlined in table 11.2 on page 129 of Croydon Local Plan Detailed Proposals and Policies (marked DM43.1)

Shirley Local Centre has a very distinctive character. Almost all the properties were built in the late 1920s or early 1930s and attractively designed. They are also very well maintained by their owners. Many of the residents are active older people who take an interest in the area and the younger ones do too. They keep the area clean and tidy, volunteer to help out with green spaces such as Miller’s Pond, help out with the Spring Park Residents Association, organise the local Neighbourhood Watch etc. The SPRA also publishes a magazine called SPAN (Spring Park Activities News) which provides details of all the events going on in Shirley (and there are pages and pages of them). There are loads of things to do and these are organised and attended by the villagers. There a substantial number of churches in Shirley and they are very well attended. A recent Victorian Carol Concert in the Methodist Church was sold out.

When I came to live in Shirley two years ago, I was invited for coffee or drinks to my neighbours’ houses and one neighbour even came and mowed my lawn for me. The welcome was amazing.

There is nothing wrong with the character of this neighbourhood nor does it lack distinctiveness. And this character would be spoilt if our houses were demolished and replaced by anonymous blocks of flats and the sense of community would be lost. And then instead of being able to support each other, residents would be calling on the Council for help instead. And the churches too would suffer if you tried to tinker with the population make-up and the loss of them would also increase the burden on the Council.

You have marked Shirley Library and Hartland Way Surgery as suitable for redevelopment. There has been overwhelming community support for keeping the library open — not only is it a magnificent building but it also plays a huge part in our community. I have already sent you the Land Registry title register for Shirley Library — you can read the agreement between the owner and the Corporation — if a library or public building isn’t built there, the land
reverts back to only permitting the building of a single dwelling-house. The only option for the Hartland Way Surgery building is either as a private house or as the professional residence of a solicitor, architect, medical practitioner or dentist. That is how it is a doctor’s surgery. With the number of older people in the area and an increasingly aging population, there is no way we could do without the surgery. It would be a community disaster if you went ahead with these proposals.

2646/01/003/DM31 (Table 11.2)

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

I am disabled, unable to go by bus or walk very far. I chose Marlows Lodge three years ago as the place most suitable for my needs - Dr Gardners practice on the corner and the library which is my main enjoyment. I am not alone in hoping that your plans do not materialise. Shirley is a safe environment and I hope it will be left as it is.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickhams Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Panagakis Object

Object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.

| 2706/01/010/DM31 (Table 11.2) | Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade | Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan. |
This would completely change the character of the area.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am writing to register my objection to those parts of the pr, which is too weak. Proposals referred to focussed intensification associated with gradual change of the area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road shopping parade and Shirley local centre. (also see table 11.2)

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

The areas in Shirley should not be zones for intensification as this type of development would be totally out of keeping with the character of the area.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mrs Frances Pearce

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

I am writing regarding the Council’s plans for a massive redevelopment in the Shirley Area. More houses mean more traffic on our already crowded roads. I no longer go into Croydon because of the journey times. How long would it be before the Council considered bringing in a congestion charge. When you build all these properties do you consider the local amenities and the effect that more people would have on these. Where are the school places for all of these children? Regarding doctors. Unless it is an emergency I have to wait at least a week for an appointment. This waiting time can only increase if there are more patients. Is it the Council’s policy to build over green belt land to the detriment of locals? I sincerely hope not. I think you need to seriously reconsider these plans.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Ms Frances Leace  

Support

The response supports the inclusion of the proposed intensification site known as "Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade" and confirms that 0.03ha of land, which is underutilised and owned by the respondent - is both deliverable and developable for intensification purposes. The site is deliverable in that our client represents a willing landowner and the site is available for redevelopment now. There is more than a realistic prospect that development will be delivered on the site within five years.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended to include the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
This area is quite tightly drawn and so no objection to it.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre; Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr T Beavall
Object Soundness - Justified
DM31 (Table 11.2) Object to focussed intensification at Shirley Road Shopping Parade

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr John Newman

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

I object to Policy DM31.4. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semi-detached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley area.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this the designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
5) Policy DM31.4 plans to change the local character of Shirley by encouraging the replacement of the existing semi-detached houses with medium rise blocks. This will be detrimental to the area and change for the worse what is currently a very pleasant area.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
the draft Local Plan identifies two other areas of Shirley as locations where the Council wants to see “focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character” under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals).

The two areas are the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the Shirley local centre (the area around Shirley Library). The former is quite tightly drawn and I therefore don’t object to it, but the latter includes not just the Wickham Road itself but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way (page 166, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
DM31 (Table 11.2)

Policy DM31.4 sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. As this is a new designation it will need to be shown on the Policies Map. Details of each designation are shown below.

Place-specific development management policy Place Setting of the Shirley Local Centre Shirley

Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade Shirley

I object to the relaxation of the planning regulations to allow the building of significantly larger structures in close proximity to the existing housing stock, comprising mainly bungalows and two storey semi-detached and detached houses in residential roads in the area described as Shirley Local Centre, i.e. around the Shirley Library, West Way Gardens, Hartland Way, Wickham Rd, Devonshire Way, West Way, Verdayne Ave, Ridgemount Ave, Wickham Ave, and the area around the Shirley Road/Shirley Shopping Parade including the Green Triangle and the Trinity School educational open space. The promoted character types of Medium rise blocks with associated grounds; large buildings with spacing; and Large buildings with strong frontages; at these locations would look out of character and is unacceptable. These types of developments in the wrong locations would adversely affect the character of Shirley both now and for future generations. In the case of the Shirley Road/Shirley park parade shops, the area behind the shopping parade is a site of Nature Conservation Importance (locally called the Green Triangle) which should be preserved for future generations and the area of Educational Open Space for future Trinity School children. If High density residential accommodation were provided there would be insufficient area for communal open space allocation. The local side road network and width could not cope with high residential density proposal and the likely car ownership and on street parking. If these proposals were to become the Croydon Plan adopted policy, it would place Planning blight on all properties as defined in DM31.4 until the year 2036.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object Soundness - DM31 (Table 11.2) Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon’s local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.

Croydon Village Residents Assoc
Mr Stuart Marsh  

Object  

Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade  

DM31 (Table 11.2)  

I object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of the area's local character under policy DM31.4 of Shirley Road Shopping Parade.  

Change  

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I strongly object to the areas listed being earmarked for ‘intensification’ as this will dramatically change the character of these areas.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
4. DM31.4: Shirley and Forestdale should not be zones for intensification as this type of development would be totally out of keeping with the character of these areas.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr John Mills

Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley.

Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object

Policy DM31.4 sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. As this is a new designation it will need to be shown on the Policies Map. Details of each designation are shown below:

Place-specific development management policy Place Setting of the Shirley Local Centre Shirley Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade Shirley

I object to the relaxation of the planning regulations to allow the building of significantly larger structures in close proximity to the existing housing stock, comprising mainly bungalows and two storey semi-detached and detached houses in residential roads in the area described as Shirley Local Centre, i.e. around the Shirley Library, West Way Gardens, Hartland Way, Wickham Rd, Devonshire Way, West Way, Verdayne Ave, Ridgemount Ave, Wickham Ave, and the area around the Shirley Road/Shirley Shopping Parade including the Green Triangle and the Trinity School educational open space. The promoted character types of Medium rise blocks with associated grounds; large buildings with spacing; and Large buildings with strong frontages; at these locations would look out of character and is unacceptable. These types of developments in the wrong locations would adversely affect the character of Shirley both now and for future generations. In the case of the Shirley Road/Shirley park parade shops, the area behind the shopping parade is a site of Nature Conservation Importance (locally called the Green Triangle) which should be preserved for future generations and the area of Educational Open Space for future Trinity School children. If High density residential accommodation were provided there would be insufficient area for communal open space allocation. The local side road network and width could not cope with high residential density proposal and the likely car ownership and on street parking. If these proposals were to become the Croydon Plan adopted policy, it would place Planning blight on all properties as defined in DM31.4 until the year 2036.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I have read Gavin Barwell's assessment of policies and proposals in the Croydon Local Plan and totally agree that if implemented would destroy the character of Shirley.

The infrastructure in Shirley is already stretched to the limit and can not withstand any further burdens.
Mr Stephen Smith

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

I object to plans to change the character of Shirley and its neighbourhood, the Shirley Road Shopping Parade in particular.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object

Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

Soundness - Justified

DM31 (Table 11.2)

4 focused intensification associated with gradual change of an area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Objections to the proposed Intensification of Shirley Local Centre and Shirley Shopping Parade as outlined in table 11.2 on page 129 of Croydon Local Plan.

I would like to register my objection to the proposals and also to request that the consultation period is extended to allow residents and other interested parties the time to fully research the likely impact of the proposals. There appears to have been very little action on behalf of the council to ensure that those affected by these proposed plans were made aware of them, thus denying them the opportunity of airing their opinion. It is a pity that the council felt itself unable to be transparent over this matter, perhaps anticipating how unpopular and ill advised the proposal is.

I object most strongly to the council planning to change the current face of The area around and including Shirley library. My understanding is that development should only complement and enhance character in an area and this cannot be achieved by building multi occupancy buildings in and around this site. Contrary to statement, it is a characterful, and typical face of 20's and 30s builds and it is this that gives it's welcome open feel. As such, residents have a strong sense of community, care for the area and this in turn contributes to a positive sense of well being and belonging. This destabilising of an area by the proposals should not be underestimated in terms of drain on council services for policing, maintenance, cleansing if this were destroyed by intensified housing.

The amenities are a further positive of this part of Shirley, the library and Surgery being two most important parts of the whole and loss of these would impact strongly on the community.

In addition, public transport in the locality is inadequate, schools and doctors surgeries oversubscribed, and any remedy would result in even greater loss of land and character.

The council should be looking at derelict area and under used sites and areas where conditions for existing residents could be improved, rather than destroying well balanced
Object | DM31 (Table 11.2) Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade  
---|---
Change | Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr Terrence McCarthy</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Terrence McCarthy</td>
<td><strong>Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade</strong></td>
<td>I object to the focused intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semi-detached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley area. The traffic congestion on Wickham Road, once limited to rush hour and school times is now so bad that even mid-morning traffic tails back from Shirley Library to the roundabout on Shirley Hills Road. The proposed development would exacerbate this to a dangerous level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

Ref DM31.4 changes to Shirley Road shopping parade and many local roads with medium rise blocks, this will change the character of Shirley. I also wonder about the impact on schools and local doctors surgeries already stretched to capacity and the ever increasing traffic in the area.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
First, the draft Local Plan identifies two areas of Shirley as locations where the Council wants to see “focused intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character” under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The document also explains what this means – that it is the aim of your team to materially change the character of the local area. Please could you explain why? Even if it was an area which had problems, this would be unacceptable. But the area you are talking about is a good residential district with good shops and a pleasant atmosphere. An area to which people move specifically because of its character, an area which people love.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Roger Williams

Object - Soundness - Justified

Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Haslam

Object

Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

DM31 (Table 11.2)

1. Policy DM31.4: Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character. Shirley Road shopping parade and Shirley local centre:

Whilst some limited intensification in the local centre along Wickham Road may be desirable to provide additional housing, the area around the local centre is far too widely drawn, including roads with quality family housing (Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Firsby Avenue, Hartland Way, Devonshire Way etc.) which should be maintained. Family housing with gardens needs to be retained for young families upsizing from flats to move to, who it is in the borough’s interest to retain.

Intensification would also lead to increased traffic which Wickham Road cannot support (rush hour delays are already very significant), especially since traffic is already expected to increase with the (admittedly desirable) Westfield development where visitors from Shirley, West Wickham and farther afield from A21/M25 will naturally use the A232 to reach Croydon.

ii) We strongly oppose intensification around the Shirley Road shopping parade. This is an architecturally strong parade which accordingly enjoys very low vacancy rates. In fact we strongly urge you to consider the 1930s parade for local listing, local heritage area or similar protection. Indeed 11.147 states that “each of Shirley’s shopping centres has a distinct character which should be enhanced and strengthened” and some form of protection is essential to secure this in the light of intensification proposals. (We would comment similarly in respect of the Sandeford Local centre also listed under DM31.4) As with the area around the Shirley local centre, we object to the loss of family housing for the reasons already stated. In fact 11.142 notes that the features of Shirley’s shopping areas “play a vital role in creating Shirley’s sense of place” and yet, in apparent contradiction, the proposed focussed intensification as outlined would seriously undermine this sense of place.

As an aside and instead it would seem that areas in need of regeneration within the borough might be considered for focussed intensification and/or change of use to provide additional housing and where access to transport and other facilities is good. For example the area along Lower Addiscombe Road between Grant Road and Davidsom

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Road has several retail units which have been unlet for a long period and a fragmented character which provides the opportunity for redevelopment into a much higher quality and largely residential area, although focus on the quality of development/conversion will be necessary to achieve a good living environment.

We are pleased to note that public realm improvements are planned for the Shirley Local Centre, as these are long overdue.

I object to focused intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Dr Bob Wenn

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

Taken at face value, it would appear that many of the residential roads adjoining the Wickham Road are now implicated in the scheme in their entirety including; Ridgemount Avenue, Verdayne Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Firby Avenue, Orchard Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. This apparent ‘land-grab’ is totally unacceptable and disruptive for the established community on so many levels, not the least being that were these proposals to become Croydon Council’s adopted policy, they would stultify home-owner development, and possibly blight the sale and value of local properties for many years to come. Unless the Council’s intentions are better clarified and more precisely detailed damage to the market will be done.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Fourth, the draft Local Plan identifies two other areas of Shirley as locations where the Council wants to see “focused intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character” under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). It goes on to describe what this means:

“New development located in designated areas would be significantly larger than existing and may be associated with merging smaller properties. The promoted character types are: ‘Medium-rise blocks with associated grounds’, ‘Large buildings with spacing’ and ‘Large buildings with strong frontages’. Their gradual introduction will alter over time the predominant character of intensified areas” (page 132, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals).

The two areas are the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the Shirley local centre (the area around Shirley Library). The former is quite tightly drawn and I therefore don’t object to it, but the latter includes not just the Wickham Road itself but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Davonshire Way (page 166, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.
The plan for the Shirley Road Shopping Parade & the Shirley local centre (page 129) actually states its intention to change the local character. So it will involve pressurising inhabitants of perfectly good houses to move out to allow demolition of their homes to replace them with multi-occupational blocks. It will not ‘complement the local character’ to remove houses and their gardens. London’s Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment assumes that garden land WILL NOT BE DEVELOPED.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this the designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Alan Heathcote
Object
DM31 (Table 11.2)
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade
This is to object strongly to your ill-conceived proposals for high density dwellings on greenbelt parkland, on existing semi-detached housing areas, and gardens in the Shirley Oaks / Library regions. Also for travellers sites in the vicinity of Coombe farm. All as outlined in Gavin Barwell’s email.

Change
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Colin Read

Object

Soundness - Justified

Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

Existing semi-detached houses should not be demolished in favour of soulless blocks of flats. People require houses to live in, especially bringing up families. Please stick to sensible developments and do not destroy Croydon with horrendous buildings. We are long-term residents and care very much about the area in which we live.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this the designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

Focused intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr E King OBE
Object
Soundness - Justified

Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change
Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am writing to you to object to the focused intensification associated with the gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 off the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley Local Centre.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms G Stevens</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM31 (Table 11.2) Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am writing to object to the Council's proposed long term plans for certain parts of Croydon, particularly the area around Shirley library, where I have lived for 30 years. Apart from the obvious increase in traffic, to an already overburdened Wickham Road, we are starting to see the gradual erosion of traditional residential roads formed of classic semi or detached houses. To cram more and more houses and flats into the designated areas would destroy their character and to build on existing green belt and back gardens would be completely inappropriate, as well as placing additional stress on local facilities and amenities. I urge the Council to reconsider these proposals and adopt a more sensitive agenda using only space and land capable of absorbing additional development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Change | Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan. |

02 September 2016
Mr Ian Masters

Object: Soundness - Justified
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

I have heard from another source that a plot of land known locally as the Green Triangle at the bottom of our gardens is included in the proposals and yet to my knowledge there is no mention of it in the document. None of the local residents know anything about it neither do the Shirley Parade Shops management committee.

Change: The triangle referred to in the representation is a Site of Nature Conservation Importance and not suitable for development. Therefore, it has been removed from the proposed area of focussed intensification.

Mr Ian Masters

Object: Legal Compliance
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

I have lived in Shirley for 22 years and one of the main reasons we moved here was because of the character and charm of the area. Needless to say we were horrified when we were recently made aware of the above document and the proposals involving medium rise housing intensification. When I first read the document I thought it just involved the development of the Shirley Road Parade of Shops, however, when I looked at the line drawing on page 166 the outline boundary stretched further than the parade so I wrote to your planning department asking for the addresses affected by the proposals. I received a reply from Dominique Barnett on 3/12, however, she did not answer my question so I replied on 5/12 and told her that I required a definitive list of addresses - to date I still haven't received a reply, although I spoke to her directly last week and she said she would try to obtain the info. And write to me.

Change:  
Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Gary Kenney

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2) Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

I am writing to show that I object to a number of your plans around the Shirley area. I contest that you need to build on our green sites and bring in new ‘traveler’ sites into Shirley.

On top of this I cannot understand the need to bring ‘medium’ high rise buildings in and around Shirley, including Devonshire way and the new proposals around Hartland way.

Please can you let me know if my objection has been noted and how I can make it more official?

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Jenny Hayden

Object

Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

My other objection relates to the draft Local Plan relating to two other areas in Shirley, i.e. Shirley Shopping Parade and the Shirley local centre, the area around Shirley Library. From the draft plan, the Council wants to see "focused intensification associated with gradual change of the area's local character" under Policy DM31.4... It further describes how this would mean merging smaller properties, medium rise blocks, large buildings with strong frontages. "The introduction of such buildings will alter, over time, the predominant character of the intensified areas"... Page 106 CLP mentions local roads in Shirley. To replace the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium rise blocks is not acceptable. It will inevitably change the character of Shirley and I would like to register my objection.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am writing to object to:

1. Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM 31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre.

   This policy is lacking in sufficient detail or thought, and actually perpetuates the poorly planned and thought out development that the Croydon Local Plan refers to, which it seeks to avoid.

   The idea that largely semi-detached buildings in the residential roads surrounding Shirley library should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is entirely unsuitable, and wholly unacceptable.

   This policy would completely change the character of Shirley for the worse (not better), with particular and direct effect on those residential streets encompassed by the suggested policy on the south side of Shirley that sit off/behind the main Wickham Road and library.

   Adopting such a policy would also significantly devalue and detract from Shirley as a whole, and would have negative consequences in respect of the existing residential properties surrounding any such development that would remain. It is also likely to result in at least a perceived element of blight if pursued.

   The policy does not indicate a respect for the local area and the existing character, which would be destroyed by adopting such a policy. It also shows little regard to the impacts on what is a settled and well established community, which would be eroded fairly quickly. The policy also shows no regard for the local environs, as well as local and public services, traffic considerations, and existing infrastructure.

   Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object Soundness - Justified Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am concerned that the areas which have been earmarked for ‘intensification’ will suffer as a result of over-building, which will destroy the character of these areas.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr J Cook

Objections to the proposed
Intensification of Shirley Local Centre
and Shirley Shopping Parade as outlined in table 11.2 on page 129 of
Croydon Local Plan Detailed Proposals and Policies and extensive
development in other areas of Shirley.

I wish to lodge my objection to the
proposals on the following grounds:
- Insufficient Notice was given
to allow adequate consideration to be
given to the proposals
- The intensification of dwelling
places in the area will have a
negative impact, changing the nature
and character of the area
- The transport links in the area
are inadequate to cope with a large
increase in the population. The A232
Wickham Road is notoriously bad.

A proposal to build flats to replace
two bungalows on the corner of Alton
Road was turned down on the
grounds that it would change the
nature and character of the road.
Alton Road consists of traditional
family homes with gardens.
Many similar roads referred to in the
Shirley proposal would be affected in
the same way.

You only have to look at Pampisford
Road in Croydon to see how such
developments change the nature and
character of a road.

Croydon's suburbs will have
sustainably grown to
accommodate homes to
contribute to the borough's
housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is
to enable growth and
regeneration in the local
context while recognising the
local character and
distinctiveness. To achieve
this this designation will be
amended so that it applies to the
buildings along Wickham
Road and Shirley Road
(combining the area with that of
Shirley Local Centre), key
corner plots and excludes
the majority of residential
streets away from the main
roads. The objective of
policy DM31.4 is to
maximise use of the existing
growth capacity, to focus
growth in sustainable
locations and to support a
smart spatial vision for the
borough. Spatially,
additional growth would
strengthen the potential for
further development of public
transport and other uses
which require a certain level of
localised demand. The
proposed areas meet criteria
referring to infrastructure
availability and accessibility;
deliverability of growth based on
local character. The
policy opens up
opportunities for more
intensive development in
selected areas and enables
gradual change of character
over time. It would also
positively encourage spatial
quality and distinctiveness of
Croydon local and
neighbourhood centres. The
complete review is available on
the Council's website on the
evidence base pages
which support the Croydon
Local Plan.
Mr J Lemanski

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2) Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

I would like you to note my strong objection to the granting of any Planning Application relating to the following Policy Ref. DM31.4.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mrs J McDonald

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

In Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for “intensification” – which is a euphemism for more building. This will change the character of those areas and should be opposed.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Mott object to this site allocation. Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Also, tearing down semi detached housing and putting up blocks of flats (as planned in Shirley) is totally unacceptable.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

Mr K George: I am unaware that I have missed public meetings or been sent details of these plans as it affects my local area. I think that were you to have had a local referendum as I think you should have done, these proposals would receive practically zero support except possibly by those who stand to gain from it. My wife and I are longstanding Shirley residents. While I understand the need for more housing, the Croydon plan as it affects Shirley seems extreme in extent and its likely impact on Shirley. I am especially concerned with policy DM31.4 and the proposed focussed intensification of the Shirley Road Shopping parade and Shirley local centre which is tantamount to the destruction of Shirley as it exists and it’s replacement by New developments of unknown nature. Apart from the unknown endpoint it is clear that the impact in terms of inconvenience and disruption to local residents would occur over many years during this redevelopment for no benefit to existing residents. It is also not evident why that part of Shirley as opposed to any other reasonably pleasant suburban area in Croydon should have been chosen for ‘intensification’.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Finally, the draft Local Plan identifies two other areas of Shirley as locations where the Council wants to see "focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character" under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). It goes on to describe what this means:

“New development located in designated areas would be significantly larger than existing and may be associated with merging smaller properties. The promoted character types are: ‘Medium-rise blocks with associated grounds’, ‘Large buildings with spacing’ and ‘Large buildings with strong frontages’. Their gradual introduction will alter over time the predominant character of intensified areas” (page 132, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals).

The two areas are the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the Shirley local centre (the area around Shirley Library) (page 166, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and we are objecting to it.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I object to it very strongly.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this the designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Paul Slaughter

Object: Soundness - Justified

Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
First, the draft Local Plan identifies two areas of Shirley as locations where the Council wants to see "focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character" under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). Happily the document also explains what this means. Unhappily, it appears to mean exactly what it says – that it is the aim of your team to materially change the character of the local area. If it was an area which had problems, which needed to be helped up, which was suffering unduly from the privations of the tight financial climate then perhaps, perhaps, it would be understandable, if still unacceptable. But the area you are talking about is none of those things – it is a nice residential district with nice shops and a pleasant atmosphere. An area to which people move specifically because of its character, and area which people love.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, the designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 – 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Shirley, page 166, Shirley Road from Shirley Avenue to the BP Service Station and a further zone on Wickham Road from Verdayne Avenue to Cheston Avenue.

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, the designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of the local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
the draft Local Plan identifies two other areas of Shirley as locations where the Council wants to see "focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character" under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). It goes on to describe what this means: New development located in designated areas would be significantly larger than existing and may be associated with merging smaller properties. The promoted character types are: ‘Medium-rise blocks with associated grounds’, ‘Large buildings with spacing’ and ‘Large buildings with strong frontages’. Their gradual introduction will alter over time the predominant character of intensified areas’ (page 132, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The two areas are the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the Shirley local centre (the area around Shirley Library). The former is quite tightly drawn and, therefore, I can not think of a reason to object to it, but the latter includes not just the Wickham Road itself but Ridgmount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way (page 166, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I object to it very strongly.

Change Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Road.

None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr M Blount

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2) Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

I have considered details of the proposed Croydon Local Plan and have the following objections on the basis that they will:

- detract from the local areas,
- dramatically change the local areas,
- have a significant adverse effect on an already overloaded infrastructure, including roads, public transport, public open space, environment and emergency, health and support services.

3. I object to the proposed replacement of low rise, terraced, semi detached, and detached properties with medium and high rise properties in the Shirley area, Addington and Forestdale area, New Addington area, Addiscombe and East Croydon area.

4. I object to the proposed increased building capacity and density in the Shirley area, Addington and Forestdale area, New Addington area, Addiscombe and East Croydon area.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this the designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Ms M Kaczanowski

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

Below is a list of our objections:

4. Policy DM 31.4 - Intensification of development in South Croydon, Kenley, Purley, Sanderstead - more new developments on these sites will change character of the areas and put local communities at risk.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mrs Barbara Cumming

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

I understand that there are two areas in Shirley where four storey buildings are planned: Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the area around the Shirley Library. Whilst I don’t object to the Shirley Road development, the latter includes not just Wickham Road itself but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way, and Devonshire Way (page 166, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I object to it very strongly.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Jan Payne Object I object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade.

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Cllr M Neal Object Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification. The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Shirley, page 166, Shirley Road from Shirley Avenue to the BP Service Station and a further zone on Wickham Road from Verdayne Avenue to Cheston Avenue;

Change Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Golbourn:

Object:

DM31 (Table 11.2) Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

I also object strongly to the proposed development of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre (Policy DM31.4). Shirley is made up of mostly semi-detached houses in residential roads. To replace these very functional and beautiful houses with medium rise blocks will change the entire character of Shirley. It will only serve to lead to further development in an already well populated area.

Change:

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Ishaq Object I would like to object to: focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Proposed Policy DM31 and DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Ishaq Object

DM31 (Table 11.2) Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

I would like to object to: focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Proposed Policy DM31 and DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

Focused intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semi-detached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley area;

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
We are life long residents of Croydon. With reference to the local plan we would like to object to the following proposals:

• DM40.1 - A skyscraper in Purley is total out of character for the town. Purley needs development but this is not the way to go about it.
• DM40.4 - Purley Pool - whilst not objecting to this area being redeveloped it should include a swimming pool. Our children learnt to swim here and it is an important facility to the community. For instance our Father uses it regularly. It has been vital to maintaining his health and he would not be able to travel to more distant pools.
• DM44.2 - It is not appropriate to have a travellers site on green belt land. We believe it is important to protect all Green Belt land from development.
• DM31.4 - We are opposed to the intensification of these areas.

Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness -</th>
<th>DM31 (Table 11.2)</th>
<th>Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the gradual change of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>area's local character, the Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>states it wants to see &quot;housed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>intensification&quot; by allowing properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>significantly larger that the existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ones to be build in Shirley Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Centre and Shirley Road under policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DM31.4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is to enable growth and regeneration in the local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>context while recognising the local character and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be amended so that it applies to the buildings along</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>excludes the majority of residential streets away from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>growth in sustainable locations and to support a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>additional growth would strengthen the potential for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>further development of public transport and other uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which require a certain level of localised demand. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>based on local character. The policy opens up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>opportunities for more intensive development in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>selected areas and enables gradual change of character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>over time. It would also positively encourage spatial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on the Council's website on the evidence base pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms R Lloyd

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

The green belt land we have in our areas, in Shirley, Forestdale, Addington and beyond, is a precious resource that should be protected by the council, not placed under threat of development at your whim. Having these green spaces helps the environment, the ecosystem, biodiversity and nature, and local residents, who benefit in many ways from having such places nearby their homes.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade</td>
<td>The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.</td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms S Lawson

**Object**

DM31 (Table 11.2) Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

**Change**

I strongly object to the areas listed being earmarked for 'intensification' as this will dramatically change the character of these areas.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Matt Knight
Object: DM31 (Table 11.2)
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade
Ref DM31.4 changes to Shirley Road shopping parade and many local roads with medium rise blocks, this will change the character of Shirley. I also wonder about the impact on schools and local doctors surgeries already stretched to capacity and the ever increasing traffic in the area.
Change: Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semi-detached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley area.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semi-detached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley area;

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The draft Local Plan identifies two other areas of Shirley as locations where the Council wants to see "focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character" under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). It goes on to describe what this means: New development located in designated areas would be significantly larger than existing and may be associated with merging smaller properties. The promoted character types are: 'Medium-rise blocks with associated grounds', 'Large buildings with spacing' and 'Large buildings with strong frontages'. Their gradual introduction will alter over time the predominant character of intensified areas" (page 132, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The two areas are the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the Shirley local centre (the area around Shirley Library).

The former is quite tightly drawn and I therefore don’t object to it, but the latter includes not just the Wickham Road itself but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way (page 166, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I object to this very strongly.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr. Vince Hemmott

Focused intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgmount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too;

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable – it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
4114/01006/DM31  
(Table 11.2)  

Mr & Mrs Kaczanowski  
Object: Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade  

Below is a list of our objections:  

4. Policy DM 31.4 - Intensification of development in South Croydon, Kenley, Purley, Sanderstead - more new developments on these sites will change character of the areas and put local communities at risk.  

Change: Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Ms S Rao object to focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road shopping Parade. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semi-detached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley Area.

DM31 (Table 11.2) Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

I object to focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road shopping Parade. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semi-detached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley Area.

Change The policy 31.4 was withdrawn from the final draft of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals in response to the new piece of evidence which was not available prior to consultation. The detailed Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment identified all six proposed areas of focussed intensification as being of a high risk of flooding (fluvial, surface and groundwater) therefore not suitable for intensification.
I am grateful to the Council for consulting on the detailed policies and proposals that will make up the Croydon Local Plan. There is much in the document that I agree with, but some of the proposals would, in my opinion, change the character of parts of Croydon very much for the worse. I hope you will forgive me if I focus on these areas of contention. I am therefore writing to formally object to:

4. focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks?

Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Benneffs Way and Davonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too;

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, the designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4150/010/010/DM31 (Table 11.2)</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade</td>
<td>I am writing to object to Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of the local character of Shirley Policy DM31.4. The proposed changes would exacerbate the traffic problems in the Wickham Road referred to above. They would change the area from a community to one of apartments and commuters.</td>
<td>Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

Focused intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semi-detached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley area;

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Carol Holmes

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2) Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

Identification of two Shirley areas as suitable for "focussed intensification associated with gradual change of areas local character" under policy DM31.4

The areas are the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the Shirley Local Centre. The roads around Shirley Library are largely semi-detached housing, where families have lived for many years. It is a settled community and it is completely unacceptable the family houses should be replaced by medium-sized blocks of flats, which would completely change the area's character and disrupt the existing community. This has personal relevance, as the proposals cover the road where I have lived for the past 32 years.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The local draft plan identifies two other areas of Shirley as locations where the Council wants to see "focussed intensification associated with gradual change of the area's character". The two areas around Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the Shirley Library which have been targeted are roads of semi-detached houses where families have lived for years. It is a settled community and it is completely unacceptable that family houses should be replaced by medium-rise blocks of flats. The character of the area would change completely.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I object to:

6. focussed intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road shopping parade and the Shirley Library local centre.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am writing to submit my objection to:

3. Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre;

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr J Westray

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Object

Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

The focussed intensification associated with the gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the Shirley local centre. The idea that new development located in these areas, including local residential roads, could be significantly larger than existing buildings of up to four storeys is totally out of keeping with the area and would fundamentally change the character of Shirley. Such a significant change is disrespectful to existing residents who have chosen to live, contribute and build a strong local community in an established residential suburban area.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mrs Mary Lane  

I object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgmount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennett Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Change Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

DM31 (Table 11.2) focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semi-detached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley area; Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade</td>
<td>Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focused intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre. As higher buildings require more surrounding space, there is no advantage in destroying the character. Retaining the shopping parades to provide local shopping facilities is essential as it is environmentally friendly, aside from strengthening communities.
Mr & Mrs Maguire

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2) Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre. The proposals to allow building of medium rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley and is unacceptable.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM31 (Table 11.2)</td>
<td>Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade**

Focused intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semi-detached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley area;
Mrs Rita Evans

As a long term resident of Shirley, since 1969, I am appalled at your proposals for focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character. Although I and other local people appreciate the need for housing, surely it is part of your responsibility as a Council to respect the views of your residents and to conserve good local character, not to bulldoze it in favour of such inappropriate redevelopment? Shirley is recognised as a prime example of excellent inter-war development. It would seem our Council is determined to destroy this asset and replace it with anonymity.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4312/01/008/DM31 (Table 11.2)</th>
<th>Doreen Jansen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Object</strong></td>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM31 (Table 11.2)</td>
<td>Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade</td>
<td>Object to the focussed intensification - Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley Local Centre. This will totally change the character of the Shirley area and damage communities without consideration for what the people of those areas need. It will create an artificial town centre by removing groups need. It will create an artificial town centre by removing groups of e.g. villages, a hallmark of Shirley.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to:

6. focussed intensification associated with gradual change of the area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road shopping parade and the Shirley Library local centre.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object DM31 (Table 11.2)
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

DM31 (Table 11.2) focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semi-detached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley area;

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Ms B Fontaine

DM31 (Table 11.2) Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

Focused intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semi-detached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley area;

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I do not object to the development plans for the Shirley Road Shopping Parade provided that the designated area in question remains as in the original drawings.

Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Ms N Nesterovich

**Object**

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

Focused intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semi-detached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley area;

**Change**

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

Focused intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre; We do not need intensified build up of the local area. I was walking along the Wickham Road recently and was praying like mad that the Council would do something about the fumes because they are most unpleasant to inhale. When my parents moved from Camberwell to Shirley many years ago, it was in the fond hope that the prevailing atmosphere in Shirley would be a lot healthier than that found in Camberwell. Some hopes! Now the Labour council is just seeking to impose more fumes and a less healthy way of life upon us! I object!

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, the designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade</td>
<td>Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DM31 (Table 11.2)
Dr I Jayamanne  
Object Soundness - Justified  
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade  

I wish to protest vehemently about your plans to destroy Shirley which is a village by building hundred of homes and setting up a Gypsy and Traveller site. You will destroy the Green Belt and increase the traffic in the area thus polluting the environment and the air we breathe.

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Steve Westray

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

The focussed intensification associated with the gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the Shirley local centre. The idea that new development located in these areas, including local residential roads, could be significantly larger than existing buildings of up to four storeys is totally out of keeping with the area and would fundamentally change the character of Shirley. Such a significant change is disrespectful to existing residents who have chosen to live, contribute and build a strong local community in an established residential suburban area.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mrs Olive Garton

Object DM31 (Table 11.2)
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade

Development around the Shirley Road shopping parade (policy DM31.4): It was established many years ago that the open land behind the shopping parade is unsuitable for development, because access to the site is too narrow for fire tenders to get onto the site, should there be a fire or other emergency.

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Local Centre), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
In Policy DM31.4 some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for intensification which is a euphemism for more building. This will change the character of those areas and should be opposed.

Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Derek & Sue Reeves

Object

We would make the following objections to the proposed Draft Local Plan which is a poorly disguised attack on the southern part of the Borough

Policy DM 31.4

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.

Brighton Road (Sanderstead Road) Local Centre with its setting (subject to development being safe from flooding for the lifetime of the Plan)
Councillor Luke Clancy

**Object**

Justified

**Soundness - DM31 (Table 11.2)**

Brighton Road (Sanderstead Road) Local Centre with its setting (subject to development being safe from flooding for the lifetime of the Plan)

Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries:

- South Croydon, page 167: Brighton Road from Napier Road to Kingsdown Avenue.

**Change**

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification. The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries:
South Croydon, page 167, Brighton Road from Napier Road to Kingstown Avenue.

Change
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this the designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: South Croydon, page 167, Brighton Road from Napier Road to Kingsdown Avenue.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: South Croydon, page 167, Brighton Road from Napier Road to Kingsdown Avenue.

The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object Soundness - Justified

Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: South Croydon, page 167, Brighton Road from Napier Road to Kingdown Avenue.

Change Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where there may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries:

- South Croydon, page 167, Brighton Road from Napier Road to Kingsdown Avenue.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object Soundness - Justified

Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area's local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries:
- South Croydon, page 167; Brighton Road from Napier Road to Kingsdown Avenue.

DM31 (Table 11.2) Brighton Road (Sanderstead Road) Local Centre with its setting (subject to development being safe from flooding for the lifetime of the Plan)

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: South Croydon, page 167, Brighton Road from Napier Road to Kingsdown Avenue.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this the designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Cllr Richard Chatterjee  
London Borough of Croydon

Object:  Soundness - Justified

Brighton Road (Sanderstead Road) Local Centre with its setting (subject to development being safe from flooding for the lifetime of the Plan)

Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where there may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be redrawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: South Croydon, page 167; Brighton Road from Napier Road to Kingsdown Avenue.

Change:  Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Stephanie Lawson

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2) Brighton Road (Sanderstead Road) Local Centre with its setting (subject to development being safe from flooding for the lifetime of the Plan) I strongly object to the areas listed being earmarked for ‘intensification’ as this will dramatically change the character of these areas

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr John Morgan

Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are identified for "intensification" - or more building. This will change the character of those areas and I strongly oppose.

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Stephen Woodward

Object

We have lived in Sanderstead for over 40 years, and have thoroughly enjoyed the areas to the south of Croydon being unspoilt. In our view these ill conceived proposals will change this area beyond recognition and take away that for which it is well known and valued. Please rethink, and do not continue with the proposed policies set out below and which can be found in your Local Plan:

- The loss of Local Area of Special Character protection for many roads such as West Hill, Campden and Spencer Roads, the Woodcote Estate and Hartley Farm will open these roads up to inappropriate development. Roads such as Oakwood Avenue in Purley should also be included as new Local Heritage Areas.
- In Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for “intensification” — which is a euphemism for more building. This will change the character of those areas beyond all recognition and I am strongly opposed to any of it.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, the designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon’s local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
In Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for “intensification” which is clearly a euphemism for more building.

Mr Richard Veldeman
Object
DM31 (Table 11.2)
Table 11.2
Brighton Road (Sanderstead Road) Local Centre with its setting (subject to development being safe from flooding for the lifetime of the Plan).

Change
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: South Croydon, page 167, Brighton Road from Napier Road to Kingsdown Avenue.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am concerned that the areas which have been earmarked for ‘intensification’ will suffer as a result of over-building, which will destroy the character of these areas.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: South Croydon, page 167, Brighton Road from Napier Road to Kingsdown Avenue.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this the designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I would like you to note my strong objection to the granting of any Planning Application relating to the following Policy Ref. DM31.4.

Brighton Road
(Sanderstead Road)
Local Centre with its setting (subject to development being safe from flooding for the lifetime of the Plan)

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough.

Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
In Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for “intensification” – which is a euphemism for more building. This will change the character of those areas and should be opposed.

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM31 (Table 11.2)</th>
<th>More protection, less &quot;intensification&quot;</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Road (Sanderstead Road) Local Centre with its setting (subject to development being safe from flooding for the lifetime of the Plan)</td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brighton Road (Sanderstead Road) Local Centre with its setting (subject to development being safe from flooding for the lifetime of the Plan)

Mr & Mrs Mott object I object to this site allocation.

Change Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 – 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: South Croydon, page 167, Brighton Road from Napier Road to Kingsdown Avenue.

Change Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mrs Heather Harris

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

In Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for “intensification”, in other words, more building, and this will change the character of those areas.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are identified for “intensification” – or more building. This will change the character of those areas and I strongly oppose.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Ms M Kaczanowski

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Below is a list of our objections:
4. Policy DM 31.4 - Intensification of development in South Croydon, Kenley, Purley, Sanderstead - more new developments on these sites will change character of the areas and put local communities at risk.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification. The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: South Croydon, page 167, Brighton Road from Napier Road to Kingsdown Avenue.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
We are life long residents of Croydon. With reference to the local plan we would like to object to the following proposals:

- **DM40.1** - A skyscraper in Purley is total out of character for the town. Purley needs development but this is not the way to go about it.
- **DM40.4** - Purley Pool - whilst not objecting to this area being redeveloped it should include a swimming pool. Our children learnt to swim here and it is an important facility to the community. For instance our Farther uses it regularly. It has been vital to maintaining his health and he would not be able to travel to more distant pools.
- **DM44.2** - It is not appropriate to have a travellers site on green belt land. We believe it is important to protect all Green Belt land from development.
- **DM31.4** - We are opposed to the intensification of these areas.

Change Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Ms S Lawson

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)
Brighton Road (Sanderstead Road) Local Centre with its setting (subject to development being safe from flooding for the lifetime of the Plan)

I strongly object to the areas listed being earmarked for ‘intensification’ as this will dramatically change the character of these areas.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Kaczanowski

Below is a list of our objections:

4. Policy DM 31.4 - Intensification of development in South Croydon, Kenley, Purley, Sanderstead - more new developments on these sites will change character of the areas and put local communities at risk.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries:

- South Croydon, page 167, Brighton Road from Napier Road to Kingsdown Avenue.

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Brighton Road and Sanderstead Road, areas in between and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Table 11.2

Mr Bob Sleeman

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Object

Forestdale

focused intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
4 focused intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Davonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development in public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Michael Fowler

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Also, the draft Plan identifies Forestdale as a location where the Council wants to see "focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character" under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area and I object to this.

Mr & Mrs K Davenport

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM31 (Table 11.2)

I am astonished that further building is proposed within Forestdale. It was created by builders who used the contours of the land and green spaces to create an environment that combined high-density housing with a pleasant living environment. The estate does not contain any 'wasted space'. The thought of erecting a medium sized tower here is a mad scheme.

1180/01/001/DM31 (Table 11.2)

Mr & Mrs K Davenport

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM31 (Table 11.2)

I am astonished that further building is proposed within Forestdale. It was created by builders who used the contours of the land and green spaces to create an environment that combined high-density housing with a pleasant living environment. The estate does not contain any 'wasted space'. The thought of erecting a medium sized tower here is a mad scheme.

1140/01/002/DM31 (Table 11.2)

Mr Michael Fowler

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Also, the draft Plan identifies Forestdale as a location where the Council wants to see "focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character" under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area and I object to this.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.

No change

The Local Plan has never proposed any such development in Forestdale estate. The focussed intensification applied to the area around the junction of Featherbed Lane and Selsdon Park Road.
The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this the designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Derek & Sue Reeves

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

We would make the following objections to the proposed Draft Local Plan which is a poorly disguised attack on the southern part of the Borough Policy DM 31.4

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification. The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Selsdon, page 165, Selsdon Park Road from Farnborough Avenue to the roundabout at Kent Gate Way and Holmbury Grove. Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Charles Marriott

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2) I particularly object to your proposals for the Forestdale

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Replacing the largely terraced housing with small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries:
Selsdon, page 165, Selsdon Park Road from Farnborough Avenue to the roundabout at Kent Gate Way and Holmbury Grove

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Councillor Mario Creatura  
London Borough of Croydon

Object Soundness - Justified  
DM31 (Table 11.2) Forestdale

Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area's local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where there may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Selsdon, page 165, Selsdon Park Road from Farnborough Avenue to the roundabout at Kent Gate Way and Holmbury Grove.

Change Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
| Object | Soundness | Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where there may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification. The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Selsdon, page 165, Selsdon Park Road from Farnborough Avenue to the roundabout at Kent Gate Way and Holmbury Grove. | Change |
|---|---|---|
| Andy Stranack | Forestside | Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan. |
Forestdale as a location where the Council wants to see focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). It goes on to describe what this means:

New development located in designated areas would be significantly larger than existing and may be associated with merging smaller properties. The promoted character types are: ‘Medium-rise blocks with associated grounds’, ‘Large buildings with spacing’ and ‘Large buildings with strong frontages’. Their gradual introduction will alter over time the predominant character of intensified areas (page 132, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals).

The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
In addition to changes in the housing stock, these proposals would significantly alter the population density. Most individuals continue to aspire to own a car and for many this is a necessity in order to travel to and from work. Public transport will never cover the needs of all people particularly those that need their vehicles as an integral part of their work. The proposed dramatic increase in dwellings and population density will add to the demand for on-street parking which is already an acute problem in some parts of Forestdale.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dewi Jones</th>
<th>DM31 (Table 11.2)</th>
<th>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, the designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In my opinion the Councils proposals, if approved, would alter the physical appearance of Forestdale changing it from one designed to blend harmoniously with the local rural environment ‘Where Town meets Country’ was developers original concept. It is difficult to imagine medium rise flats, perhaps up to 15 storeys high, blending with the existing housing stock or the countryside surrounding Forestdale as the existing area is relatively small and narrow and surrounded by woods and a bird sanctuary.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When Forestdale was designed by the developers, Wates, it was always intended that the housing stock would provide a range of dwellings for various incomes and different household needs. It remains ‘relatively cheap’ by current London standards. These proposals would alter that original concept.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Furthermore, there must be considerable doubt whether existing home owners would be adequately compensated. I am left with the inevitable but uncomfortable conclusion that many existing owners, dispossessed by the council, will have insufficient funds to buy a similar property either in Croydon or elsewhere in London and will either have to downsize or relocate to another part of the country.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I wish to object strongly to what I consider are ludicrous proposals bordering on the insane. Referring in particular to Policy DM31.4 I would like to state that myself and many other people moved here because it's quite an open area without large blocks of flats. Already over time the area has changed - parking is a nightmare and amount of litter and fly tipping has increased greatly. How indeed does the Council propose to change small housing into blocks of flats? Will they issue hundreds of Compulsory Purchase Orders or send in the 'Heavies' to force residents out. Public transport around Forestdale is already stretched to breaking point and parking along the Piston Way is so bad that at certain times of the day and particularly at weekends the high frequency bus service finds the main road virtually impassible. I do believe Abellio the company running the bus service have complained on many occasions.

At present Forestdale is served by two schools- Forestdale and Courtwood. Forestdale has recently doubled in size. So what plans for the future when the population on Forestdale virtually doubles? Also there is one small part time Doctors surgery. It's all very well moving in masses of people but what about other services? In my opinion Forestdale is not suitable for your so called 'intensification' But yet again residents with modest amounts of money and property and of course little political influence pay the price again.
The respondent states that they chose this area because of the affordable housing, garden spaces (open plan feel) and no large blocks of flats. Already the area has changed (and not for the better).

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am writing to object to:

1. Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of Forestdale

With regard to policy DM31.4, my wife and I have lived in Forestdale for 40 years and raised our family here, firstly in Hartscoft and then in Brookscroft. I have been a director of Brookscroft Management Ltd for ten years and chairman for eight. I believe that Brookscroft is a valuable asset for Croydon which the Council should be aiming to protect, not threaten:

a) The houses are relatively low cost, and therefore aspirational homes for first time buyers including those moving from social housing (there are also Housing Association properties in the estate)

b) Unlike most properties at comparable cost the area is ‘green’ thanks to shared amenity land, providing a healthy environment for young families with consequential benefit in terms of their children’s development and reduced social cost compared with other more ‘urban’ areas

c) This is achieved because the amenity land (including roads and street lighting) is owned and maintained by Brookscroft Management Ltd at no cost to the Council, despite all houses paying full Council Tax. If the character was changed this cost (currently £52,000 pa) would fall to the Council

d) It should also be noted that the current character and legal status of Brookscroft is protected by Trust and Covenants, which we would fight to preserve.

These points apply in varying degree to Forestdale as a whole, of which Brookscroft forms only a small part.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Selsdon, page 165, Selsdon Park Road from Farnborough Avenue to the roundabout at Kent Gate Way and Holmbury Grove.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries:
- Selsdon, page 165, Selsdon Park Road from Farnborough Avenue to the roundabout at Kent Gate Way and Holmbury Grove

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object Soundness - Justified  
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where there may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification. The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Selsdon, page 165, Selsdon Park Road from Farnborough Avenue to the roundabout at Kent Gate Way and Holmbury Grove.

Change: Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
DM31 (Table 11.2)

Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where there may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Selsdon, page 165, Selsdon Park Road from Farnborough Avenue to the roundabout at Kent Gate Way and Holmbury Grove.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Ms Valerie Humfress | Support

I agree with the proposal to include Forestdale in the Selsdon district which is our natural District centre. I also approve of the concept of designating a Neighbourhood centre at the Selsdon Park Road/Featherbed Lane junction. This is a thriving centre and convenient for local residents. It has a small supermarket, two chemists, a newsagent with sub post office, bakery, launderette, GP surgery and dentist so it's good to protect these services. There are also restaurants for fish and chips and Indian food plus daytime cafes and takeaways. The loss of the bank to become a betting shop was a shame although there are cash points at the newsagent and petrol station. There are also good public transport links. Some intensification in this locality may be appropriate if carefully designed and does not adversely affect the existing residents or businesses. Therefore I would not object if the intensification is only in the area shown marked as DM31.4 on the Changes of Policies map of Selsdon indicated in blue (page 165).

My initial worry on learning of the intensification proposal from my MP was that it would apply to all of Forestdale and this has been the impression that he and his supporters have given to me and other residents. The whole of Forestdale is identified in the Detailed Policies and Proposals, Paragraph 11.9, Table 11.2 as marked for intensification.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where there may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification. The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Selsdon, page 165, Selsdon Park Road from Farnborough Avenue to the roundabout at Kent Gate Way and Holmbury Grove.

The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Andrew Green Object Forestdale to see "focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character" under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). "New development located in designated areas would be significantly larger than existing and may be associated with merging smaller properties. The promoted character types are: 'Medium-rise blocks with associated grounds', 'Large buildings with spacing' and 'Large buildings with strong frontages'. Their gradual introduction will alter over time the predominant character of intensified areas"

I have been a resident of Forestdale all my life, having been brought up in our family home there, and subsequently my first flat, and now a 3 bedroom house. I am incensed that the above would even have crossed someone's mind let alone be turned into a formalised plan. Forestdale is a private housing estate which was built with great consideration to provide a mixture of property types for all, from solo occupancy to family homes. They were built with consideration for the surroundings and with green spaces and play areas incorporated. It is a measure of its success that many like myself have chosen to stay there over moving elsewhere as we have moved through the property chain.

The proposal to rip up areas of Forestdale to replace the well thought out considerate planning with mid-rise blocks of flats, which would sit like high-rise amongst their surroundings, is beyond ludicrous. The way to increase housing is not to rip up good housing and destroy an area through a complete change of character, it is to build houses on unused brownfield sites and develop waste ground or derelict areas.

"Focused intensification...change of local character" – How is changing the character of a well thought out housing development a positive move? Focussed intensification is just a flowery way of saying cram people in. Forestdale already is used to capacity as far as vehicles and parking spaces is concerned, and has the facilities in place such as primary schools and local shops for the size it is. It was designed and built that way. Increasing the volume would just break these facilities and destroy the environment.

"Significantly larger than existing", "large buildings with strong frontages" – This sounds like the worst decision that could be made. Rip out areas of

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selondon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
existing housing that serves the community well and replace with vast facades that dominate their surroundings and destroy the area.

I cannot object strongly enough to these proposals and find them incredibly insulting as a way of developing the area and providing housing solutions. Croydon is a huge town covering a large area, and the best that can be come up with is to rip out existing homes in nice areas and destroy communities and the character of area. That is to say nothing of the utilities such as water and drainage which has been put in to serve the existing environment and would have to be ripped out and replaced ruining many surrounding roads and areas whilst that was being done.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2913/01/002/DM31 (Table 11.2)</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs J Webb</td>
<td>DM31 (Table 11.2)</td>
<td>I object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of the area's local character under policy DM31.4 of Forestdale. With reference to making Forestdale any bigger, is madness as already too big and sprawling. Forestdale already has a lot of crime going on, not to mention drugs and break ins.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cecile Griggs  

Object  

DM31 (Table 11.2)  

Forestdale  

I have lived on Forestdale for some thirty years, twenty-six of those years at my present address. Forestdale is a well-planned, pleasant estate largely in private ownership and it horrifies me that the Local Plan identifies it as a location where the Council wants to see “focused intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character”. The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats should be replaced by medium-rise blocks or even large buildings is quite unacceptable. Forestdale is complete in itself and the Council’s proposals would completely change the character of the whole area.

Change  

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Sam Want

Object: DM31 (Table 11.2) - Forestdale

The building of medium rise blocks and reduction of parking facilities. Transport has recently been cut back in the area and parking is already difficult in some places. The area has a high enough population density already.

Change: Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I strongly object to the latest proposals specifically.

1. Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of areas local character under Policy DM31.4 of Forestdale. This is unacceptable because Forestdale was built by Wates as a family community, with large swathes of land for children to play in, wider paths for pushchairs etc and a focussed character. It has always been a pleasant place to live. Building large buildings with strong frontages and medium rise blocks will so alter the character of the area and housing that it will become very unpleasant to live here. Forestdale is known for it's beauty being centred in the middle of some beautiful woodland and spaces that were part of the original design to provide a safe haven for family living. It was built with Christian values in mind.

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I strongly object to the areas listed being earmarked for 'intensification' as this will dramatically change the character of these areas.

Stephanie Lawson

Object DM31 (Table 11.2)

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mrs Christine Hardy</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>DM31 (Table 11.2)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forestdale</td>
<td>I am concerned that as well as unnecessarily changing the character of the area there are no plans mentioned about increasing the number of school places in the Forestdale schools.</td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mrs Christine Hardy
Object: DM31 (Table 11.2)

I am writing to object to:

Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of character under policy DM31.4 of Forestdale.

Change: Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
4. DM31.4: Shirley and Forestdale should not be zones for intensification as this type of development would be totally out of keeping with the character of these areas.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too. Change Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. This would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Laurie King Forestdale

I have lived on Forestdale for over 20 years and it has become a mature and well structured area of housing that is completely conducive to its local environment and surrounding areas. To remove some of the current housing and replace with medium to large story flats is neither in keeping nor is required in this area and would change the character beyond recognition. I object to this proposal.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am also concerned about Forestdale being identified for a gradual change of the area’s local character (Policy DM31.4, page 129 Local Plan) by allowing new development to be significantly larger than that in existence and which may be associated with merging smaller properties eg gradually introducing larger, taller buildings. The idea that the existing terraced housing and small blocks of flats should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable and would change the character of the area. This area has already changed over the years with more and more cars and not enough parking spaces – the recent introduction of double-decker buses to replace the single decker ones has also been a retrograde step already as the poor drivers find it very difficult to get between the rows of parked cars.

Change
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr David Carter</th>
<th>Object DM31 (Table 11.2)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forestdale</td>
<td>I am writing to object to focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of Forestdale. As a resident on Forestdale for 39 years the above are in complete contravention of what Forestdale was designed for adjacent to greenbelt land.</td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Steve White

ASPRA

Object Soundness - DM31 (Table 11.2)

Forestdale

4 focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Davonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Andrew Webb Object I object to Focused intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character under (Policy DM 31.4) of Forestdale.

Change Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM31 (Table 11.2)</td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, the designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more extensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 11.2/O | The building of medium rise blocks and reduction of parking facilities. Transport has recently been cut back in the area and parking is already difficult in some places. The area has a high enough population density already. |

| Mr Matthew Want | Forestdale |
Mr Roger William

Object: DM31 (Table 11.2) Forestdale

The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change: Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Robert Watson

I live in Crofters Mead, Forestdale and cannot see any benefits to the areas mentioned in the above proposals. I am sure it would be better to refurbish existing properties in the area concerned and create more green areas for residents and their children to enjoy. To create more sensible car parking areas people will buy cars regardless of not having a parking space and simply park in and existing space thus creating a problem for somebody else. Transport for London have already created a problem by the introduction of double yellow lines which in some areas are not required. Why anybody would want to create a traveller camp at Pear Tree Farm is beyond me surely a nice new housing complex would be more suitable.

Forestdale is a very nice place to live and I cannot see any improvement to the area in your proposals. I understand that these proposals are inappropriate and unacceptable these are my views on the matter.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this the designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Leggatt

Equally concerning, the draft Plan identifies Forestdale as a location where the Council wants to see "focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character" under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). “New development located in designated areas would be significantly larger than existing and may be associated with merging smaller properties. The promoted character types are: Medium-rise blocks with associated grounds; ‘Large buildings with spacing’ and ‘Large buildings with strong frontages’. Their gradual introduction will alter over time the predominant character of intensified areas” (page 132, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area. Forestdale is a lovely place to live and the character does not require changing.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selston Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Joy Harris

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2) The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am also worried about the plan stating it wants to change the areas local character. I am not exactly sure what this means but my understanding is that it is building bigger blocks of flats. Having lived in this quiet, safe area for over 30 years I find this very worrying. There is no space to put these extra larger buildings and any building would change the area adversely. If more people move into the area there will need to be more infrastructure needed. Things such as schools, doctors, dentists, shops and improved travel infrastructure. The councils intention seems to be to try and discourage the use of cars. Many older people need their own transport as they cannot use public transport and carry say food shopping. Most people will have a car even if they do not use it all the time, myself included. The parking situation in this area is dire as it is with the council removing car parking spaces the whole time. All these changes that you are proposing will be detrimental to the area and will not encourage people to move to the area.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Equally concerning, the draft Plan identifies Forestdale as a location where the Council wants to see “focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character” under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). It goes on to describe what this means:

“New development located in designated areas would be significantly larger than existing and may be associated with merging smaller properties. The promoted character types are: ‘Medium-rise blocks with associated grounds’, ‘Large buildings with spacing’ and ‘Large buildings with strong frontages’. Their gradual introduction will alter over time the predominant character of intensified areas” (page 132, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals).

The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Ms Avni Dave

Object: DM31 (Table 11.2)

We have lived here for 34 years only because of the pleasant environment, therefore we strongly oppose the Croydon local plan that has been proposed. We are against policy DM31.4. We strongly agree that this plan would fundamentally change the environment in Forestdale to its detriment.

Change:

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Ms Christine Waring

Object
DM31 (Table 11.2)

Forestdale

The introduction of medium rise blocks with associated grounds and large buildings with spacing and/or strong frontages will completely alter the character of Forestdale. This is unacceptable.

Change
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mrs Candida de Poitiers

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Forestdale

Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of Forestdale. I object to this most strongly and cannot understand why the Council should wish to alter the local character of Forestdale - for what purpose?? The local character of Forestdale has evolved since its creation in the 80s/90s to a well-balanced residential community. It is already quite densely populated, but is a pleasant area to live. Further development would also exacerbate the existing severe parking problems.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and its support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Existing semi-detached houses should not be demolished in favour of soulless blocks of flats. People require houses to live in, especially bringing up families. Please stick to sensible developments and do not destroy Croydon with horrendous buildings. We are long-term residents and care very much about the area in which we live.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this the designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Dave Fasham

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Forestdale

The draft Local Plan identifies Forestdale as a location where the Council intends to implement a policy of focussed intensification associated with the gradual change of the area’s local character. This apparently means that new developments in the area would be significantly larger than those in the existing street scene with medium-rise blocks and large buildings increasingly predominant in the area. This is objectionable because, to the detriment of existing residents, it would totally change the friendly cul-de-sac defined, local neighbourhood character of the largely terraced housing in Forestdale.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr David Haworth

**Object**

DM31 (Table 11.2) I am writing to object to: Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of Forestdale.

**Change**

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
| Policy DM31:4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where there may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification. The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Selsdon, page 165, Selsdon Park Road from Farnborough Avenue to the roundabout at Kent Gate Way and Holmbury Grove. Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31:4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan. |
Mr D Lane Object Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennets Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Ms E Randall

**Object**

DM31 (Table 11.2) Forestdale

I strongly object to the following proposals which will have a negative impact on either green belt land or the character of an area.

The draft Plan identifies Forestdale as a location where the Council wants to see "focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character" under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). It goes on to describe what this means:

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr T Gray

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

I am not happy with the following things and I would like you to note down my objections:

- Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of areas local character under policy DM31.4 of Forestdale.

I am very worried that these plans will jeopardise the potential of my home increasing in value when the area is suffering from a lower than average property price increase and I strongly suggest that these plans are rejected.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Maureen Wilcox

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2) The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Noemi Molloy

Object: DM31 (Table 11.2)

I am concerned that the areas which have been earmarked for 'intensification' will suffer as a result of over-building, which will destroy the character of these areas.

Change: Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
DM31 (Table 11.2)

Cllr J Cummings

Object

Soundness - Justified

Forestdale

Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where there may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Selsdon, page 165, Selsdon Park Road from Farnborough Avenue to the roundabout at Kent Gate Way and Holmbury Grove.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I would like you to note my strong objection to the granting of any Planning Application relating to the following Policy Ref. DM31.4.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am writing to express my concerns. About 20 years ago I decided to move from Woodpecker Mount to Brockscoft on Forestdale. My decision was made because Brockscoft is a well managed estate with plenty of green spaces. When I brought the house, took on board that strict covenants were in place and that a management charge was in required to cover the cost of our lighting, gardening, upkeep of the roads and other maintenance issues. From time to time we have had problems from ill disciplined youths on quad bikes and misbehaving in the adjoining playground but I feel making areas of Forestdale more dense would make the security problem of this quiet part of the estate worse.

I suggest that changing the format of the Forestdale estate be dropped. Any further development of denser housing would make the current congestion on the roads at peak times even worse than it is at present. The proposed reduction in parking spaces is not a good idea as parking is already at a premium and the suggestion that more people would not have a private vehicle is quite ridiculous. Parking problems are made worse due to so many workers having to park their vans on the estate. Safety on Forestdale roads is bad enough at present. We have already had one fatality on Linton Glade which resulted in the parking spaces in the area being removed.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object

Forestdale

I have been made aware that Croydon Council has recently published proposals which, if approved and implemented, will fundamentally alter the existing housing density and adversely change the appearance of my local area, Forestdale. Specifically, if approved, it is proposed that existing terraced housing and small blocks of flats will be replaced by medium sized blocks of flats perhaps 8, 10 or 15 storeys high (Policy DM31.4 Croydon Local Plan - focused intensification associated with gradual changes of area’s local character). My objection is based on my experience of living in Forestdale since 26th June 2015 when I purchased my property in Markfield. I am shocked that this planning proposal was not found in my solicitors searches prior to purchase. The area is popular with all ages as the existing area is relatively small and narrow and surrounded by woods and a bird sanctuary. My neighbour in Markfield has lived in her property since it was built in the 1970’s and is proud of her home, as I am sure there are many more in Forestdale. Since moving here there is a real community spirit. The only negativity is the parking as many home owners who initially moved here and had small children, have now young adults who drive and have vehicle. I moved to this area with my son his partner and their three year old son as it has good schools and was ideal with the woods and nature surroundings. So I urge you as a new resident to this community to reject this planning application and the prospect of destroying a community and my home.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Mott object to this site allocation. Change Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am writing to object to the following policies and proposals:- Policy DM31.4 of Forestdale

Tracy Clarke

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Ms K Kendall

Object

I am writing to object to the following proposals in the Croydon Local Plan. The plans that will lead to a change in character of Forestdale Estate (Policy DM31.4). As a Forestdale resident I am somewhat at a loss as to how the Council can influence the intensity of development on a privately owned estate, unless they are going to sell off Forestdale Primary School’s playground, or the triangle down by Featherbed Lane. How can you support the ‘merging of smaller properties’, or the knocking down of blocks of flats to build taller ones, when those properties are owner occupied?

Forestdale

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Walker

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

RE: OBJECTION TO DE-
DESIGNATION GREEN BELT ;
SHIRLEY, NEW ADDINGTON,
FOREST HILL

We have lived in the Borough of
Croydon for 30 years and value its
vibrancy and diversity.

As Croydon ratepayers we object to
the de-designation of Metropolitan
Open Land generally, especially land
detailed above, which will change
forever Croydon's character.

We would ask you to encourage
policies/development to:

1. Build new housing on brown field
sites by all means AND preserve
invaluable green space for the benefit
of the community of Croydon;
2. Protect green belt land and preserve
the green corridors we desperately
vital for wildlife and biodiversity;
3. Amend the tall buildings policy and
keep the tall building zone where it is
suited in the centre of town;
4. Utilise brownfield sites for new low-level
housing only where it can be
developed alongside new GP
surgeries, schools and improved
public transport;

"Nowadays people know the price of
everything and the value of nothing".
Green Belt is vital and precious.
Once lost for future generations and
will not be replaced by developers.

We understand the need for housing,
schools, hospitals and infrastructure.
Are the Developers investing these
also alongside their building
investments?

Please protect our few remaining
green spaces on the borough map,
by making better use of brown field
sites.

Croydon's suburbs will have
sustainably grown to accommodate homes to
contribute to the borough's
housing need. The challenge
for the Croydon Local Plan is
to enable growth and
regeneration in the local
context while recognising the
local character and
distinctiveness. To achieve
this this designation will be
amended so that it does not
include homes on smaller
plots of land focussing
instead on Selson Park
Road, Gravel Hill, parts of
Featherbed Lane and key
corner plots. The objective of
policy DM31.4 is to
maximise use of the existing
growth capacity, to focus
growth in sustainable
locations and to support a
smart spatial vision for the
borough. Spatially,
additional growth would
strengthen the potential for
further development of public
transport and other uses
which require a certain level
of localised demand. The
proposed areas meet criteria
referring to infrastructure
availability and accessibility;
deliverability of growth based
on local character. The
policy opens up
opportunities for more
intensive development in
selected areas and enables
gradual change of character
over time. It would also
positively encourage spatial
quality and distinctiveness of
Croydon local and
neighbourhood centres. The
complete review is available
on the Council's website on
the evidence base pages
which support the Croydon
Local Plan.
The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr Paul Slaughter</th>
<th>DM31 (Table 11.2)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forestdale</strong></td>
<td>The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area and I will be objecting to it very strongly.</td>
<td>Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM31 (Table 11.2)</td>
<td>Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 – 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification. The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Selsdon, page 165. Selsdon Park Road from Farnborough Avenue to the roundabout at Kent Gate Way and Holmbury Grove;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Equally concerning is that the draft Plan identifies Forestdale as a location where the Council wants to see "focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character" under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). It goes on to describe what this means: "New development located in designated areas would be significantly larger than existing and may be associated with merging smaller properties. The promoted character types are: ‘Medium-rise blocks with associated grounds’, ‘Large buildings with spacing’ and ‘Large buildings with strong frontages’. Their gradual introduction will alter over time the predominant character of intensified areas" (page 132, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable and would completely change the character of the area and I object to it most strongly.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I write to you having received this email from Gavin Barwell MP, the tone of which I find inflammatory and discriminatory towards the Gypsy and Traveller communities, and smacks of “not in my backyard”.

I write as a resident of Addiscombe who recognises the huge problem of lack of affordable housing to buy and to rent in London promulgated by this Conservative government and the previous coalition government.

I fully support Croydon Council’s proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>DM31 (Table 11.2)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forestdale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have considered details of the proposed Croydon Local Plan and have the following objections on the basis that they will:

detract from the local areas,

dramatically change the local areas,

have a significant adverse effect on an already overloaded infrastructure, including roads, public transport, public open space, environment and emergency, health and support services.

3. I object to the proposed replacement of low rise, terraced, semi-detached, and detached properties with medium and high rise properties in the Shirley area, Addington and Forestdale area, New Addington area, Addiscombe and East Croydon area.

4. I object to the proposed increased building capacity and density in the Shirley area, Addington and Forestdale area, New Addington area, Addiscombe and East Croydon area.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Below is a list of our objections:

4. Policy DM 31.4 - Intensification of development in South Croydon, Kenley, Purley, Sanderstead - more new developments on these sites will change character of the areas and put local communities at risk.

Change
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Anthony Taylor Object I am writing to object to:

2. Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of Forestdale.

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM31 (Table 11.2)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forestdale</td>
<td>Focussed intensification associated with gradual change if area’s local character</td>
<td>Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The idea of knocking down semi-detached houses and replacing with medium-rise blocks is totally unacceptable and I object to most strongly as it will completely destroy the area and character of Shirley, and Forestdale. This again increases pressure on local roads, public transport, schools and NHS facilities.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Jan Payne  

Objection to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of Forestdale.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Cllr M Neal

Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification. The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Selsdon, page 165, Selsdon Park Road from Farnborough Avenue to the roundabout at Kent Gate Way and Holmbury Grove;

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Crane

We are life long residents of Croydon. With reference to the local plan we would like to object to the following proposals:
- **DM40.1** - A skyscraper in Purley is total out of character for the town. Purley needs development but this is not the way to go about it.
- **DM40.4** - Purley Pool - whilst not objecting to this area being redeveloped it should include a swimming pool. Our children learnt to swim here and it is an important facility to the community. For instance our Farther uses it regularly. It has been vital to maintaining his health and he would not be able to travel to more distant pools.
- **DM44.2** - It is not appropriate to have a travellers site on green belt land. We believe it is important to protect all Green Belt land from development.
- **DM31.4** - We are opposed to the intensification of these areas.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Jarrett

Object
DM31 (Table 11.2)

Forestdale

We strongly object to any alteration of properties on Forestdale which would prove to be unattractive also the proposed sites on Featherbed Lane and Conduit Lane. We are a green belt area!! Please let it stay that way.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Ms R Lloyd Object The green belt land we have in our areas, in Shirley, Forestdale, Addington and beyond, is a precious resource that should be protected by the council, not placed under threat of development at your whim. Having these green spaces helps the environment, the ecosystem, biodiversity and nature, and local residents, who benefit in many ways from having such places nearby their homes.

Change Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr R Morley-Smith: The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms S Lawson</th>
<th>DM31 (Table 11.2)</th>
<th>Forestdale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I strongly object to the areas listed being earmarked for ‘intensification’ as this will dramatically change the character of these areas.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require certain levels of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The draft Plan identifies Forestdale as a location where the Council wants to see “focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character” under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). It goes on to describe what this means:

“New development located in designated areas would be significantly larger than existing and may be associated with merging smaller properties. The promoted character types are: ‘Medium-rise blocks with associated grounds’, ‘Large buildings with spacing’ and ‘Large buildings with strong frontages’. Their gradual introduction will alter over time the predominant character of intensified areas” (page 132, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals).

The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area. Forestdale is a tight knit community, people tend to move here and stay as their families grow up and it would completely change the dynamic of the area.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Equally concerning, the draft Plan identifies Forestdale as a location where the Council wants to see "focused intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character" under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). It goes on to describe what this means: "New development located in designated areas would be significantly larger than existing and may be associated with merging smaller properties. The promoted character types are: 'Medium-rise blocks with associated grounds', 'Large buildings with spacing' and 'Large buildings with strong frontages'. Their gradual introduction will alter over time the predominant character of intensified areas" (page 132, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM31 (Table 11.2)</td>
<td>The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area and I will be objecting to it very strongly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change: Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Vivienne Murray  
**Object**  
Vivienne Murray has lived in Forestdale for 33 years - it has become over populated as it is - parking is a nightmare and Pixton Way is being used for parking, with vehicles parked right and left. At certain times vehicles speed on this road making it a hazard - more properties would be madness. I also don’t agree to changing the landscaped areas in and around Forestdale for more properties. People in flats don’t have gardens but Management companies keep the areas pleasant for us to enjoy.

**Change**  
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Kaczanowski

Below is a list of our objections:

4. Policy DM 31.4 - Intensification of development in South Croydon, Kenley, Purley, Sanderstead - more new developments on these sites will change character of the areas and put local communities at risk.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Janet Norris

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Forestdale

I am objecting to planning permission being granted for redevelopment to high-rise dwellings on any part of Forestdale.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Councillor M Fisher

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries:
- Selsdon, page 165, Selsdon Park Road from Farnborough Avenue to the roundabout at Kent Gate Way and Holmbury Grove

Change: Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Janet Harding

I am writing to object to: Planning Permission being granted for redevelopment to high rise dwellings on any part of Forestdale

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The draft Plan identifying Forestdale as a location where the Council wants to see 'focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character’ under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area and greatly impact the current residents who chose to live here for the character of the area as it currently is.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am grateful to the Council for consulting on the detailed policies and proposals that will make up the Croydon Local Plan. There is much in the document that I agree with, but some of the proposals would, in my opinion, change the character of parts of Croydon very much for the worse. I hope you will forgive me if I focus on these areas of contention. I am therefore writing to formally object to:

4. focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgmount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Benneffs Way and Davonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too;

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I understand the need for regeneration, new housing and for spaces for travellers to rest. However I am deeply concerned as to your current plans in using Croydon’s fabulous green spaces and encroaching on and changing existing, thriving communities with vague plans for developments. We have brownfield sites that could be used for these purposes as well as alternative proposals. I am writing to strongly object to: 1. The focused intensification with gradual change of area’s local character under policy DM31.4 of Forestdale and Policy DM2 development of garden land. Forestdale is currently a family estate with young couples and families living in small maisonettes and family houses. Why on earth would we want to ‘alter over time, have ‘large buildings with strong frontage’s and ‘development on garden land’ in this wonderful green estate with protected trees? The centre of Croydon has fantastic new developments of some such homes which are urban living for those who desire it- you do not need to encroach on family housing and gardens to do this. It would completely change the character of the homes and family areas where children still play safely outside to have “Medium Rise blocks with associated grounds.” The Policy DM2 clearly assumes that garden land will not be developed and therefore the arguments that it will ‘complement the local character’ to lose such small gardens as they are in small terraced houses has no valid argument on the estate as it stands and they are inappropriate and weak. There is absolutely no detail as to how ‘biodiversity’ is to protected- vague and weak again.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selston Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon’s local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr John Mathers

Furthermore, we totally object to the Council’s plan to Intensify Forestdale. Replacing the terraced houses and small flats with much larger properties will completely ruin the lovely nature of Forestdale and this is the reason so many Families enjoy living here. It is unbelievable that Councils always want to ruin nice places to live and create monstrosities. We live near open spaces and Nature reserves and doing this will not Compliment the Local Character of the area but ruin it, and doing this will definitely not ensure that biodiversity is protected! Both of these are the criteria for permitting new dwellings so these plans need to be scrapped NOW.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am writing to express concern about the following proposals for Forestdale which have been brought to my attention namely:

New development located in designated areas would be significantly larger than existing and may be associated with merging smaller properties. The promoted character types are: ‘Medium-rise blocks with associated grounds’, ‘Large buildings with spacing’ and ‘Large buildings with strong frontages’. Their gradual introduction will alter over time the predominant character of intensified areas” (page 132, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals).

As a long term resident of Forestdale and Chair of Sorrel Bank Management Company, I am opposed to the idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks in time. This would completely change the character of the area.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on Selsdon Park Road, Gravel Hill, parts of Featherbed Lane and key corner plots.

The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres.

The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
In Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for intensification which is a euphemism for more building. This will change the character of those areas and should be opposed.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this the designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Derek & Sue Reeves

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Sanderstead Local Centre

We would make the following objections to the proposed Draft Local Plan which is a poorly disguised attack on the southern part of the Borough

Policy DM 31.4

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
We would make the following objections to the proposed Draft Local Plan which is a poorly disguised attack on the southern part of the Borough 
Policy DM 31.4

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries:
- Sanderstead, page 164. Lmpsfield Road from the roundabout at Sanderstead Hill to Riding Hill and Cranleigh Close.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Councillor Jason Perry  
London Borough of Croydon

Object: Soundness - Justified

Setting of the Sanderstead Local Centre

Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

Change: Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where there may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification. The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries:

- Sanderstead, page 164, Limpisfield Road from the roundabout at Sanderstead Hill to Riding Hill and Cranleigh Close;

The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of locational demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Setting of the Sanderstead Local Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM31: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area's local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where there may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries:
Sanderstead, page 164, Limpfield Road from the roundabout at Sanderstead Hill to Riding Hill and Cranleigh Close;

Object of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility: deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility: deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object Soundness - Justified  

Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

Intensification in Onslow Gardens and surrounding roads would be contrary to the desire expressed in Strategic Policies p186 to retain and protect the view of All Saints Church from Limpfield Road. On this page the view is listed as being ‘close to Wentworth Way’, whereas in the map on p103 of the CLP Strategic Policies document the viewpoint is shown as being next to Hilton Way. In both cases any intensification of the roads surrounding All Saints would inevitably block the view. The appendix to this letter shows the current state of development of these residential roads and the view from both referenced locations.

In particular in Sanderstead ward the boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change (Onslow Gardens, Cranleigh Gardens, Blenheim Gardens, Stanley Gardens) and should instead show the following boundaries on p164: Limpfield Road from the roundabout at Sanderstead Hill to Riding Hill and Cranleigh Close.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area's local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Sanderstead, page 164, Limpfield Road from the roundabout at Sanderstead Hill to Riding Hill and Cranleigh Close.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area's local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Sanderstead, page 164, Limpfield Road from the roundabout at Sanderstead Hill to Riding Hill and Cranleigh Close.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>DM31 (Table 11.2)</th>
<th>Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.</th>
<th>The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Sanderstead, page 164. Limpsfield Road from the roundabout at Sanderstead Hill to Riding Hill and Cranleigh Close, Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting of the Sanderstead Local Centre</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>Setting of the Sanderstead Local Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cllr Yvette Hopley
London Borough of Croydon

Object: Soundness - Justified
Setting of the Sanderstead Local Centre

Concerned about intensification of both Sanderstead village and Hamsey Green. Support appropriate development (such as Ken’s Autos and McCarthy & Stone application) provided in line with planning. Area that could be intensified was site of the four properties on Addington Road rather than Onslow Gardens.

Change: Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Cllr Yvette Hopley  
London Borough of Croydon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>DM31 (Table 11.2)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting of the Sanderstead Local Centre</td>
<td>Concerned about intensification of both Sanderstead village and Hamsey Green. Support appropriate development (such as Ken's Autos and McCarthy &amp; Stone application) provided in line with planning. Area that could be intensified was site of the four properties on Addington Road rather than Onslow Gardens.</td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Yvette Hopley</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM31 (Table 11.2) Setting of the Sanderstead Local Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concerned about intensification of both Sanderstead village and Hamsey Green. Support appropriate development (such as Ken’s Autos and McCarthy & Stone application) provided in line with planning. Area that could be intensified was site of the four properties on Addington Road rather than Onslow Gardens.

Change
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Cllr Richard Chatterjee  
London Borough of Croydon

Object: Soundness - Justified  

Setting of the Sanderstead Local Centre  

Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where there may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification. The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries:

- Sanderstead, page 164, Limpfield Road from the roundabout at Sanderstead Hill to Riding Hill and Cranleigh Close,

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, the designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Stephanie Lawson Object I strongly object to the areas listed being earmarked for ‘intensification’ as this will dramatically change the character of these areas. Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are identified for "intensification" - or more building. This will change the character of those areas and I strongly oppose.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Stephen Woodward

Object

We have lived in Sanderstead for over 40 years, and have thoroughly enjoyed the areas to the south of Croydon being unspoilt. In our view these ill conceived proposals will change this area beyond recognition and take away that for which it is well known and valued. Please rethink, and do not continue with the proposed policies set out below and which can be found in your Local Plan:

The loss of Local Area of Special Character protection for many roads such as West Hill, Campden and Spencer Roads, the Woodcote Estate and Hartley Farm will open these roads up to inappropriate development. Roads such as Oakwood Avenue in Purley should also be included as new Local Heritage Areas. In Policy DM31.4 (p.126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for "intensification" – which is a euphemism for more building. This will change the character of those areas beyond all recognition and I am strongly opposed to any of it.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.

Change
Mr Richard Veldeman
Object
DM31 (Table 11.2)
Setting of the Sanderstead Local Centre
In Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for "intensification" which is clearly a euphemism for more building.

Change
Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this the designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
| Object | Soundness | DM31 (Table 11.2) | Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification. The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Sanderstead, page 164, Limpfield Road from the roundabout at Sanderstead Hill to Riding Hill and Cranleigh Close; | Change | Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan. |

| Setting of the Sanderstead Local Centre | | | | | |

| 02 September 2016 | Page 633 of 4384 |
I am concerned that the areas which have been earmarked for ‘intensification’ will suffer as a result of over-building, which will destroy the character of these areas.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
DM31 (Table 11.2)

Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Sanderstead, page 164, Lumpsfield Road from the roundabout at Sanderstead Hill to Riding Hill and Cranleigh Close;

Object Soundness - Justified
Setting of the Sanderstead Local Centre

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility: deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr J Lemanski

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

I would like you to note my strong objection to the granting of any Planning Application relating to the following Policy Ref. DM31.4.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3708/01015/DM31 (Table 11.2)</th>
<th>Mrs J McDonald</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM31 (Table 11.2) Setting of the Sanderstead Local Centre</th>
<th>In Policy DM31-4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for “intensification” – which is a euphemism for more building. This will change the character of those areas and should be opposed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Nick Peiris Object More protection, less "intensification"

Setting of the Sanderstead Local Centre

Change Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, the designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Mott object to this site allocation.

Setting of the Sanderstead Local Centre

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
DM31 (Table 11.2)

Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 – 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Sanderstead, page 164. Limpfield Road from the roundabout at Sanderstead Hill to Riding Hill and Cranleigh Close.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mrs Heather Harris

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Sanderstead Local Centre

In Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for “intensification”, in other words, more building, and this will change the character of those areas.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM31 (Table 11.2)</td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Setting of the Sanderstead Local Centre

Any more building in these areas will have an adverse effect on the locality.
### Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are identified for "intensification" - or more building. This will change the character of those areas and I strongly oppose.

**Change**

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainable grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Below is a list of our objections:

4. Policy DM 31.4 - Intensification of development in South Croydon, Kenley, Purley, Sanderstead - more new developments on these sites will change character of the areas and put local communities at risk.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification. The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Sanderstead, page 164, Limpsfield Road from the roundabout at Sanderstead Hill to Riding Hill and Cranleigh Close;

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>DM31 (Table 11.2)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting of the Sanderstead Local Centre</td>
<td>We oppose the policy relaxation which would enable intensification of residential development in Sanderstead</td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr & Mrs Crane

Object Soundness - Justified

Setting of the Sanderstead Local Centre

We are life long residents of Croydon. With reference to the local plan we would like to object to the following proposals:
• DM40.1 - A skyscraper in Purley is totally out of character for the town. Purley needs development but this is not the way to go about it.
• DM40.4 - Purley Pool - whilst not objecting to this area being redeveloped it should include a swimming pool. Our children learnt to swim here and it is an important facility to the community. For instance our Farther uses it regularly. It has been vital to maintaining his health and he would not be able to travel to more distant pools.
• DM44.2 - It is not appropriate to have a travellers site on green belt land. We believe it is important to protect all Green Belt land from development.
• DM31.4 - We are opposed to the intensification of these areas.

Change
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Ms S Lawson

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Sanderstead Local Centre

I strongly object to the areas listed being earmarked for ‘intensification’ as this will dramatically change the character of these areas.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focussing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Kaczanowski

Setting of the Sanderstead Local Centre

Below is a list of our objections:

4. Policy DM 31.4 - Intensification of development in South Croydon, Kenley, Purley, Sanderstead - more new developments on these sites will change character of the areas and put local communities at risk.

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility: deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where there may be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two-storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Sanderstead, page 164, Limpfield Road from the roundabout at Sanderstead Hill to Riding Hill and Cranleigh Close; Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, the designation will be amended so that it does not include homes on smaller plots of land focusing instead on the main roads through Sanderstead and key corner plots. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Bob Sleeman

Object DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

Change Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combing the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object Soundness - Justified
Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

DM31 (Table 11.2)

4 focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Change
Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Focusing on 2 areas for "focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character". Replacing smaller buildings with larger ones. This would completely change the character of the area and I object.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Andrew Black

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

I object to the scope of the proposed change which I believe should be limited to properties fronting onto Wickham Road and I cannot understand the logic of not including Bluebird Parade together with Secombe’s Builders Yard in this.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
We are happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but we are objecting to building on precious open space. Finally, the draft Local Plan identifies two other areas of Shirley as locations where the Council wants to see “focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character” under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). It goes on to describe what this means: “New development located in designated areas would be significantly larger than existing and may be associated with merging smaller properties. The promoted character types are: ‘Medium-rise blocks with associated grounds’, ‘Large buildings with spacing’ and ‘Large buildings with strong frontages’. Their gradual introduction will alter over time the predominant character of intensified areas” (page 132, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The two areas are the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the Shirley local centre (the area around Shirley Library) (page 166, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and we are objecting to it.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The two areas around Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the Shirley Library which have been targeted are roads of semi-detached houses where families have lived for years. It is completely unacceptable that family houses should be replaced by medium-rise blocks of flats. The character of the area would change completely and would mean neighbours in conflict with each other.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Annette and Robert Butler

Object Soundness - Justified

DM31 (Table 11.2) We strongly object to the following:

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character under policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre

Change Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Objection to focussed intensification of Shirley Local Centre (Policy DM31.4 and Shirley Shopping Parade (Wickham Road Shopping Parade))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy DM31 (Table 11.2) Setting of the Shirley Local Centre</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
1 Proposed Policy DM31 Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon Policy DM31.4 sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. As this is a new designation it will need to be shown on the Policies Map. Details of each designation are: - Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade - Shirley  
- Setting of the Shirley Local Centre - Shirley

1 Proposed Policy DM31 Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon Policy DM31.4 sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. As this is a new designation it will need to be shown on the Policies Map. Details of each designation are: - Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade - Shirley  
- Setting of the Shirley Local Centre - Shirley

I object to the relaxation of the planning regulations to allow the building of significantly larger structures in close proximity to the existing housing stock, comprising mainly bungalows and two storey semi-detached houses in residential roads in the area described as Shirley Local Centre, i.e. around the Shirley Library and the area around the Shirley Road/Shirley Shopping Parade including the Green Triangle and the Trinity School educational open space. The promoted character types of Medium rise blocks with associated grounds; large buildings with spacing; and Large buildings with strong frontages; in this location would look out of character and is unacceptable. These types of developments in the wrong locations would adversely affect the character of Shirley both now and for future generations.  
1. In the case of the Shirley Road/Shirley Park parade shops, the area behind the shopping parade is a site of Nature Conservation Importance (locally called the Green Triangle) which should be preserved for future generations and the area of Educational Open Space for future Trinity School children.  
2. If High density residential accommodation were provided there would be insufficient area for communal open space allocation.  
3. The local side road network and width could not cope with high residential density proposals and the likely car ownership and on street parking.  
4. If those proposals were to become the Croydon Plan adopted policy, it would place Planning blight on all properties as defined in DM31.4 until the year 2036.  

I object to the development plans for the Shirley (Wickham Road) Shopping Parade and the intensification of Wickham Avenue.
I object to the relaxation of the planning regulations to allow the building of significantly larger structures in close proximity to the existing housing stock, comprising mainly bungalows and two storey semi-detached houses in residential roads in the area described as Shirley Local Centre, i.e. around the Shirley Library. The promoted character types of: Medium rise blocks with associated grounds; Large buildings with spacing; and Large buildings with strong frontages; in this location would look out of character and is unacceptable. These types of developments in the wrong locations would adversely affect the character of Shirley both now and for future generations.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. If High density residential accommodation were provided there would be insufficient area for communal open space allocation.
5. The local road network and width could not cope with high residential density proposal and the likely car ownership and on street parking.
6. If these proposals were to become the Croydon Plan adopted policy, it would place Planning blight on all properties as defined in DM31.4 until the year 2036.
7. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

Change
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Derek & Sue Reeves  

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

We would make the following objections to the proposed Draft Local Plan which is a poorly disguised attack on the southern part of the Borough

Policy DM 31.4

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
As a local resident who is affected by these proposals, I would like to register my comments and objection to the proposals for the focussed intensification associated with the gradual change of the local area around Shirley Local Centre, including Wickham Road and Ridgemount Avenue. This area should not be intensified.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly. Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I strongly object to many of the proposed developments within the Shirley area. I believe that allowing low rise developments around Shirley library will alter the balance of properties in that area, which are mainly detached and semi-detached. People have moved to this 'sought after area' precisely because of its current character. I also object to the intensive developments proposed on the Metropolitan open land around Shirley Oaks. We need open land to reduce carbon emissions, for wildlife and for our own well-being. Both of the above developments would put a huge strain on the services in the area, schools, doctors, busses and the already congested road system. I urge you not to progress with these proposals.

I also think that the two proposed travellers site in Shirley are inappropriate as they would be on Green Belt land, which is against your own policy and would be a blight on one of the few areas that are beautiful and wildlife friendly within Croydon. I am always defending Croydon to those that mock it, saying that we have some lovely open spaces in which to walk and enjoy the diversity of nature. They only see the high rise blocks and litter. If these proposals go ahead, Croydon will have nothing left to commend itself.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries:

- Shirley, page 166, Shirley Road from Shirley Avenue to the BP Service Station and a further zone on Wickham Road from Verdayne Avenue to Cheston Avenue;
- Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object | Soundness - Justified | Object most strongly where these proposals will fundamentally damage the nature of the designated area in Shirley. It is difficult to see how para 11.16 and 11.12 are compatible.
--- | --- | ---
Setting of the Shirley Local Centre | DM31 (Table 11.2) | Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Shirley, page 166, Shirley Road from Shirley Avenue to the BP Service Station and a further zone on Wickham Road from Verdayne Avenue to Cheston Avenue;

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

Object Soundness - Justified

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Setting of the Shirley Local Centre</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Baker</td>
<td>I would like to register my extremely strong objections to the proposed development in Shirley. As a resident at 70 West Way, Shirley, I see your proposed allowance to develop the local roads around the Shirley shopping precinct to allow the removal of houses to build larger dwellings IE flats as to tally in appropriate and not in keeping with the local area. Also it will be destroying large areas of green land and gardens that are home to wild life.</td>
<td>Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where there may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries:
- Shirley, page 166, Shirley Road from Shirley Avenue to the BP Service Station and a further zone on Wickham Road from Verdaine Avenue to Cheston Avenue;
- Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this the designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Alfred Lancaster

Object: DM31 (Table 11.2) Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

Semi-detached houses in Wickham Avenue, Ridgemount Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, Westway Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the Western parts of Bennets Way and Devonshire Way to be replaced by medium-rise blocks of flats.

Change: Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this the designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object

DM31 (Table 11.2) Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

I also object to Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of areas’ local character under DM31/4 of the Shirley Local Centre.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am writing to record my objection to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of the area's loyal character under policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Local Centre.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity to focus growth in sustainable locations and support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where there may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries:

- Shirley, page 166, Shirley Road from Shirley Avenue to the BP Service Station and a further zone on Wickham Road from Verdayne Avenue to Cheston Avenue;

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Jeffrey

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon's local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr. A.W. Greenfield

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2) Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

I object to the relaxation of the planning regulations to allow the building of significantly larger structures in close proximity to the existing housing stock, comprising mainly bungalows and two storey semi-detached houses in residential roads in the area described as Shirley Local Centre, i.e. around the Shirley Library. The promoted character types of Medium rise blocks with associated grounds; Large buildings with spacing; and Large buildings with strong frontages; in this location would look out of character and is unacceptable. These types of developments in the wrong locations would adversely affect the character of Shirley both now and for future generations. The preferred option is deliverable but not acceptable and does not enable sustainable development as it will comprise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.

Change

The area around Shirley Local Centre should not be identified as an area suitable for intensification.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I object to proposed intensification associated with a gradual change of local character of the Shirley Road shopping parade and Shirley Local Centre areas. Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting of the Shirley Local Centre</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The plans for intensification of residential development are unacceptable and will change the character of the area and also overburden the already problematic local road infrastructure.
Ms Ellie London
Object DM31 (Table 11.2) I object to the policy regarding Shirley Local Centre.

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2586/01/09/DM31 (Table 11.2)</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM31 (Table 11.2) Setting of the Shirley Local Centre</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna Bannon</td>
<td>The areas in Shirley should not be zones for intensification as this type of development would be totally out of keeping with the character of the area.</td>
<td>Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>DM31 (Table 11.2) Setting of the Shirley Local Centre</td>
<td>Shirley Shopping Parade/Library/surrounding roads. Any development should be sympathetic to the existing area. Medium to high rise developments would intrinsically change a well established residential area. As above, the impact on local transport would be unacceptable. Devonshire Way and Hartland Way are already used as a means to avoid Wickham Road and residents are often severely compromised, unable to leave their own driveways at peak times because of the heavy flow of traffic. This would impact way beyond the local area, causing further congestion at the Shirley Library traffic lights, leading to Elmers End, West Wickham and beyond. Any development should be sympathetic to the existing area- medium to high density development would have unacceptable impact on the local character and local transport. Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Object to focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and especially Shirley local Centre. Shirley local centre area in particular houses a large proportion of elderly residents, including two sheltered housing complexes, and those living there are doing so for the convenience of transport, shops, doctors, library etc. If you take their property where do they all go? Not everyone will find another property with such convenience on their doorstep.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Miss P Jones

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

The two areas off Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the local centre around Shirley Library would affect not just Wickham Road but other roads including Devonshire Way and would completely change the character of Shirley which I do not agree with.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Objections to the proposed Intensification of Shirley Local Centre and Shirley Shopping Parade as outlined in table 11.2 on page 129 of Croydon Local Plan Detailed Proposals and Policies and extensive development in other areas of Shirley that are affected by road congestion and poor PTAL scores.

Lack of Communication re Consultation

Many residents in the Shirley area only learnt about Croydon Council’s proposed local plan first through an email sent out by Gavin Barwell, MP and secondly through documents he delivered to each property.

There were no notices put up on lamp posts, in the library or on public noticeboards in Shirley’s main shopping parade or any prominent place in the Shirley Local Centre.

The consultation period commenced on 5 November but the three large books containing the Croydon Plan and associated consultation documents were only delivered to Shirley Library on 11 December – after the consultation meeting had taken place and one week before the closing date of 18 December.

The Consultation meeting that covered the Shirley area was not held in Shirley (even though there are many suitable venues there – particularly Shirley Library or the Parish Hall) but miles away in Selsdon so that fewer people could attend.

For this reason Croydon Council, with regard to the transparency it claims for itself, should extend the closing date so that all residents can have a say and that this time the plans and proposals be widely advertised.

Shirley Road Area

I am writing to object to the proposals to intensify development in many roads around this centre for the following reasons:

- Poor transport accessibility

The Shirley character assessment notes that Shirley has some of the poorest public transport links in the borough. There is no railway or tram station in the built up area. The nearest railway station is 1½ miles away.

The bulk of the proposed intensification area has a PTAL score of only 2, some parts as low as 1a.
The A232 Wickham Road leads into the A215 at the Methodist Church, this has been identified as one of the most congested roads in Europe (Source: Daily Telegraph).

The council already knows there are existing traffic problems in Shirley even before any houses are built - see page 253 of transport strategy document which notes high car dependency due to poor public transport and peak time congestion. [https://www.croydon.gov.uk/sites/default/files/...localcentres.pdf](https://www.croydon.gov.uk/sites/default/files/articles/downloads/localcentres.pdf)

There is no evidence (beyond a mere pious hope in section 7.76 that people will use public transport more) that the council has considered the effect of the intensification of development on local transport networks. This is contrary to London Plan policy 6.3 which states assessments must be undertaken, and in particular the cumulative effects of development considered. Paragraph D of the policy contains the presumption that development should be directed to areas with good transport links. See London Plan paragraph 8.15 “In practical terms, this means ensuring that new developments that will give rise to significant numbers of new trips should be located either where there is already good public transport accessibility with capacity adequate to support the additional demand or where there is a realistic prospect of additional accessibility or capacity being provided in time to meet the new demand.”

- Increased car usage

The effect of the poorer transport links can be seen in increased car ownership in Shirley ward.

Table – Car ownership in Shirley and Croydon Borough (Source 2011 census)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shirley Croydon</th>
<th>All Households</th>
<th>No Cars or Vans in Household</th>
<th>1 Car or Van in Household</th>
<th>2 Cars or Vans in Household</th>
<th>3 Cars or Vans in Household</th>
<th>4 or More Cars or Vans in Household</th>
<th>All Cars or Vans in Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>5586</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>2387</td>
<td>1426</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>6981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>145010</td>
<td>4852</td>
<td>6318</td>
<td>2583</td>
<td>5571</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>4904</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is further reflected in modes of...
travel to work. Only about 10% of people who don’t work at home work in Central Croydon, the rest have to work further afield.

54% of all journeys to work from Shirley are by motor. Even in the narrow corridor along the A232 there are as many car journeys as bus/tram. Outside of there it is no contest. Even in the remainder of Croydon itself, these three times as many journeys are made by car as by tram/bus/train. 70% of journeys to work in the second placed borough of Bromley are by car.

This table shows the 20 most popular locations in 2011 for Shirley residents to work and the mode of travel to work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Work</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Tram/bus</th>
<th>Motor</th>
<th>Train</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Croydon (all)</td>
<td>3028</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster, City of London</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate and Banstead</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevenoaks</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexley</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All journeys to work 864219 54% 21% 16%

Note: these are journeys to work from the 3 Middle Layer Super Output areas which make up most of Shirley (Croydon 18, 25, 26). Central Croydon is defined as MSOA Croydon 20, 24, 27. Source: Nomis based on 2011 census.

- **Sustainability**

National Planning Policy Framework (page 6) has a presumption against development in locations that are non-sustainable, which includes where environmental damage such as increasing greenhouse gases would result (‘actively manage patterns of...
growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable). The poor transport links in Shirley is reflected in a significantly higher level of car ownership than the borough as a whole.

Individual applicants have to carry out transport assessments, why has the council not done the same for the areas they propose to designate as suitable for development?

- Council has underestimated the amount of empty houses coming forward

We note that the council assume only 190 empty houses will be reoccupied during the period 2016-36. However this appears to be at variance London Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (2009). In that Croydon stated that in the period 2011-2021 they would return 91 long term vacant properties per year to housing, plus a further 20 per annum for non-self contained units. This means that you have already stated that the borough will gain 555 homes this way in the period 2016-21, why then is a figure of 190 given for empty homes only for the whole period 2016-36? Omitting non-self contained units conflicts with the GLA SHLAA 2009.

The 2011 census Croydon had 3,814 empty properties, and as well as that there were over 1,500 commercial sites in 2010 that were vacant, many would have flats over shops, or would be capable of conversion to residential.

- Effect on local character

Sections 11.140 and 11.141 of the Detailed Policies document emphasises the pleasing uniformity of Shirley with its predominately 1930s housing in planned estates. New buildings have tended to be designed to fit into the existing streetscape.

You have stated in your report to Cabinet that development should only complement and enhance character.

This conflicts with your reasons given in paragraph 3.46 of the Report to Cabinet of 21 September 2016 (select 7.2 Main Report then find pages 15-16). Then this is used to argue Shirley has no dominant character and can therefore be the host for more intensive development. This is clearly not the case with one exception the shopping centre is consonant with the surrounding architecture, that of 1930s suburbia, creating a homogeneous whole. In no sense can intensified
development with dense house building up to 4 stories high in suburban side roads be in keeping with the inter-war single and two storey houses with gardens.

- Inability of development to occur
  
We have ordered a number of registers for properties in the proposed expanded Shirley Centre and it appears that large swathes are incapable of intensified development because they contain restrictive covenants which limit the number of houses to 1 per plot.

We note you have rejected a number of proposed development sites because of the unlikelihood that they can be developed (e.g. A181 - 45 to 81 Church Street, A469 - 234 The Glades, A476 - 1 to 19 Craven Road and many others). We would particularly refer you to A354 (118-148 Tennison Road) which was rejected as a site because of replacing the existing function. This is precisely the situation here.

Please find attached the following registers:

10 Hartland Way Title number SGL53297
Shirley Library Title number SY7794
19 Westway Title number SGL53604
5 Wickham Avenue Title number SGL62833
7 Devonshire Way Title number SY266

Detrimental effect on residents of merging two smaller properties re intensification

On page 132, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies and Proposals, it is explained that intensification involving building of medium rise blocks of flats (up to 4 storeys) could be achieved by merging smaller properties.

As noted on page 84 of Croydon Local Plan Policies and Proposals appendix 4, there is a ‘higher than average proportion of older people’ living in Shirley. And some of these may be quite vulnerable.

If a developer succeeds in buying up a semi-detached property, which could potentially be used for building flats on, what pressures could be brought to bear on an elderly owner of the adjoining semi if he or she refuses to sell? ‘What sort of tenant could the developer obtain that might change the mind of the elderly owner?’ This policy has the potential to result in harassment and substantial distress. It is troubling that the Council could propose such an approach.
Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object: Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

I am disabled, unable to go by bus or walk very far. I chose Marlowe Lodge three years ago as the place most suitable for my needs. Dr Gardner's practice on the corner and the library which is my main enjoyment. I am not alone in hoping that your plans do not materialise. Shirley is a safe environment and I hope it will be left as it is.

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Change: Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mrs Jean Brooks

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

Strongly object to the plans for the Shirley Library area. Wickham Road is already overloaded with traffic. Have you thought about schools, doctors and cars with more people living here. Where are existing residents supposed to go?

With the threat of redevelopment hanging over us the value of our property will significantly diminish.

Please re-think your proposals and put our minds at ease soon.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mrs Valerie Mickelburgh
Object
DM31 (Table 11.2) Overintensification of properties proposing to be built in Shirley area.
Change
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
| 2683/01001/DM31 | Mr & Mrs Iles | Setting of the Shirley Local Centre | How anyone in their right mind can think of putting medium-rise blocks around the Shirley Library area needs to think again. This idea will not only completely change the essential character, it will obviously mean the removal of the library, the doctors surgery, and by the sound of it, the shopping parade as well. The area has many hundreds of elderly people, where are they to go? Will they be re-housed at enormous cost to the tax paying people of Croydon, or put into the new medium-rise blocks? The idea is totally unacceptable. | Change | Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan. |
| DM31 (Table 11.2) |  |  |  |  |
Mr Beresford Walker

Object

As a local affected resident, I would like to register my comments and objection to the proposals as documented in the Croydon Local Plans CLP1.1 and CLP2.

I object to the Proposed Policy DM31.4 Focussed Intensification Associated with Gradual Change of the Local Area around Shirley Local Centre, Including Wickham Avenue and Ridgemount Avenue.

I object to the relaxation of the planning regulations to allow the building of significantly larger structures in close proximity to the existing housing stock, comprising mainly bungalows and two storey semi-detached houses in residential roads in the area described as Shirley Local Centre, i.e. around the Shirley Library. The promoted character types of Medium rise blocks with associated grounds; Large buildings with spacing; and Large buildings with strong frontages; in this location would look out of character and is unacceptable. These types of developments in the wrong locations would adversely affect the character of Shirley both now and for future generations.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. If High density residential accommodation were provided they would be insufficient area for communal open space allocation.
5. The local road network and Width could not cope with high residential density proposal and the likely car ownership and on street parking.
6. If these proposals were to become the Croydon Plan adopted policy, it would place Planning blight on all properties as defined in DM31.4 until the year 2036.
7. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I do not object to the development plans for the Shirley Road Shopping Parade provided that any expansion is along the A232 and does not affect the existing residential areas.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Thomas – Object Soundness - Justified

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

Shirley is a suburban residential area and to allow 4 storey buildings along and close to Wickham Road would completely destroy the character of the area where our family have lived for over 60 years.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Panagakis submitted an objection to the proposed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of Shirley Local Centre.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr A Zelisko

Object Soundness - Justified

DM31 (Table 11.2)

This would completely change the character of the area.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
2726/01/003/DM31
(Table 11.2)

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2) Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

I am writing to register my objection to those parts of the pr, which is too weak. Proposals referred to focussed intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road shopping parade and Shirley local centre. (also see table 11.2)

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Reynolds

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)
Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

It was with immense shock that I was informed of Council plans for Shirley. We already have Shrublands in our area and the very large New Addington housing on our doorstep. Over the last few years in fit back gardens and spare land has been used to building both private and public housing in a sensible, to fit in with the area way. Now we see that you are looking at plans to demolish many roads such as Wickham Avenue, Finshy, Ridgemount, West Way Gardens and part of Hartland way thus destroying well built houses which over the years have had million of pounds spent on them by caring owners. How can you justify destroying much sort after property to erect blocks of flats which will resemble Shrublands Council Estate. As far as I can see there are no proposals for more schools, the present ones are over suberbuted. No more doctors surgery and we have Dr Nick Ford's Surgery and not a children's nursery.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
As an elderly woman in my 70s I was born in Shirley. After a life spent working locally I am now retired to a bungalow in Orchard Ave and I object most strongly to the proposed demolition of homes and building of middle rise flats.

This is entirely the wrong area for such horrific changes. There is plenty of spare land in the New Addington area that would not be devastating to people like your proposals would do.

Whoever stands to gain by these proposed plans needs to heed the strong objections that will arise unless the area is changed to New Addington or similar unbuilt-on land.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
As an elderly woman in my 70s I was born in Shirley. After a life spent working locally I am now retired to a bungalow in Orchard Ave and I object most strongly to the proposed demolition of homes and building of middle rise flats. This is entirely the wrong area for such horrific changes. There is plenty of spare land in the New Addington area that would not be devastating to people like your proposals would do. Whoever stands to gain by these proposed plans needs to heed the strong objections that will arise unless the area is changed to New Addington or similar unbuit-on land.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting of the Shirley Local Centre</td>
<td>The areas in Shirley should not be zones for intensification as this type of development would be totally out of keeping with the character of the area.</td>
<td>Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, the designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, the designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mrs Frances Pearce

Object DM31 (Table 11.2) Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

I am writing regarding the Council's plans for a massive redevelopment in the Shirley Area. More houses mean more traffic on our already crowded roads. I no longer go into Croydon because of the journey times. How long would it be before the Council considered bringing in a congestion charge. When you build all these properties do you consider the local amenities and the effect that more people would have on these. Where are the school places for all of these children? Regarding doctors. Unless it is an emergency I have to wait at least a week for an appointment. This waiting time can only increase if there are more patients. Is it the Council's policy to build over green belt land to the detriment of locals? I sincerely hope not. I think you need to seriously reconsider these plans.

Change Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Derek Ritson
Monks Orchard Residents Associa

Object

The designation of these sites will put planning blight on all dwellings in Wickham Avenue and Ridgemount Avenue Shirley until 2036. Intensification with high density accommodation could not be provided without changing the character of the area. It is very unlikely that current methods of retail shopping will continue to be competitive with the substantial growth of on-line provision and future development of on-line services and therefore it is questionable whether the proposed intensification of retail premises in the areas specified, will even be necessary. If the proposed gradual intensification is for high density residential accommodation of 3 or 4 storeys the residential density and number of families will increase; therefore car ownership per hectare will also increase. Even being near public transport, there is unlikely to be any way that the authorities could prevent car ownership and both Wickham Avenue and Ridgemount Avenue are narrow roads as compared to other local roads. If the objective is to provide increased housing and residential density for the increased population, it would not be efficient to displace current residents who would need somewhere else to live with their families. The requirements for new dwellings are for three bedroom dwellings and most of the dwellings in Wickham Avenue and Ridgemount Avenue are already 3 or more bedrooms having been extended at great expense by the owners. In addition, re-intensification of these streets would generate more traffic and as previously stated these two roads are very narrow compared to many roads in the area. To intensify the area would create traffic chaos unless the roads could be widened but that would require extensive major redevelopment of the area whereas the proposal is for slow gradual intensification - not a feasible strategy. If re-intensification were gradual, only small sections of the area would individually be re-developed in a piecemeal fashion and therefore there would not be any spare area for the allocation of communal open space for the occupants of the new high density flats or apartments as the footprints would consume most of the area used for intensification. It would be difficult to provide space in accordance with recommended retention of UDP RO12. For all the reasons stated above we request that Wickham Avenue and Ridgemount Avenue are removed from areas recommended for intensification. i.e.

Wickham Avenue and Ridgemount Avenue should be removed from the proposed areas suitable for intensification.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
allowed for redevelopment for high density residential accommodation. Why should local residents suffer planning blight up to the year 2036 when the intensification would cause local congestion and loss and degradation of amenity? There is no proposal to increase school places or health provision in the locality which, according to previous policies, should be provided prior to any developments or re-developments.

Object Soundness - Justified

Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries:
- Shirley, page 166, Shirley Road from Shirley Avenue to the BP Service Station and a further zone on Wickham Road from Ventayne Avenue to Cheston Avenue;
- Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries:
- Shirley, page 166, Shirley Road from Shirley Avenue to the BP Service Station and a further zone on Wickham Road from Verdayne Avenue to Cheston Avenue;
- Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am emailing to raise concerns over the council's proposals for Shirley, to replace buildings to provide medium-rise blocks. I am the Estate Manager at Peregrine Gardens, Shirley Croydon. This is a leasehold residential retirement estate, with 43 properties housing the over 60's, and is specifically mentioned within your proposals.

My residents have expressed concerns that they may be forced to sell their properties, as you will appreciate for an elderly population this is a worry.

We are managed by Anchor (the largest not for profit) organisation for care provision to the elderly, and provide a valuable resource for the older people in Shirley.

I would appreciate your assurances to pass on to my residents.
I am emailing to raise concerns over the council’s proposals for Shirley, to replace buildings to provide medium-rise blocks.

I am the Estate Manager at Peregrine Gardens, Shirley Croydon. This is a leasehold residential retirement estate, with 43 properties housing the over 60’s, and is specifically mentioned within your proposals.

My residents have expressed concerns that they may be forced to sell their properties, as you will appreciate for an elderly population this is a worry.

We are managed by Anchor (the largest not for profit) organisation for care provision to the elderly, and provide a valuable resource for the older people in Shirley.

I would appreciate your assurances to pass on to my residents.
DM31 (Table 11.2) Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

The CPL identifies the Local Area around Shirley Local Centre, including Wickham Avenue and Ridgemount Avenue as locations where the Council wants to see as stated on page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals: “Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character”. It goes on to describe what this means on page 132, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals “New development located in designated areas would be significantly larger than existing and may be associated with merging smaller properties. The promoted character types are: ‘Medium-rise blocks with associated grounds,’ ‘Large buildings with spacing’ and ‘Large buildings with strong frontages’. Their gradual introduction will alter over time the predominant character of intensified areas”.

The Shirley Local Centre and surrounding area comprises of well-maintained two-storey semi-detached houses, purchased by people with families, which also include grandparents. This neighbourhood is not one which can incorporate Medium-rise blocks without significantly having an adverse impact on its character. I therefore strongly object to such action.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Cllr Jan Buttinger  
London Borough of Croydon

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM31 (Table 11.2): Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where there may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Shirley, page 166. Shirley Road from Shirley Avenue to the BP Service Station and a further zone on Wickham Road from Verdayne Avenue to Cheston Avenue.

Change: Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon’s local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Shirley, page 166. Shirley Road from Shirley Avenue to the BP Service Station and a further zone on Wickham Road from Verdayne Avenue to Cheston Avenue;

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon’s local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Cllr Richard Chatterjee
London Borough of Croydon

Object: Soundness - Justified

Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where there may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

Change:

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Shirley, page 166. Shirley Road from Shirley Avenue to the BP Service Station and a further zone on Wickham Road from Verdayne Avenue to Cheston Avenue;

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4 Other than on the main road itself, the Shirley Local Centre comprises an area of well-maintained semi-detached housing. This neighbourhood is not one which can incorporate blocks of flats without significantly worsening its character.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Graham Lyon

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

This includes not just the Wickham Road itself but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable – it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon’s local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mrs Helen McMillan

Object

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

DM31 (Table 11.2)

The area around Shirley Library, itself an important social point, would be changed of all recognition. The pleasant village atmosphere would be lost. It is totally unacceptable to replace perfectly good semi-detached property with medium rise blocks of flats.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre; Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I object to Policy DM31.4. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semi-detached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley area.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I object to most of the proposals around Shirley as we are already over populated causing traffic hold ups and long queues even in the middle of the day to say nothing of the way Shirley is being spoilt and turned into a small town. The land around Hartland Way and Devonshire Way should only be used for either detached or semi-detached housing with gardens at least 150' long and no sheds or caravans. Development around Wickham Road will destroy the character of Shirley.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
5) Policy DM31.4 plans to change the local character of Shirley by encouraging the replacement of the existing semi-detached houses with medium rise blocks. This will be detrimental to the area and change for the worse what is currently a very pleasant area.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr John Helen

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

the draft Local Plan identifies two other areas of Shirley as locations where the Council wants to see " focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character" under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals).

The two areas are the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the Shirley local centre (the area around Shirley Library). The former is quite tightly drawn and I therefore don’t object to it, but the latter includes not just the Wickham Road itself but Ridgamount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Harland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way (page 166, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Chris Lynam
Object
Setting of the Shirley Local Centre
Policy DM31.4 sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. As this is a new designation it will need to be shown on the Policies Map. Details of each designation are shown below:

Place-specific development management policy Place Setting of the Shirley Local Centre Shirley
Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade Shirley

I object to the relaxation of the planning regulations to allow the building of significantly larger structures in close proximity to the existing housing stock, comprising mainly bungalows and two storey semi-detached and detached houses in residential roads in the area described as Shirley Local Centre, i.e. around the Shirley Library, West Way Gardens, Hartland Way, Wickham Rd, Devonshire Way, West Way, Verlayne Ave, Ridgemount Ave, Wickham Ave, and the area around the Shirley Road/Shirley Shopping Parade including the Green Triangle and the Trinity School educational open space. The promoted character types of Medium rise blocks with associated grounds; large buildings with spacing; and Large buildings with strong frontages; at these locations would look out of character and is unacceptable. These types of developments in the wrong locations would adversely affect the character of Shirley both now and for future generations. In the case of Shirley Local Centre the local side road network and width could not cope with high residential density proposal and the likely car ownership and on street parking. At present there are significant traffic delays at rush hour times on the Wickham Rd, Hartland Way, Devonshire Rd and West Way gardens and substantial parking by non-residents in area who access transport links. West Way gardens and Devonshire Way are reduced to single way traffic when vehicles are parked on both sides of the road. Any additional development would only increase this problem.

The type of home in the area lends itself to family oriented living, a move towards apartment type dwellings will impact upon the area character. If these proposals were to become the Croydon Plan adopted policy, it would place Planning blight on all properties as defined in DM31.4 until the year 2036.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting of the Shirley Local Centre</td>
<td>Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Road. None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Paul Newton  
Addington Village Residents Assoc

Object Soundness - Justified  
Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Stuart Marsh

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)
Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

I object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of the area's local character under policy DM31.4 of Shirley Local Centre.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I strongly object to the areas listed being earmarked for 'intensification' as this will dramatically change the character of these areas.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
4. DM31.4: Shirley and Fossedale should not be zones for intensification as this type of development would be totally out of keeping with the character of these areas.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this the designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennets Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

Policy DM31.4 sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. As this is a new designation it will need to be shown on the Policies Map. Details of each designation are shown below:

Place-specific development management policy Place Setting of the Shirley Local Centre Shirley Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade Shirley

I object to the relaxation of the planning regulations to allow the building of significantly larger structures in close proximity to the existing housing stock, comprising mainly bungalows and two storey semi-detached and detached houses in residential roads in the area described as Shirley Local Centre, i.e. around the Shirley Library, West Way Gardens, Hartland Way, Wickham Rd, Devonshire Way, West Way, Verdayne Ave, Ridgemount Ave, Wickham Ave, and the area around the Shirley Road/Shirley Shopping Parade including the Green Triangle and the Trinity School educational open space. The promoted character types of Medium rise blocks with associated grounds; large buildings with spacing; and Large buildings with strong frontages; at these locations would look out of character and is unacceptable. These types of developments in the wrong locations would adversely affect the character of Shirley both now and for future generations. In the case of Shirley Local Centre the local side road network and width could not cope with high residential density proposal and the likely car ownership and on street parking. At present there are significant traffic delays at rush hour times on the Wickham Rd, Hartland Way, Devonshire Rd and West Way and substantial parking by non-residents in area who access transport links. West Way gardens and Devonshire Way are reduced to single way traffic when vehicles are parked on both sides of the road. Any additional development would only increase this problem. The type of home in the area lends itself to family orientated living; a move towards apartment type dwellings will impact upon the area character. If these proposals were to become the Croydon Plan adopted policy, it would place Planning blight on all properties as defined in DM31.4 until the year 2036.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I have read Gavin Barwell’s assessment of policies and proposals in the Croydon Local Plan and totally agree that if implemented would destroy the character of Shirley.

The infrastructure in Shirley is already stretched to the limit and can not withstand any further burdens.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
4 focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Sharon Creffield
Object Soundness - Justified
Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

Objections to the proposed Intensification of Shirley Local Centre and Shirley Shopping Parade as outlined in table 11.2 on page 129 of Croydon Local Plan.

I would like to register my objection to the proposals and also to request that the consultation period is extended to allow residents and other interested parties the time to fully research the likely impact of the proposals. There appears to have been very little action on behalf of the council to ensure that those affected by these proposed plans were made aware of them, thus denying them of the opportunity of airing their opinion. It is a pity that the council felt itself unable to be transparent over this matter, perhaps anticipating how unpopular and ill advised the proposal is.

I object most strongly to the council planning to change the current face of the area around and including Shirley library. My understanding is that development should only complement and enhance character in an area and this cannot be achieved by building multi-occupancy buildings in and around this site. Contrary to statement, it is a characterful, and typical face of 20's and 30s builds and it is this that gives it's welcome open feel. As such, residents have a strong sense of community, care for the area and this in turn contributes to a positive sense of well being and belonging. This destabilising of an area by the proposals should not be underestimated in terms of drain on council services for policing, maintenance, cleansing if this were destroyed by intensified housing.

The amenities are a further positive of this part of Shirley, the library and Surgery being two most important parts of the whole and loss of these would impact strongly on the community.

In addition, public transport in the locality is inadequate, schools and doctors surgeries oversubscribed, and any remedy would result in even greater loss of land and character.

The council should be looking at derelict area and under used sites and areas where conditions for existing residents could be improved, rather than destroying well balanced change.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM3.14 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Peter Kenny

I am writing to object to focused intensification associated with gradual change of the areas local character under policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads.

The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Terrence McCarthy

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

I object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semidetached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley area. The traffic congestion on Wickham Road, once limited to rush hour and school times is now so bad that even mid-morning traffic tails back from Shirley Library to the roundabout on Shirley Hills Road. The proposed development would exacerbate this to a dangerous level.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
First, the draft Local Plan identifies two areas of Shirley as locations where the Council wants to see “focused intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character” under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The document also explains what this means – that it is the aim of your team to materially change the character of the local area. Please could you explain why? Even if it was an area which had problems, this would be unacceptable. But the area you are talking about is a good residential district with good shops and a pleasant atmosphere. An area to which people move specifically because of its character, an area which people love.

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon's local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Haslam

Object

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

Policy DM31 (Table 11.2) 1. Policy DM31.4: Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character: Shirley Road shopping parade and Shirley local centre: (Whilst some limited intensification in the local centre along Wickham Road may be desirable to provide additional housing, the area around the local centre is far too widely drawn, including roads with quality family housing (Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Firsby Avenue, Hartland Way, Devonshire Way etc.) which should be maintained. Family housing with gardens needs to be retained for young families upsizing from flats to move to, who it is in the borough's interest to retain. Intensification would also lead to increased traffic which Wickham Road cannot support (rush hour delays are already very significant), especially since traffic is already expected to increase with the (admittedly desirable) Westfield development where visitors from Shirley, West Wickham and farther afield from A21/M25 will naturally use the A232 to reach Croydon.

ii) We strongly oppose intensification around the Shirley Road shopping parade. This is an architecturally strong parade which accordingly enjoys very low vacancy rates. In fact we strongly urge you to consider the 1930s parade for local listing, local heritage area or similar protection. Indeed 11.147 states that "each of Shirley's shopping centres has a distinct character which should be enhanced and strengthened" and some form of protection is essential to secure this in the light of intensification proposals. (We would comment similarly in respect of the Sanderstead Local centre also listed under DM31.4) As with the area around the Shirley local centre, we object to the loss of family housing for the reasons already stated. In fact 11.142 notes that the features of Shirley's shopping areas "play a vital role in creating Shirley's sense of place" and yet, in apparent contradiction, the proposed focussed intensification as outlined would seriously undermine this sense of place.

As an aside and instead it would seem that areas in need of regeneration within the borough might be considered for focussed intensification and/or change of use to provide additional housing and where access to transport and other facilities is good. For example the area along Lower Addiscombe Road between Grant Road and Davidsen

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon's local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Road has several retail units which have been unlet for a long period and a fragmented character which provides the opportunity for redevelopment into a much higher quality and largely residential area, although focus on the quality of development/conversion will be necessary to achieve a good living environment.

We are pleased to note that public realm improvements are planned for the Shirley Local Centre, as these are long overdue.

| 3354/01/013/DM31 (Table 11.2)/O | Dr Bob Wenn | Object | DM31 (Table 11.2) Setting of the Shirley Local Centre | Change | Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan. |
Object | DM31 (Table 11.2) Setting of the Shirley Local Centre
---|---
I formally object to the relaxation of the planning regulations to allow the building of significantly larger structures in close proximity to the existing housing stock, comprising mainly bungalows and two-storey semi-detached houses in residential roads in the area described as Shirley Local Centre, i.e. around the Shirley Library. The proposed dwelling types of 1) medium rise blocks with associated grounds, 2) large buildings with spacing, and 3) large buildings with strong frontages, would look completely out of character in this location and are unacceptable. These types of developments would adversely affect the character of Shirley both now and for future generations.

Change | Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Rishi Gohill
Object Soundness - Justified
Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change
Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Joy Harris  

Object: Soundness - Justified

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The suggestion of developing medium-rise blocks in several residential roads surrounding Shirley would totally alter the character of the area and again brings with it more traffic and parking pressure to the surrounding streets.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Fourth, the draft Local Plan identifies two other areas of Shirley as locations where the Council wants to see "focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character" under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). It goes on to describe what this means:

“New development located in designated areas would be significantly larger than existing and may be associated with merging smaller properties. The promoted character types are: ‘Medium-rise blocks with associated grounds’, ‘Large buildings with spacing’ and ‘Large buildings with strong frontages’. Their gradual introduction will alter over time the predominant character of intensified areas” (page 132, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals).

The two areas are the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the Shirley local centre (the area around Shirley Library). The former is quite tightly drawn and I therefore don’t object to it, but the latter includes not just the Wickham Road itself but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Davonshire Way (page 166, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable – it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The plan for the Shirley Road Shopping Parade & the Shirley local centre (page 129) actually states its intention to change the local character. So it will involve pressurising inhabitants of perfectly good houses to move out to allow demolition of their homes to replace them with multi-occupational blocks. It will not ‘complement the local character’ to remove houses and their gardens. London’s Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment assumes that garden land WILL NOT BE DEVELOPED.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Alan Heathcote

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

This is to object strongly to your ill-conceived proposals for high density dwellings on greenbelt parkland, on existing semi-detached housing areas, and gardens in the Shirley Oaks / Library regions. Also for travellers sites in the vicinity of Coombe farm. All as outlined in Gavin Barwell’s email.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3403/01/002/DM31 (Table 11.2/O)</th>
<th>Mr &amp; Mrs Green</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM31 (Table 11.2) Setting of the Shirley Local Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As residents of Devonshire Way we wish to object (very strongly) to the Policy DM 31.4 concerning &quot;focused intensification&quot; aimed at changing the local character of Shirley. We have always relied on Local Government to establish a typical local character and then protect that local character. In our opinion your proposals will spoil the area and possibly ruin it and we cannot understand why you would wish to do that.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change
Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, the designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Existing semi-detached houses should not be demolished in favour of soulless blocks of flats. People require houses to live in, especially bringing up families. Please stick to sensible developments and do not destroy Croydon with horrendous buildings. We are long-term residents and care very much about the area in which we live.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where there may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Shirley, page 166, Shirley Road from Shirley Avenue to the BP Service Station and a further zone on Wickham Road from Verdayne Avenue to Cheston Avenue.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr D Lane Object Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennets Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Change Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr E King OBE

Object Soundness - Justified

DM31 (Table 11.2) Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

DM31

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am writing to you to object to the Focussed intensification associated with the gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 off the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley Local Centre.

The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Ms G Stevens

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)
Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

I am writing to object to the Council's proposed long term plans for certain parts of Croydon, particularly the area around Shirley Library, where I have lived for 30 years.

Apart from the obvious increase in traffic, to an already overburdened Wickham Road, we are starting to see the gradual erosion of traditional residential roads formed of classic semi or detached houses.

To cram more and more houses and flats into the designated areas would destroy their character and to build on existing green belt and back gardens would be completely inappropriate, as well as placing additional stress on local facilities and amenities.

I urge the Council to reconsider these proposals and adopt a more sensitive agenda using only space and land capable of absorbing additional development.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Ms G Stevens

I am writing to object to the Council's proposed long term plans for certain parts of Croydon, particularly the area around Shirley Library, where I have lived for 30 years.

Apart from the obvious increase in traffic, to an already overburdened Wickham Road, we are starting to see the gradual erosion of traditional residential roads formed of classic semi or detached houses.

To cram more and more houses and flats into the designated areas would destroy their character and to build on existing green belt and back gardens would be completely inappropriate, as well as placing additional stress on local facilities and amenities.

I urge the Council to reconsider these proposals and adopt a more sensitive agenda using only space and land capable of absorbing additional development.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am writing to object to the Council's proposed long term plans for certain parts of Croydon, particularly the area around Shirley Library, where I have lived for 30 years. Apart from the obvious increase in traffic, to an already overburdened Wickham Road, we are starting to see the gradual erosion of traditional residential roads formed of classic semi or detached houses. To cram more and more houses and flats into the designated areas would destroy their character and to build on existing green belt and back gardens would be completely inappropriate, as well as placing additional stress on local facilities and amenities.

I urge the Council to reconsider these proposals and adopt a more sensitive agenda using only space and land capable of absorbing additional development.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Gary Kenney

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)
Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

I am writing to show that I object to a number of your plans around the Shirley area. I contest that you need to build on our green sites and bring in new ‘traveler’ sites into Shirley.

On top of this I cannot understand the need to bring ‘medium’ high rise buildings in and around Shirley, including Devonshire way and the new proposals around Hartland way.

Please can you let me know if my objection has been noted and how I can make it more official?

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM31 (Table 11.2) Setting of the Shirley Local Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Hayden</td>
<td>My other objection relates to the draft Local Plan relating to two other areas in Shirley, i.e. Shirley Shopping Parade and the Shirley local centre, the area around Shirley Library. From the draft plan, the Council wants to see &quot;focused intensification associated with gradual change of the area's local character&quot; under Policy DM31.4,... it further describes how this would mean merging smaller properties, medium rise blocks, large buildings with strong frontages. &quot;The introduction of such buildings will alter, over time, the predominant character of the intensified areas&quot;... page 132 of CLP. Page 166 CLP... mentions local roads in Shirley. To replace the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium rise blocks is not acceptable. It will inevitably change the character of Shirley and I would like register my objection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Change | Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan. |
Mr Atkinson & Wade

Object DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

We would like to object to 1 aspect of the Croydon Plan that affects Shirley under policy DM31.4. We are really concerned that the proposals for more high density buildings around the Shirley Centre will have an impact on amenities in the area. What will happen to the local library? Shirley has very few public amenities. What will happen to the GP surgery at the bottom of Hartland Way? Shirley needs to be a living place and a space with public amenities. This is what makes a community. The idea that the largely semi detached houses in the residential roads around Shirley library should be replaced by medium rise blocks is not acceptable as it would simply change the character of Shirley.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am writing to object to:

1. Focused intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character under Policy DM 31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre.

This policy is lacking in sufficient detail or thought, and actually perpetuates the poorly planned and thought out development that the Croydon Local Plan refers to, which it seeks to avoid.

The idea that largely semi-detached buildings in the residential roads surrounding Shirley library should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is entirely unsuitable, and wholly unacceptable.

This policy would completely change the character of Shirley for the worse (not better), with particular and direct effect on those residential streets encompassed by the suggested policy on the south side of Shirley that sit off/behind the main Wickham Road and library.

Adopting such a policy would also significantly devalue and detract from Shirley as a whole, and would have negative consequences in respect of the existing residential properties surrounding any such development that would remain. It is also likely to result in at least a perceived element of blight if pursued.

The policy does not indicate a respect for the local area and the existing character, which would be destroyed by adopting such a policy. It also shows little regard to the impacts on what is a settled and well established community, which would be ended fairly quickly. The policy also shows no regard for the local environs, as well as local and public services, traffic considerations, and existing infrastructure.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Maureen Wilcox

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am concerned that the areas which have been earmarked for 'intensification' will suffer as a result of over-building, which will destroy the character of these areas.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting of the Shirley Local Centre</td>
<td>Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Road. None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Change | Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan. |
Objections to the proposed Intensification of Shirley Local Centre and Shirley Shopping Parade as outlined in table 11.2 on page 129 of Croydon Local Plan Detailed Proposals and Policies and extensive development in other areas of Shirley.

I wish to lodge my objection to the proposals on the following grounds:

- Insufficient Notice was given to allow adequate consideration to be given to the proposals.
- The intensification of dwelling places in the area will have a negative impact, changing the nature and character of the area.
- The transport links in the area are inadequate to cope with a large increase in the population. The A232 Wickham Road is notoriously bad.

A proposal to build flats to replace two bungalows on the corner of Alton Road was turned down on the grounds that it would change the nature and character of the road. Alton Road consists of traditional family homes with gardens. Many similar roads referred to in the Shirley proposal would be affected in the same way.

You only have to look at Pampisford Road in Croydon to see how such developments change the nature and character of a road.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where there may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Shirley, page 166, Shirley Road from Shirley Avenue to the BP Service Station and a further zone on Wickham Road from Verdayne Avenue to Cheston Avenue;

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr J Lemanski  
Object

DM31 (Table 11.2) Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

I would like you to note my strong objection to the granting of any Planning Application relating to the following Policy Ref. DM31.4.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mrs J McDonald

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

In Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for “intensification” – which is a euphemism for more building. This will change the character of those areas and should be opposed.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Mott object to this site allocation. Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Also, tearing down semi-detached housing and putting up blocks of flats (as planned in Shirley) is totally unacceptable.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr K George

I am unaware that I have missed public meetings or been sent details of these plans as it affects my local area. I think that were you to have had a local referendum as I think you should have done, these proposals would receive practically zero support except possibly by those who stand to gain from it.

My wife and I are longstanding Shirley residents. While I understand the need for more housing, the Croydon plan as it affects Shirley seems extreme in extent and its likely impact on Shirley.

I am especially concerned with policy DM31.4 and the proposed focused intensification of the Shirley Road Shopping parade and Shirley local centre which is tantamount to the destruction of Shirley as it exists and its replacement by new developments of unknown nature. Apart from the unknown endpoint it is clear that the impact in terms of inconvenience and disruption to local residents would occur over many years during this redevelopment for no benefit to existing residents. It is also not evident why that part of Shirley as opposed to any other reasonably pleasant suburban area in Croydon should have been chosen for 'intensification'.

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Barnes

Finally, the draft Local Plan identifies two other areas of Shirley as locations where the Council wants to see "focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character" under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). It goes on to describe what this means:

“New development located in designated areas would be significantly larger than existing and may be associated with merging smaller properties. The promoted character types are: ‘Medium-rise blocks with associated ground’ , ‘Large buildings with spacing’ and ‘Large buildings with strong frontages’. Their gradual introduction will alter over time the predominant character of intensified areas” (page 132, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals).

The two areas are the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the Shirley local centre (the area around Shirley Library) (page 166, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and we are objecting to it.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I object to it very strongly.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, the designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon’s local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Paul Slaughter

Object

Soundness - Justified

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
First, the draft Local Plan identifies two areas of Shirley as locations where the Council wants to see “focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character” under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). Happily the document also explains what this means. Unhappily, it appears to mean exactly what it says – that it is the aim of your team to materially change the character of the local area. If it was an area which had problems, which needed to be helped up, which was suffering unduly from the privations of the tight financial climate then perhaps, perhaps, it would be understandable, if still unacceptable. But the area you are talking about is none of those things – it is a nice residential district with nice shops and a pleasant atmosphere. An area to which people move specifically because of its character, and area which people love.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
the draft Local Plan identifies two other areas of Shirley as locations where the Council wants to see “focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character” under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals) - it goes on to describe what this means: New development located in designated areas would be significantly larger than existing and may be associated with merging smaller properties. The promoted character types are: ‘Medium-rise blocks with associated grounds’, ‘Large buildings with spacing’ and ‘Large buildings with strong frontages’. Their gradual introduction will alter over time the predominant character of intensified areas’ (page 132, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The two areas are the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the Shirley local centre (the area around Shirley Library). The former is quite tightly drawn and, therefore, I can not think of a reason to object to it, but the latter includes not just the Wickham Road itself but Ridgmount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way (page 166, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I object to it very strongly.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I write to you having received this email from Gavin Barwell MP, the tone of which I find inflammatory and discriminatory towards the Gypsy and Traveller communities, and smacks of "not in my backyard".

I write as a resident of Addiscombe who recognises the huge problem of lack of affordable housing to buy and to rent in London promulgated by this Conservative government and the previous coalition government.

I fully support Croydon Council’s proposals.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Neil Morrison

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

I am concerned that I cannot find further information regarding the development at Shirley Library. I don't think we need to despoil an area for the sake of having a new development for a developer to make increased profits and these are parts of the community used by a good number of residents and are in fact centres of the community Doctors Library.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object  

Soundness - Justified

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Road.

None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr M Blount

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

I have considered details of the proposed Croydon Local Plan and have the following objections on the basis that they will:

detract from the local areas,

dramatically change the character of local areas,

have a significant adverse effect on an already overloaded infrastructure, including roads, public transport, public open space, environment and emergency, health and support services.

3. I object to the proposed replacement of low rise, terraced, semi-detached, and detached properties with medium and high rise properties in the Shirley area, Addington and Forestale area, New Addington area, Addiscombe and East Croydon area.

4. I object to the proposed increased building capacity and density in the Shirley area, Addington and Forestale area, New Addington area, Addiscombe and East Croydon area.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Below is a list of our objections:

4. Policy DM 31.4 - Intensification of development in South Croydon, Kenley, Purley, Sanderstead - more new developments on these sites will change character of the areas and put local communities at risk.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mrs Barbara Cumming

Object Soundness - Justified

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

I understand that there are two areas in Shirley where four storey buildings are planned: Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the area around the Shirley Library. Whilst I don’t object to the Shirley Road development, the latter includes not just Wickham Road itself but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way, and Devonshire Way (page 166, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I object to it very strongly.

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combing the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The idea of knocking down semi-detached houses and replacing with medium-rise blocks is totally unacceptable and I object to most strongly as it will completely destroy the area and character of Shirley, and Forestgate. This again increases pressure on local roads, public transport, schools and NHS facilities.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM31 (Table 11.2) Setting of the Shirley Local Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley local centre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, the designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object

I also object strongly to the proposed development of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre (Policy DM31.4). Shirley is made up of mostly semi-detached houses in residential roads. To replace these very functional and beautiful houses with medium rise blocks will change the entire character of Shirley. It will only serve to lead to further development in an already well populated area.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Malec

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)
Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

The roads within the identified area are predominantly semi-detached properties on small/medium plots and terraced properties on small/medium size plots. In another part of the policy, the Council states that 3-bed properties are predominantly required. DM38.1c states “complement the existing predominant building heights of 2 storeys up to a maximum of 4 storeys”. I do not believe that this is possible to provide when you also need to add the associated grounds and required parking without totally changing the character of Shirley. The Council also states that this is a busy traffic area (consolidated borough character appraisal - Shirley/movement points 4 & 5) also DM18.1 states “the Council also ensure the provision of community facilities”. Both the Shirley Library and Hartland Surgery are within this area. I strongly object to this proposal and eagerly await the Council’s response.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Ms S Ikpa

Object DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

Focused intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semi-detached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley area;

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I have been a Shirley Resident since 1966 and am aware of how the majority of Shirley residents feel about where they live. Ref. DM 31.4. Areas around Shirley Library. It is understood that you intend to replace semi detached houses with medium rise flats!! Who are these flats for? Does this mean compulsory purchase orders? Shirley is already densely populated and the traffic in Wickham Road is already over congested with regular traffic jams.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Walsh

Object

We are writing to you to voice our very real concerns and objections to your proposals to allow the development of up to four storeys along some of the Wickham Road, especially in the area around the library. Also your proposal for relaxing the rules with regard to allowing back-garden developments. We feel that these plans will totally alter the character of Shirley.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr P Cook

I wish to lodge my objection to the following proposal for Shirley Focussed Intensification. This proposal will be totally changing the character of the area. No consideration has been given to the people already living in the area.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Crane

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

We are life long residents of Croydon. With reference to the local plan we would like to object to the following proposals:

• DM40.1 - A skyscraper in Purley is total out of character for the town. Purley needs development but this is not the way to go about it.

• DM40.4 - Purley Pool - whilst not objecting to this area being redeveloped it should include a swimming pool. Our children learnt to swim here and it is an important facility to the community. For instance our Father uses it regularly. It has been vital to maintaining his health and he would not be able to travel to more distant pools.

• DM44.2 - It is not appropriate to have a travellers site on green belt land. We believe it is important to protect all Green Belt land from development.

• DM31.4 - We are opposed to the intensification of these areas.

Change
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I object to the gradual change of the area’s local character, the Council states it wants to see "focused intensification" by allowing properties significantly larger than the existing ones to be built in Shirley Local Centre and Shirley Road under policy DM31.4.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object: Setting of the Shirley Local Centre
Soundness: Justified

The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Ms S Lawson

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

I strongly object to the areas listed being earmarked for ‘intensification’ as this will dramatically change the character of these areas.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this the designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Dr Chandra Pawa

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley local centre. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semi-detached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley area.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Table 11.2

Melissa Chu

Object focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semi-detached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley area;

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The draft Local Plan identifies two other areas of Shirley as locations where the Council wants to see "focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character" under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). It goes on to describe what this means: New development located in designated areas would be significantly larger than existing and may be associated with merging smaller properties. The promoted character types are: 'Medium-rise blocks with associated grounds', 'Large buildings with spacing' and 'Large buildings with strong frontages'. Their gradual introduction will alter over time the predominant character of intensified areas" (page 132, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The two areas are the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the Shirley local centre (the area around Shirley Library). The former is quite tightly drawn and I therefore don't object to it, but the latter includes not just the Wickham Road itself but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way (page 166, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I object to this very strongly.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Vince Hemmert

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

DM31 (Table 11.2)

focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgmount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too;

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Below is a list of our objections:

4. Policy DM 31.4 - Intensification of development in South Croydon, Kenley, Purley, Sanderstead - more new developments on these sites will change character of the areas and put local communities at risk.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Councillor M Fisher

Object DM31 (Table 11.2)

Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where there may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Shirley, page 166, Shirley Road from Shirley Avenue to the BP Service Station and a further zone on Wickham Road from Verdayne Avenue to Cheston Avenue;

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I understand that there are two areas in Shirley where four storey buildings are planned: Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the area around the Shirley Library. Whilst I don’t object to the Shirley Road development, the latter includes not just Wickham Road itself but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennets Way and Devonshire Way (page 166, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I object to it very strongly.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms S Rao</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Object</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM31 (Table 11.2) Setting of the Shirley Local Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Local Centre. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semi-detached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The policy 31.4 was withdrawn from the final draft of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals in response to the new piece of evidence which was not available prior to consultation. The detailed Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment identified all six proposed areas of focussed intensification as being of a high risk of flooding (fluvial, surface and groundwater) therefore not suitable for intensification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am grateful to the Council for consulting on the detailed policies and proposals that will make up the Croydon Local Plan. There is much in the document that I agree with, but some of the proposals would, in my opinion, change the character of parts of Croydon very much for the worse. I hope you will forgive me if I focus on these areas of contention. I am therefore writing to formally object to:

4. focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks?

Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Benneffs Way and Davonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Change
Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, the designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Kennard

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

I am writing to object to Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of the local character of Shirley Policy DM31.4. The proposed changes would exacerbate the traffic problems in the Wickham Road referred to above. They would change the area from a community to one of apartments and commuters.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this the designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Meeting of the Shirley Local Centre

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2) focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semi-detached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley area;

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object: DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

Identification of two Shirley areas as suitable for "focussed intensification associated with gradual change of areas local character" under policy DM31.4

The areas are the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the Shirley Local Centre. The roads around Shirley Library are largely semi-detached housing, where families have lived for many years. It is a settled community and it is completely unacceptable the family houses should be replaced by medium-sized blocks of flats, which would completely change the area's character and disrupt the existing community. This has personal relevance, as the proposals cover the road where I have lived for the past 32 years.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The local draft plan identifies two other areas of Shirley as locations where the Council wants to see “focused intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s character”. The two areas around Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the Shirley Library which have been targeted are roads of semi-detached houses where families have lived for years. It is a settled community and it is completely unacceptable that family houses should be replaced by medium-rise blocks of flats. The character of the area would change completely.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr G Furmanski  
Object: Setting of the Shirley Local Centre  
Soundness - Justified  

I object to:  
6. focussed intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road shopping parade and the Shirley Library local centre.

Change:  
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am writing to submit my objection to:

3. Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre;

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr J Westray
Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)
Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

The focussed intensification associated with the gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the Shirley local centre. The idea that new development located in these areas, including local residential roads, could be significantly larger than existing buildings of up to four storeys is totally out of keeping with the area and would fundamentally change the character of Shirley. Such a significant change is disrespectful to existing residents who have chosen to live, contribute and build a strong local community in an established residential suburban area.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs King

Object

As a local affected resident, I would like to register my comments and objection to the proposals as documented in the Croydon Local Plans CLP1.1 and CLP2

I object to the Proposed Policy DM31.4 Focussed Intensification Associated with Gradual Change of the Local Area around Shirley Local Centre, Including Wickham Avenue and Ridgemount Avenue.

I object to the relaxation of the planning regulations to allow the building of significantly larger structures in close proximity to the existing housing stock, comprising mainly bungalows and two storey semi-detached houses in residential roads in the area described as Shirley Local Centre, i.e. around the Shirley Library. The promoted character types of Medium rise blocks with associated grounds; Large buildings with spacing; and Large buildings with strong frontages; in this location would look out of character and is unacceptable. These types of developments in the wrong locations would adversely affect the character of Shirley both now and for future generations.

For the reasons given above:

1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. If high density residential accommodation were provided they would be insufficient for communal open space allocation.
5. The local road network and Width could not cope with high residential density proposal and the likely car ownership and on street parking.
6. If these proposals were to become the Croydon Plan adopted policy, it would place Planning blight on all properties as defined in DM31.4 until the year 2036.
7. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I do not object to the development plans for the Shirley Road Shopping Parade provided that any expansion is along the A232 and does not affect the existing residential areas.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs DB Good

Object

As a local affected resident, I would like to register my comments and objection to the proposals as documented in the Croydon Local Plans CLP1.1 and CLP2. I object to the Proposed Policy DM31.4 Focussed Intensification Associated with Gradual Change of the Local Area around Shirley Local Centre, Including Wickham Avenue and Ridgemount Avenue.

I object to the relaxation of the planning regulations to allow the building of significantly larger structures in close proximity to the existing housing stock, comprising mainly bungalows and two storey semi-detached houses in residential roads in the area described as Shirley Local Centre, i.e. around the Shirley Library. The promoted character types of Medium rise blocks with associated grounds; Large buildings with spacing; and Large buildings with strong frontages; in this location would look out of character and is unacceptable. These types of developments in the wrong locations would adversely affect the character of Shirley both now and for future generations.

For the reasons given above:

1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. If High density residential accommodation were provided there would be insufficient area for communal open space allocation.
5. The local road network and Width could not cope with high residential density proposal and the likely car ownership and on street parking.
6. If these proposals were to become the Croydon Plan adopted policy, it would place Planning blight on all properties as defined in DM31.4 until the year 2036.
7. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I do not object to the development plans for the Shirley Road Shopping Parade provided that any expansion is along the A232 and does not affect the existing residential areas.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object of Policy DM31 (Table 11.2) Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

I object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Sheila Newman
Object
DM31 (Table 11.2)
Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

Focused intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semi-detached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley area;

Change
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
As a local affected resident, I would like to register my comments and objection to the proposals as documented in the Croydon Local Plans CLP1.1 and CLP2. I object to the Proposed Policy DM31.4 Focussed Intensification Associated with Gradual Change of the Local Area around Shirley Local Centre, including Wickham Avenue and Ridgemount Avenue. I object to the relaxation of the planning regulations to allow the building of significantly larger structures in close proximity to the existing housing stock, comprising mainly bungalows and two storey semi-detached houses in residential roads in the area described as Shirley Local Centre, i.e. around the Shirley Library. The promoted character types of Medium rise blocks with associated grounds; Large buildings with spacing; and Large buildings with strong frontages; in this location would look out of character and is unacceptable. These types of developments in the wrong locations would adversely affect the character of Shirley both now and for future generations.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. If High density residential accommodation were provided there would be insufficient area for communal open space allocation.
5. The local road network and Width could not cope with high residential density proposal and the likely car ownership and on street parking.

Change
Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon's local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM31 (Table 11.2) Setting of the Shirley Local Centre</td>
<td>Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is a private owned sheltered accommodation for the elderly. There is no way we can do without the shops in walking distance. If you pull them down the dust and dirt would be bad for all our health etc. More people put into this area would require more parking spaces, not less. The library is the hub of my life as I cannot go far at 83. Pulling down more houses would alter Shirley forever.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting of the Shirley Local Centre</td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focused intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre. The proposals to allow building of medium rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley and is unacceptable. |
Mr D Nesterovitch  

**Object**  

DM31 (Table 11.2)  

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre  

Focused intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semi-detached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley area;

**Change**  

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mrs Glenna Fullick

Object

As a local affected resident, I would like to register my comments and objection to the proposals as documented in the Croydon Local Plans CLP1.1 and CLP2. I object to the Proposed Policy DM31.4 Focussed Intensification Associated with Gradual Change of the Local Area around Shirley Local Centre, including Wickham Avenue and Ridgemount Avenue.

I object to the relaxation of the planning regulations to allow the building of significantly larger structures in close proximity to the existing housing stock, comprising mainly bungalows and two storey semi-detached houses in residential roads in the area described as Shirley Local Centre, i.e. around the Shirley Library. The promoted character types of Medium rise blocks with associated grounds; Large buildings with spacing; and Large buildings with strong frontages; in this location would look out of character and is unacceptable. These types of developments in the wrong locations would adversely affect the character of Shirley both now and for future generations.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. If High density residential accommodation were provided, there would be insufficient area for communal open space allocation.
5. The local road network and Width could not cope with high residential density proposal and the likely car ownership and on street parking.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this the designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mrs Rita Evans

Object

As a long term resident of Shirley, since 1969, I am appalled at your proposals for focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character. Although I and other local people appreciate the need for housing, surely it is part of your responsibility as a Council to respect the views of your residents and to conserve good local character, not to bulldoze it in favour of such inappropriate redevelopment? Shirley is recognised as a prime example of excellent inter-war development. It would seem our Council is determined to destroy this asset and replace it with anonymity.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Objection to the focussed Intensification - Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley Local Centre. This will totally change the character of the Shirley area and damage communities without consideration for what the people of those areas need. It will create an artificial town centre by removing groups of e.g. villages, a hallmark of Shirley.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads.

The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I object to: 6. focussed intensification associated with gradual change of the area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road shopping parade and the Shirley Library local centre.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr P Bhanji  

Object: DM31 (Table 11.2) Setting of the Shirley Local Centre  

DM31 (Table 11.2) focussed intensification associated with gradual change of local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semi-detached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley area;  

Change: Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semi-detached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley area;

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
As a local affected residents we would like to register our comments and objection to the proposals as documented in the Croydon Local Plans CLP1.1 and CLP2.

We object to the Proposed Policy DM31.4 Focussed Intensification Associated with Gradual Change of the Local Area around Shirley Local Centre, Including Wickham Avenue and Ridgemount Avenue.

We object to the relaxation of the planning regulations to allow the building of significantly larger structures in close proximity to the existing housing stock, comprising mainly bungalows and two storey semi-detached houses in residential roads in the area described as Shirley Local Centre, i.e. around the Shirley Library. The promoted character types of Medium rise blocks with associated grounds; Large buildings with spacing; and Large buildings with strong frontages; in this location would look out of character and is unacceptable. These types of developments in the wrong locations would adversely affect the character of Shirley both now and for future generations.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
2. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
3. If High density residential accommodation were provided there would be insufficient area for communal open space allocation.
4. If High density residential accommodation were provided there would be insufficient area for communal open space allocation.
5. The local road network and Width could not cope with high residential density proposal and the likely car ownership and on street parking.
6. If these proposals were to become the Croydon Plan adopted policy, it would place Planning blight on all properties as defined in DM31.4 until the year 2036.
7. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I do not object to the development plans for the Shirley Road Shopping Parade provided that any expansion is along the A232 and does not affect the existing residential areas.
Ms Gemma Sturgeon

As a local affected resident, I would like to register my comments and objection to the proposals as documented in the Croydon Local Plans CLP1.1 and CLP2

I object to the Proposed Policy DM31.4 Focussed Intensification Associated with Gradual Change of the Local Area around Shirley Local Centre, including Wickham Avenue and Ridgemount Avenue.

I object to the relaxation of the planning regulations to allow the building of significantly larger structures in close proximity to the existing housing stock, comprising mainly bungalows and two storey semi-detached houses in residential roads in the area described as Shirley Local Centre, i.e. around the Shirley Library. The promoted character types of Medium rise blocks with associated grounds; Large buildings with spacing; and Large buildings with strong frontages; in this location would look out of character and is unacceptable. These types of developments in the wrong locations would adversely affect the character of Shirley both now and for future generations.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. If High density residential accommodation were provided them would be insufficient area for communal open space allocation.
5. The local road network and Width could not cope with High residential density proposal and the likely car ownership and on street parking.
6. If these proposals were to become the Croydon Plan adopted policy, it would place Planning blight on all properties as defined in DM31.4 until the year 2036.
7. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I do not object to the development plans for the Shirley Road Shopping Parade provided that any expansion is along the A232 and does not affect the existing residential areas.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object: DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

1 Proposed Policy DM31.4 Focussed Intensification Associated with Gradual Change of the Local Area around Shirley Local Centre, including Wickham Road and Ridgemount Avenue

I object to the relaxation of the planning regulations to allow the building of significantly larger structures in close proximity to the existing housing stock, comprising mainly bungalows and two storey semi-detached houses in residential roads in the area described as Shirley Local Centre, i.e. around the Shirley Library. The proposed character types of: Medium rise blocks with associated grounds; Large buildings with spacing; and Large buildings with strong frontages; in this location would look out of character and is unacceptable. These types of developments in the wrong locations would adversely affect the character of Shirley both now and for future generations.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet the Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

Change: Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Ms N Nesterovich | Object | DM31 (Table 11.2) Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre. Replacing the existing shopping parade and the surrounding semi-detached housing with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of the Shirley area.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mrs Janet Baine

Object focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre. We do not need intensified build up of the local area; I was walking along the Wickham Road recently and was praying like mad that the Council would do something about the fumes because they are most unpleasant to inhale. When my parents moved from Camberwell to Shirley many years ago, it was in the fond hope that the prevailing atmosphere in Shirley would be a lot healthier than that found in Camberwell. Some hopes! Now the Labour council is just seeking to impose more fumes and a less healthy way of life upon us! I object!

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this, this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I wish to protest vehemently about your plans to destroy Shirley which is a village by building hundred of homes and setting up a Gypsy and Traveller site. You will destroy the Green Belt and increase the traffic in the area thus polluting the environment and the air we breathe.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Steve Westray

Object

DM31 (Table 11.2)

Setting of the Shirley Local Centre

The focussed intensification associated with the gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the Shirley local centre. The idea that new development located in these areas, including local residential roads, could be significantly larger than existing buildings of up to four storeys is totally out of keeping with the area and would fundamentally change the character of Shirley. Such a significant change is disrespectful to existing residents who have chosen to live, contribute and build a strong local community in an established residential suburban area.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. To achieve this designation will be amended so that it applies to the buildings along Wickham Road and Shirley Road (combining the area with that of Shirley Shopping Parade), key corner plots and excludes the majority of residential streets away from the main roads. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
0203/03/03/M31.1/C Mr Charles King
East Coulsdon Residents' Associat
Comment
DM31.1
House extensions should not be allowed to extend up to property boundaries, because as mentioned above this can rapidly change the street scene by changing roads of semi-detached properties into roads of continuous terraced houses. It can also cause problems to existing wild life particularly in areas like Coulsdon.

No change
Gradual renewal of housing stock is led by individual developers. Policy 31.1 in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework will guide design solutions. Spacing between buildings is an integral component of many local character types and therefore will be protected in relevant areas. Detailed information about particular local character types is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages supporting the Croydon Local Plan.

0203/03/03/M31.1/C Mr Charles King
East Coulsdon Residents' Associat
Comment
DM31.1
Housing Renewal: We support the demolition of old life expired large properties and their replacement with a greater number of smaller houses, apartments and flats on the same site provided that this does not lead to overcrowding. We believe this is more desirable than turning large unsuitable properties into multiple occupation. We are opposed to the replacement of existing good quality property that is not life expired and still suitable for occupation as this can radically alter the existing street scene.

No change
Gradual renewal of housing stock is led by individual developers. Policy 31.1 in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework will guide design solutions. The principle of converting larger properties into smaller dwellings is supported by the plan due to relatively low impact of such transformations on existing character of the area.

2199/01/008/M31.1/O August & Wendy Kolster
Object
DM31.1
5. “Intensification”
We are of course aware that there is pressure to build more housing but we believe that at this point in time this can for the most part only be done at the expense of the current living environment. Cramming ever more smaller houses or apartments into small plots of land with completely insufficient car parking facilities cannot be a vision for a good quality of life.

Surely it must be recognised that at some point the borough is effectively “saturated” and that further development will be very detrimental to the quality of life in the borough. We believe that this point has now pretty much been reached.

No change
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Gradual renewal of housing stock is led by individual developers. Policy 31.1 in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework will guide design solutions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - DM31.2</th>
<th>DM31.1</th>
<th>Insufficient protection has been to the character of Shirley in respect of its separation of buildings and length of gardens and scale and proportions of homes, including the ratio of sizes of windows to walls.</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>This is covered by general policies about urban design and local character with reference to the Borough Character Appraisal.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2842/01/005/DM31.1/O</td>
<td>Cllr Richard Chatterjee</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM31.1</td>
<td>Insufficient protection has been to the character of Shirley in respect of its separation of buildings and length of gardens and scale and proportions of homes, including the ratio of sizes of windows to walls.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3754/01/007/DM31.1/O</td>
<td>Myra Rand</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM31.1</td>
<td>Insufficient protection has been to the character of Shirley in respect of its separation of buildings and length of gardens and scale and proportions of homes, including the ratio of sizes of windows to walls.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926/01/020/DM31.2/O</td>
<td>Councillor Luke Clancy</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM31.2</td>
<td>Policy DM31.2: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it only applies to areas where there is already a predominance of three storey buildings or at least a mixed character.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1993/01/01/DM31.2/G Graham & Kate Marsden Object Soundness - Justified DM31.2 Object most strongly where these proposals will fundamentally damage the nature of the designated area in Shirley. It is difficult to see how para 11.16 and 11.12 are compatible.

No change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The policy encourages the height of minimum three storeys to impose more efficient use of valuable land in the context of general shortage of developable plots. In case of existing housing stock, the predominant height of single family dwellings in the borough is two storeys plus pitched roof. Roof extensions are one of the most common ways residents increase their living space, by effectively adding one storey. The policy makes clear that such an increase in height would be acceptable, subject to design.

2056/01/008/DM31.2/D Councillor Dudley Mead London Borough of Croydon Object DM31.2 Policy DM31.2: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it only applies to areas where there is already a predominance of three storey buildings or at least a mixed character. There should not be a blanket policy to allow three storey development across the borough, as it will destroy the existing character of the 16 places

No change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The policy encourages the height of minimum three storeys to impose more efficient use of valuable land in the context of general shortage of developable plots. In case of existing housing stock, the predominant height of single family dwellings in the borough is two storeys plus pitched roof. Roof extensions are one of the most common ways residents increase their living space, by effectively adding one storey. The policy makes clear that such an increase in height would be acceptable, subject to design.
Object Soundness - Justified DM31.2

There should not be a blanket policy to allow three storey development across the borough, as it will destroy the existing character of the 16 places.

Policy DM31.2: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it only applies to areas where there is already a predominance of three storey buildings or at least a mixed character.

No change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The policy encourages the height of minimum three storeys to impose more efficient use of valuable land in the context of general shortage of developable plots. In case of existing housing stock, the predominant height of single family dwellings in the borough is two storeys plus pitched roof. Roof extensions are one of the most common ways residents increase their living space, by effectively adding one storey. The policy makes clear that such an increase in height would be acceptable, subject to design.
Cllr Steve O'Connell AM

Object DM31.2

Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it only applies to areas where there is already a predominance of three storey buildings or at least a mixed character. There should not be a blanket policy to allow three storey development across the borough, as it will destroy the existing character of the 16 places.

There should not be a blanket policy to allow three storey development across the borough.

No change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The policy encourages the height of minimum three storeys to impose more efficient use of valuable land in the context of general shortage of developable plots. In case of existing housing stock, the predominant height of single family dwellings in the borough is two storeys plus pitched roof. Roof extensions are one of the most common ways residents increase their living space, by effectively adding one storey. The policy makes clear that such an increase in height would be acceptable, subject to design.

Miss Vanessa Garner
Network Rail Infrastructure Limited

Object DM31.2

DM31.2 states that ‘The Council encourages the increase of height to 3 storeys of developments across the borough, subject to high quality design, other policies’ compliance and cumulative impact on community and transport infrastructure.’ It is not clear where the justification is for a 3 storey restriction. Height should be assessed on a site by site basis, as set out elsewhere in the policy document.

No change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The policy encourages the height of minimum three storeys to impose more efficient use of valuable land in the context of general shortage of developable plots. In case of existing housing stock, the predominant height of single family dwellings in the borough is two storeys plus pitched roof. Roof extensions are one of the most common ways residents increase their living space, by effectively adding one storey. The policy makes clear that such an increase in height would be acceptable, subject to design.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>2448/01/020/DM31.2/O</td>
<td>Andy Stranack Croydon Council</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM31.2</td>
<td>Policy DM31.2: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it only applies to areas where there is already a predominance of three storey buildings or at least a mixed character. No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>2635/01/012/DM31.2/O</td>
<td>Paul Sandford Bourne Society</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM31.2</td>
<td>Policy DM31.2: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it only applies to areas where there is already a predominance of three storey buildings or at least a mixed character. There should not be a blanket policy to allow three storey development across the borough, as it will destroy the existing character of the 16 places.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object: Soundness - Justified

DM31.2

There should not be a blanket policy to allow three storey development across the borough, as it will destroy the existing character of the 16 places. Policy DM31.2: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it only applies to areas where there is already a predominance of three storey buildings or at least a mixed character.

No change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The policy encourages the height of minimum three storeys to impose more efficient use of valuable land in the context of general shortage of developable plots. In case of existing housing stock, the predominant height of single family dwellings in the borough is two storeys plus pitched roof. Roof extensions are one of the most common ways residents increase their living space, by effectively adding one storey. The policy makes clear that such an increase in height would be acceptable, subject to design...
Object Soundness - Justified DM31.2

There should not be a blanket policy to allow three storey development across the borough, as it will destroy the existing character of the 16 places.

Policy DM31.2: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it only applies to areas where there is already a predominance of three storey buildings or at least a mixed character.

No change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The policy encourages the height of minimum three storeys to impose more efficient use of valuable land in the context of general shortage of developable plots. In case of existing housing stock, the predominant height of single family dwellings in the borough is two storeys plus pitched roof. Roof extensions are one of the most common ways residents increase their living space, by effectively adding one storey. The policy makes clear that such an increase in height would be acceptable, subject to design.
Policy DM31.2: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it only applies to areas where there is already a predominance of three storey buildings or at least a mixed character. There should not be a blanket policy to allow three storey development across the borough, as it will destroy the existing character of the 16 places.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The policy encourages the height of minimum three storeys to impose more efficient use of valuable land in the context of general shortage of developable plots. In case of existing housing stock, the predominant height of single family dwellings in the borough is two storeys plus pitched roof. Roof extensions are one of the most common ways residents increase their living space, by effectively adding one storey. The policy makes clear that such an increase in height would be acceptable, subject to design.
There should not be a blanket policy to allow three storey development across the borough, as it will destroy the existing character of the 16 places.

Policy DM31.2: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it only applies to areas where there is already a predominance of three storey buildings or at least a mixed character.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The policy encourages the height of minimum three storeys to impose more efficient use of valuable land in the context of general shortage of developable plots. In case of existing housing stock, the predominant height of single family dwellings in the borough is two storeys plus pitched roof. Roof extensions are one of the most common ways residents increase their living space, by effectively adding one storey. The policy makes clear that such an increase in height would be acceptable, subject to design.
Policy DM31.2: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it only applies to areas where there is already a predominance of three storey buildings or at least a mixed character. There should not be a blanket policy to allow three storey development across the borough, as it will destroy the existing character of the 16 places.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The policy encourages the height of minimum three storeys to impose more efficient use of valuable land in the context of general shortage of developable plots. In case of existing housing stock, the predominant height of single family dwellings in the borough is two storeys plus pitched roof. Roof extensions are one of the most common ways residents increase their living space, by effectively adding one storey. The policy makes clear that such an increase in height would be acceptable, subject to design.
Policy DM31.2: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it only applies to areas where there is already a predominance of three storey buildings or at least a mixed character. There should not be a blanket policy to allow three storey development across the borough, as it will destroy the existing character of the 16 places.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The policy encourages the height of minimum three storeys to impose more efficient use of valuable land in the context of general shortage of developable plots. In case of existing housing stock, the predominant height of single family dwellings in the borough is two storeys plus pitched roof. Roof extensions are one of the most common ways residents increase their living space, by effectively adding one storey. The policy makes clear that such an increase in height would be acceptable, subject to design.
In Policy DM31.4 (page 126 – CLP2) some parts of Kenley, Purley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for "intensification" or in other words allow more building. This will change the character of these areas and we object. These areas should not be identified as being suitable for intensification.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I appeal to you to fully document all of the proposed sites for “Intensification” (DM31.4) and explain why they have been selected when other areas (e.g. London Rd, Portland Rd, Lodge Lane & Parkway) have not been included. Where are the plans for the reconstruction of sites damaged in the Riots? For example fig 7.2 on page 88 of Preferred and Alternative Options and fig 7.12 on page 108 make no mention of the proposed areas of “Intensification” that were included on the display screens at public meetings.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Addiscombe Residents Association

Object

We are aware of the difficulties the residents have had in the area between Canning Road and Cherry Orchard Road and Lower Addiscombe and Addiscombe Road. This area has been neglected in the past. The owners of the properties have been discouraged maintain their properties possibly because of uncertainty, waiting for the grand plans around East Croydon to materialise - this has been the case for more than 20 years. The area is predominantly small homes, semi detached and some detached. Same will happen in DM31.4 if it is approved and it should not be under any circumstances.

Object against approval of DM31.4 due to detrimental impact on surrounding smaller scale areas.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object DM31.4

We are opposed to the replacement of existing good quality property that is not life expired and still suitable for occupation as this can radically alter the existing street scene.

Properties in good condition should not be replaced.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
We support the demolition of old life expired large properties and their replacement with a greater number of smaller houses, apartments and flats on the same site provided that this does not lead to overcrowding. We believe this is more desirable than turning large unsuitable properties into multiple occupation.

Older larger properties should be demolished and replaced with a greater density of development.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
In Policy DM31.4 (p.126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for “intensification” which is a euphemism for more building. This will change the character of those areas and should be opposed.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I totally disagree to the following planning applications which would spoil the character of our local environment and threaten our green belt. I choose to live in an area that is peaceful and quiet and resent the changes that are being forced upon me. In the spirit of true democracy I wish to make clear my objection to the following developments –

Policy DM2 (p18); Policy DM40.1 (p165); Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168); Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, Site 61 (p171); Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, Site 61 (p179); Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, Site 61 (p179); Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, Site 61 (p179); Policy DM35, Table 11.8, Site 945 (p146); and Policy DM31.4 (p126).
Its treatment of areas in Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon should be treated with respect and not allowed to be crammed with more development. The character of these areas should be protected and not exploited.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon’s local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgmount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development into selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
More Protection; Less “Intensification”

In Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for “intensification” – which is a euphemism for more building. This will change the character of those areas for the worse not better and should not be approved.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
In Policy DM31.4 (p.126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for “intensification” – which is a euphemism for more building. This will change the character of those areas and should be opposed.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am concerned about the proposals in DM31.4 regarding certain areas losing the current Local Area of Special Heritage status and not being reclassified as a Local Heritage Area. The plan mentions 'intensification' which seems to suggest increased building. This would undoubtedly change the character of these areas so I wish to register my objection to these proposals.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
In Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for “intensification” – which is a euphemism for more building. This will change the character of these areas significantly and should not take place.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.

In meeting this increased housing target TfL would welcome further discussions with the council about how development could be intensified around current and future transport links and nodes, for example plans to expand and increase capacity of the tram network could provide an opportunity for higher density or potential change of use or changes to the mixture of uses. TfL would be pleased to discuss this further with the council.

The Council should explore how development could be intensified around current and future transport links and nodes.

The Council would welcome discussions with TfL about how development could be intensified around current and future transport links and nodes.
The loss of Local Area of Special Character protection for West Hill, Dorkton Road, Campden Road and Spencer Road, as they are heritage assets that deserve protection as a Local Heritage Area under Policy SP4.13.

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries:

Kenley and Old Coulsdon, page 163, Godstone Road, Hayes Lane upto Kenley Lane and Station Road;
Sanderstead, page 164, Limpfield Road from the roundabout at Sanderstead Hill to Rolling Hill and Cranleigh Close;
Selsdon, page 165, Selsdon Park Road from Farnborough Avenue to the roundabout at Kent Gate Way and Holmbury Grove;
Shirley, page 166, Shirley Road from Shirley Avenue to the BP Service Station and a further zone on Wickham Road from Verdayne Avenue to Cheston Avenue;
South Croydon, page 167, Brighton Road from Napier Road to Kingsdown Avenue.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon’s local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4 - I believe that parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon should not be earmarked for "intensification", thus changing the character of areas I have lived in for all my life.

The Loss of Local Area of Special Character protection, such as West Hill, Campden and Spencer Roads, the Woodcote Estate and Hartley Farm will encourage developers to create buildings which are not in character with the areas.

Oakwood Avenue, Purley should be included as a new Local Heritage Area.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The loss of Local Area of Special Character protection for West Hill, Dorrton Road, Campden Road and Spencer Road, as they are heritage assets that deserve protection as a Local Heritage Area under Policy SP4.13

Change
Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Specifically from a Kenley viewpoint I am concerned at DM31.4 in that I feel that there is a poor definition for the zone for focussed intensification. The definition of focussed intensification needs to be improved.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
This will have a deleterious effect on the character of residential roads adjacent to Shirley Library due to the loss of Local Area of Special Character protection for many roads (West Hill, Campden & Spencer Road, the Woodcote Estate and Hartley Farm) leading to inappropriate development. Of concern is the earmarking of some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon for ‘Intensification’ i.e. more building. These areas should not lose their protection and Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon should not be identified as areas for intensification.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163-167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries:

Kenley and Old Coulsdon, page 163, Godstone Road, Hayes Lane upto Kenley Lane and Station Road;
Sanderstead, page 164, Limpfield Road from the roundabout at Sanderstead Hill to Roling Hill and Cranleigh Close;
Selsdon, page 165, Selsdon Park Road from Farnborough Avenue to the roundabout at Kent Gate Way and Holmbury Grove;
Shirley, page 166, Shirley Road from Shirley Avenue to the BP Service Station and a further zone on Wickham Road from Verdayne Avenue to Cheston Avenue;
South Croydon, page 167, Brighton Road from Napier Road to Kingsdown Avenue.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am writing to object to the following:  
2 Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of areas local character under Policy DM31.4 of Forestdale

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Blighting the area with focused intensification would not enhance the area.

Building low rise flats would be an echo of the 60s would destroy prime residential sites.

This is poor planning and would be a travesty for Shirley and there will be mass opposition.

The preferred approach is ill thought out and the Council should not just wade in and change things.

Development cannot be sustainable if the areas are changed for the worst and the more flats the more exploitation and overcrowding and misery for all involved.

what does Large buildings with strong frontages and spaces actually mean?

Shirley should not end up like Central Croydon and be an eyesore.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed Neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and Neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am writing to strongly object to:
2. Focused intensification associated with gradual change of areas local character under policy DM31.4 of Forestdale.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object DM31.4 I am writing to strongly object to:
5. Policy DM32 to development of large and tall buildings.

Change
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre;

To take away the semi-detached houses from these areas and put in medium height blocks of flats would take away the character of the local area which is the reason Shirley is a sought after area to live and would again, increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
If high density residential accommodation were provided there would be insufficient area for communal open space allocation. The intensification would result in insufficient communal open space.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focused Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object DM31.4: The local road network and width could not cope with the high residential density proposal and the likely car ownership and on-street parking. Higher density development should not be supported in this area due to the impact on the local road network.

Change:

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
If these proposals were to become the Croydon Plan adopted policy, it would place planning blight on all properties as defined in DM31.4, until the year 2036. Higher density developments should not be permitted in these areas due to the impact on existing properties.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM31.4</td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre;

To take away the semi-detached houses from these areas and put in medium height blocks of flats would take away the character of the local area which is the reason Shirley is a sought after area to live and would again, increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.
The level of growth depends on existing local character. The capacity for natural evolution is dependent upon the local character typology. The new development should not adversely impact on the predominant character. I cannot understand how this statement is compatible with Note 11.16. Is the Council proposing that semi-detached houses in my area should be replaced by medium-rise blocks. Totally unacceptable!

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre;

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The areas in Shirley should not be zones for intensification as this type of development would be totally out of keeping with the character of the area.

Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I strongly object to your policies.

Local shopping parades are empty due to draconian parking charges. Whitgift and Centrale are empty. Office Blocks empty.

The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity.

Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Any development should be sympathetic to the existing area. Medium to high density developments would intrinsically change a well established residential area. As above, the impact on local transport would be unacceptable. Devonshire Way and Hartland Way are already used as a means to avoid Wickham Road and residents are often severely compromised, unable to leave their own driveways at peak times because of the heavy flow of traffic. This would impact way beyond the local area, causing further congestion at the Shirley Library traffic lights, leading to Elmers End, West Wickham and beyond.

Any development should be sympathetic to the existing area - medium to high density development would have unacceptable impact on the local character and local transport.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
We are aware of the difficulties the residents have had in the area between Canning Road and Cherry Orchard Road and Lower Addiscombe and Addiscombe Road. This area has been neglected in the past. The owners of the properties have been discouraged to maintain their properties possibly because of uncertainty, waiting for the grand plans around East Croydon to materialise; this has been the case for more than 20 years. The area is predominantly small homes, semi-detached and some detached. Same will happen in DM31.4 if it is approved and it should not be under any circumstances.

The area should not be identified as being suitable for intensification.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon’s local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification. The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries: Kenley and Old Coulsdon, page 163, Godstone Road, Hayes Lane up to Kenley Lane and Station Road; Sanderstead, page 164, Limpsfield Road from the roundabout at Sanderstead Hill to Riding Hill and Cranleigh Close; Selsdon, page 165, Selsdon Park Road from Farborough Avenue to the roundabout at Kent Gate Way and Hornbury Grove; Shirley, page 166, Shirley Road from Shirley Avenue to the BP Service Station and a further zone on Wickham Road from Verdayne Avenue to Cheston Avenue; South Croydon, page 167, Brighton Road from Napier Road to Kingsdown Avenue.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
To comment properly on policy DM31.4 we need clarity in terms of its practical implications with respect to planning. One assumes it means more of the same, but the ‘scale’ can be increased. Logically, the scale here would mean a given building can occupy more of the available curtilage or potentially have 1 or 2 more floors. But is there more to this? What level of character change under DM31.4 is deemed acceptable?

In the absence of any clarity we ask that DM31.4 be removed from the Croydon Local Plan.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: why would our own council even seek to "change (an) area's local character?" This makes any particular area desirable - or otherwise! Indeed, the very reason my wife and I chose to move into Shirley was its historic ambience and village atmosphere, the shopping parade reflecting its admirable past. Our art-deco style library epitomises Shirley and what Shirley is. Change this and you will destroy the environment we chose to pay a premium for.

Change Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
We are writing to object to DM31.4: focused intensification associated with the gradual change of area’s local character of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley Local Centre.

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre;

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The areas in Shirley should not be zoned for intensification as this type of development would be totally out of keeping with the character of the area.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres.

The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
DM31.4 some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for “intensification” and specifically the loss of Local Area of Special Character protection for many roads such as West Hill, Campden and Spencer Roads, the Woodcote Estates and Hartley Farm will open these roads up to inappropriate development. Rather than a relaxation roads in Purley such as Oakwood Avenue and Selcroft Road should also be included as new Local Heritage Areas to prevent the change of character in these areas and erosion of green spaces.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
This will result in the loss of character to areas which were designed to allow for street scenes with greenery and open areas and a semi rural feel. Its removal will result in more loss of character as so well demonstrated in Pampisford Road which in some 20 years has changed from detached and semi-detached early 20th century dwelling houses to mass over development of small bland design houses often of some 50 sq m to 60 sq m usable floor area and numerous block of flats.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focused Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The main Forestdale residential estate is already compact with essential landscaping. With limited scope for extensions or conversions without altering the character of the estate. I say this as a previous resident and with relatives still living on the estate.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
In Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for “intensification” – which is a euphemism for more building. This will change the character of those areas and should be opposed.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 - 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries:

- Kenley and Old Coulsdon, page 163, Godstone Road, Hayes Lane up to Kenley Lane and Station Road;
- Sanderstead, page 164, Limpfield Road from the roundabout at Sanderstead Hill to Riding Hill and Cranleigh Close;
- Selsdon, page 165, Selsdon Park Road from Farnborough Avenue to the roundabout at Kent Gate Way and Holmbury Grove;
- Shirley, page 166, Shirley Road from Shirley Avenue to the BP Service Station and a further zone on Wickham Road from Verdayne Avenue to Cheston Avenue;
- South Croydon, page 167, Brighton Road from Napier Road to Kingsdown Avenue.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
THERE ARE NUMEROUS BROWNFIELD SITES IN THE BOROUGH THAT CAN BE BUILT UPON TO SOLVE THE HOUSING CRISES. STOP THE POLITICS OF ENVY. THERE IS A CONNECTION BETWEEN MENTAL ILLNESS AND GREEN SPACES. EVERYONE NEEDS GREEN SPACE FOR GENERAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING. OPEN SPACES MUST BE RETAINED WITH MINIMUM OF BUILDING.

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Do you think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3? - No it remains to be seen if objections are taken into account. Do you think that the preferred approach is deliverable? - No the onus for this is on the council. Is it sustainable? See response below. Why are you changing the `Local Area of Special Character` protection to some areas of South Croydon? Do you plan to demolish all the properties in the area to facilitate less acceptable property building? The whole policy proposal suggests envy and destruction of the one area in Croydon which can claim to be a credit to the council in its pursuit of city status.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object DM31.4

I am writing regarding the proposed redevelopment plans affecting Forestdale in South Croydon, which I understand are to be shortly debated by the Croydon Council. I am unclear exactly how much public consultation has been conducted beforehand in order to sound out residents concerns however if the impact is so far reaching then I believe it would only be right and proper that local residents’ views are kept paramount before any final decision is arrived at. The plans may well have a detrimental effect on the neighbourhood and negatively alter the character of the area.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focused Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Hartland Way is recognised locally as a rat run and with cars parked on the side of the road becomes congested at busy times of the day which would obviously be made much worse if there is an increase in housing. This road also suffers several burst water mains a year which adds to the traffic and parking problems. The Title Deeds of the properties targeted state that the site should not be used for any purpose other than a private dwelling or professional office. The proposals under this policy will completely change this area’s character which is not pleasing to local residents. The A215 from Camberwell to Shirley Road Croydon was named as having 9.5 miles of traffic congestion and delays.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object

I also object to the draft plan DM31.4. I live on Forestdale. It is already a crowded area with little room for car parking. If the Council intensify the density of the buildings the traffic problems will increase accordingly. Please use your head and let us keep one part of the borough as pleasant as possible.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
In Policy DM31.4 (p.126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for “intensification” which is a euphemism for more building. This will change the character of those areas beyond all recognition and I am strongly opposed to any of it.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Facilities are already stretched across the borough, intensification in quite residential areas is not the answer and these areas should remain as they are.

Change Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I have to say No No No to any more loss of green spaces around Croydon.

In an already crowded and busy borough we need fields, open spaces, trees, gardens, parks and fresh air to be able to allow future generations to live, breathe and enjoy some freedom to relax, walk and enjoy nature, sunshine and space. Life is not just about having somewhere to live or work or go to school. Living in small flats and houses with little or no garden working in high rise blocks in a crowded town where little sun will even shine through the windows is not beneficial to the populations health and well being.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I wish to add my objections made on this document by our local M.P. Chris Philp.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object

DM31.4

I am writing to object to the following: Policy DM31.4 re Forestdale (focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character)

Forestdale consists of mainly terraced houses and low blocks of flats and is already densely populated. To introduce, gradually or otherwise, medium rise blocks of flats or large buildings would not only change the character of the area in an unacceptable way but also put unbearable pressure on parking and local facilities.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.

Change
I am writing to object to:
In Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for "intensification", in other words, more building, and this will change the character of those areas.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I would like to register my objection to DM31.4 (possible intensification of certain areas)

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am a resident of Hartley Farm in Purley, and am very concerned that the removal of its classification of an area of special protection (as in other local areas) could lead to more buildings being accepted and thus losing the current proportion of houses to area of land which maintains the character and history of the original farm and Hartley area.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
5. Policy DM31.4

Focusing on 2 areas for "focused intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character" Replacing smaller buildings with larger ones. This would completely change the character of the area and I object.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Fourth, and most important to me as I live in this part of Shirley, the draft Local Plan identifies two other areas of Shirley as locations the Council wants to ruin. The Plan states - “New development located in designated areas would be significantly larger than existing and may be associated with merging smaller properties. The promoted character types are: Medium-rise blocks with associated grounds”, “Large buildings with spacing” and “Large buildings with strong frontages”. Their gradual introduction will alter over time the predominant character of intensified areas”.

The two areas are the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the Shirley local centre. This includes not just the Wickham Road itself, but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. There is already way too much traffic around these roads. I moved to Hartland Way specifically in Shirley as it was one of the quieter roads. Now its probably the busiest road. It used to only be busy in rush hour for literally, an hour, now from before 7am to gone 10am and again from 4.00pm to gone 7.00pm it has hundreds of cars cutting through. There are speed bumps on Hartland Way but these do nothing to slow the majority of drivers down. They seem to see it as an acceleration tool! There is one guy on a moped that stands on the pegs to get greater acceleration and must do in excess of 60mph. I have been thinking of starting a petition for years to get either the speed limit lowered, new speed bumps or even suggesting that the road is made one way. Something is needed, whatever reduces traffic the most. When I first moved in, children used to play on the pavements. Always supervised of course, but they did play. Now you never see a child. I purposely don’t let my cats out till gone 9.30am at the earliest in the hope the traffic has decreased somewhat. You can tell you are in Shirley by the house style, it’s a beautiful part of Croydon and South Shirley is the place to live. Ask any estate agent in the area. They are chomping at the bit to get your home if you live on any of the roads mentioned above. The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley plus add to the already hazardous traffic problem and I am objecting to it very
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM31.4</td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equally concerning, the draft Plan identifies Forestdale as a location where the Council wants to see "focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character" under Policy DM31.4. "New development located in designated areas would be significantly larger than existing and may be associated with merging smaller properties. The promoted character types are: 'Medium-rise blocks with associated grounds', 'Large buildings with spaciousness' and 'Large buildings with strong frontages'. Their gradual introduction will alter over time the predominant character of intensified areas". The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area and I am objecting to it very strongly.
please note my objection to the following policy reference numbers within your current draft plan for planning & development:

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Focussed intensification associated with enhancement of area’s local character. Area identified as Shirley Local Centre around Shirley Library including Wilmsham Avenue and Ridgemount Avenue. DM43.1 states: ‘Within Shirley Local Centre, to retain the unique qualities development should...’ However, 11.16 states: ‘New development located in designated areas would be significantly larger than existing and may be associated with merging smaller properties. The promoted character types are: ‘medium-rise blocks with associated grounds’, ‘large buildings with spacing’ and ‘large buildings with strong frontages’. Their gradual introduction will alter over time the predominant character of intensified areas’. The objectives of DM43.1 and 11.6 cannot be achieved together. The proposed developments in this location would be out of character, unacceptable and destroy the areas unique qualities which you say you wish to retain. How can medium or large 4 story high density blocks complement the existing buildings? They would be overpowered and would completely change the character of Shirley. The preferred approach is not acceptable. Future generations will not thank you for high residential density in this area where current infrastructure cannot cope. This proposal is unachievable, unsustainable and should be abandoned.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon’s local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I object to DM31.4 regarding Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals in regards to Shirley Road Parade & The Shirley Local Centre. The residential area of Wickham Road, Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, The northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Davonshire Way. Should not in any way be changed. The idea that these houses be replaced by medium rise blocks is unacceptable and would change the character of Shirley. The council appears to be going mad.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon's local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I would like to object to parts of the recent Croydon Local Plan with particular reference to the following proposals, as they all will lead to degradation of the natural environment:

DM2 Infill building on existing gardens
DM44.2 Table 11.17 site 661 Loss of Green belt (it's there for a reason)! There must be more suitable site
DM44.2 Table 11.17 site 662 Loss of Green belt
DM31.4 Reclassification of areas of special interest

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
the draft Plan identifies Forestdale as a location where the Council wants to see "focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character" under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals).

It goes on to describe what this means: "New development located in designated areas would be significantly larger than existing and may be associated with merging smaller properties. The promoted character types are: 'Medium-rise blocks with associated grounds', 'Large buildings with spacing' and 'Large buildings with strong frontages'. Their gradual introduction will alter over time the predominant character of intensified areas" (page 132, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals).

The idea that the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of the area and I object to it very strongly.

Change Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I AM AGAINST MORE INTENSIFICATION, WHICH IS ANOTHER NAME FOR HOUSE CRAMMING IN OUR BOROUGH. It will change the character of our district. It will put more cars on the road, take away our green spaces - our lungs - thus reducing the air quality. Put pressure on our hospitals and doctors.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am writing to support my local MP Chris Phipp in his objections.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I object to the proposal to change an area's local character by introducing medium-rise blocks amongst normal residential housing. Policy DM31.4.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon's local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I recently purchased number 39 crofters mead with my fiancé back in December 2014, after much deliberation as we were looking to start a family and invest our life savings in to a home. We chose Forestdale for its open spaces and quite neighbourhood, Low crime rates and pleasant surroundings, with largely professional neighbours. I'm extremely angry at the proposals for developments of large scale flats and a traveller sight. I'm extremely angry that Croydon council have not notified the residence of Forestdale aiming to get the development in through the back door. I have only been made aware of the proposal because members of our management team have notified us (8/12/2015) with the deadline being the 18th of December, giving me just 10 days to make this objection. I will also be writing to my MP, The Croydon Advertiser and fellow Forestdale residence. The house we bought was sold on information by the owner (A member of the estate management team) that the gardens were small due to the amount of open space of the surrounding areas. The proposed developments and traveller sight would greatly affect this (it’s my understanding that the traveller sight would effectively be at the bottom of my Garden). Changing the views and greatly impacting on the sense of privacy and claustrophobias. Had I known about this we wouldn’t have purchased the house. I also currently Pay an additional of £39 per month to the management team of our Estate for the upkeep of the natural surroundings and would like to keep it that way.

- The proposed developments would greatly infringe on my personal privacy.
- Would greatly affect area’s local character.
- The proposal would put a strain on local infrastructure, impact our school catchment, GP services and public transport. This is and was a key reason why we made the purchase. Croydon council is assuming without evidence based data that less cars would be used which is incorrect.
- Increase parking of residence cars and work vans that are already parallel parked in the surrounding areas of the proposed developments.
- Busier roads will lead to increase risks of injuries/death to children and animals and adults.
- The increased volumes of traffic on the all roads in the surrounding area (roads leading in and away from the area are already congested).
- The additional volume of people would lead to an increase in noise.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of focussed intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
crime and litter (recent articles in newspapers have shown a significant drop in crime when travellers have been removed from their place of address. (Luke salkeld the daily mail June 25th 2009 reports removal of one traveller family reduced crime rate in county to a 20 year low) to name one.

The council acknowledges that the Pear tree farm and cottage is green belt land Policy E of planning policy for traveller sights, published by the government in August says very clearly ""Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the green belt are an inappropriate development. Their fore Croydon council is in breach of that policy. If the council requires an immoral traveller sight then it should look at expansion of existing sights like off the Purley way.
The loss of Local Area of Special Character protection for many areas is a step backward for preserving the character of the area. More housing is of course a requirement the council is obliged to provide. Intensification at the expense of amenity for local residence is not the answer. I implore the council to think again about over crowding Kenley as it is already verging on the ridiculous. The area is already overcrowded and under resourced as it is. Recycling areas near Purley station have become flats already. The current recycling scheme with fortnightly collections is a shambles that causes more litter on the street than seems to end up in the collection vehicle. This is the tip of the iceberg and the area will only degenerate further with more intensification.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity.

Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
With reference to the Local Plan which has been proposed, please note my objection to the following policies:

- Garden Grabbing
- Policy DM2
- Purley Skyscraper authorisation
- Policy DM40.1
- Purley Pool
- Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30
- Purley Parking
- Policy 40.4, Table 11.3,
- Sanderstead “Lidl” Site
- Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306
- Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane, next to Coombe Wood Gardens
- Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661
- Loss of Green Belt – (1) Coombe Playing Fields, (2) Croham Hurst, (3) Sanderstead Plantation
- The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662
- Lack of Parking in new developments
- Policy DM28
- More Protection; Less “Intensification”
- Policy DM31.4

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon’s local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Richard Brandwood

Object DM31.4

There should be NO “intensification” - use, and encourage use of brown sites.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object DM31.4 I would like to object.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am writing to object: Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of the area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of Forestdale. Forestdale is a mature area of low density housing which backs onto several green areas, and to transplant large buildings and medium rise blocks into this would completely change the character of the area. I understand that this is the intention, but please can you explain why you believe that it would be improved by converting it from an community of small terraces and low rise flats to an estate of 'medium rise blocks' and 'large buildings with strong frontages'?

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Where intensification of existing land use is to occur, I would argue that strong and specific regulations be adopted regarding the size and in particular the height of the replacement structures. What does 'medium height' mean?

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object

I object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgmount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
the Forestdale estate is a well-established residential area and replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats by medium-rise blocks would be detrimental and unacceptable, c.f. Policy DM31.4.

No change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Furthermore, the Forestdale estate is a well-established residential area and replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats by medium-rise blocks would be detrimental and unacceptable, c.f. Policy DM31.4.

Change: Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I object to the proposal to change an area’s local character by introducing medium rise blocks amongst normal residential housing, Policy DM31.4.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am writing to object to:
5. Focused intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
In Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for "intensification". As mentioned earlier, this area of Croydon is at the start of a less intensively populated and more green area, the graduation of building leading to the green belt. This planned change of character of those areas is not in the interests of Croydon residents since it will put more pressure on the greenbelt. And development should be on brown field sites and not at the expense of the areas character.

No change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I object to Shirley Road Shopping Parade & Shirley local centre - why do we need to change these areas and character? - Policy DM31.4

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
As a local affected resident, I am registering my comments and objections to the proposals as documented in the Croydon Local Plans CLP1.1 and CLP2.

1 Proposed Policy DM31 Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon

Policy DM31.4 sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area’s local character. As this is a new designation it will need to be shown on the Policies Map. Details of each designation are:

- Area of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade - Shirley
- Setting of the Shirley Local Centre - Shirley

I object to the relaxation of the planning regulations to allow the building of significantly larger structures in close proximity to the existing housing stock, comprising mainly bungalows and two storey semi-detached houses in residential roads in the area described as Shirley Local Centre, i.e. around the Shirley Library and the area around the Shirley Road/Shirley Shopping Parade including the Green Triangle and the Trinity School educational open space. The promoted character types of Medium rise blocks with associated grounds; large buildings with spacing; and Large buildings with strong frontages; in this location would look out of character and is unacceptable. These types of developments in the wrong locations would adversely affect the character of Shirley both now and for future generations.

1. In the case of the Shirley Road/Shirley park parade shops, the area behind the shopping parade is a site of Nature Conservation Importance (locally called the Green Triangle) which should be preserved for future generations and the area of Educational Open Space for future Trinity School children.
2. If High density residential accommodation were provided there would be insufficient area for communal open space allocation.
3. The local side road network and width could not cope with high residential density proposals and the likely car ownership and on street parking.
4. If these proposals were to become the Croydon Plan adopted policy, it would place Planning blight on all properties as defined in DM31.4 until the year 2036.

I object to the development plans for Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
the Shirley (Wickham Road) Shopping Parade and the intensification of Wickham Avenue and Ridgemount Avenue. Any expansion should be along the A232 and not affect the existing residential areas including the Shirley Library or the Hartland Way Surgery.

3523/01/01/DM31.4/O Mr Mike Rice

Object

DM31.4

Dear Sirs,

With reference to the recently published ‘Croydon Local Plan’, as a resident of the past 25 years I give my views as follows:-

Policy DM31.4 (p126). Objection- No intensification in these areas. Loss of Local Area of Special Character protection unacceptable.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity. To focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I wish to object to DM31.4. For centuries parks and green spaces have been an important part of urban living where people can walk and relax. It would be a sad day if these open spaces were lost for ever. We have enjoyed open places and do not want to see them lost for future generations when with a bit of imagination brownfield sites could be considered ahead of the green belt. Future generations will not thank us for destroying their heritage, and character of their local community. We are aware of the need for housing but here in Sanderstead we have already seen a lot of development in recent years, and its character slowly being eroded.

Change
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Please think very carefully about ruining an entire area. We who pay Council Tax will be replaced by non-payers. We will move out to East Sussex or Abroad. We cannot sustain the whole world.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object

I object to the draft local plan in two other areas of Shirley as locations where the Council wants to see ‘focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character’ under Policy DM31.4. The idea that largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I will be objecting to it very strongly.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
In Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for “intensification” – which is a euphemism for more building. This will change the character of those areas and is strongly opposed.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
In Policy DM31.4 (p.126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for "intensification" which means more building. This will change the character of those areas and is opposed.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I wish to register my objection in the strongest possible terms to Policy DM 31.4 - the proposal for 'Medium-rise blocks' near Shirley Library amounts to a deliberate plan to change what remains of the village-like character of this area much for the worse in the opinion of almost everyone who lives in this area.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I write to express my extreme objection to those elements of the plan relating to Forestdale, viz DM31.4 - intensification. My husband and I lived on Forestdale for over 25 years, and now let the property to a tenant. When work first brought us to Croydon, Forestdale was the only area where we could afford to buy. It remains an area where property prices have not risen to the extremes of other parts of the borough and thus fulfils a vital part in the housing strategy. Elsewhere your plan identifies the need for 3 bedroom family homes, and this is what Forestdale offers, alongside a well mixed offering of smaller and larger homes and easily accessible flats and apartments. It is already high density, but in a way that does not feel overwhelming. Outside of the green belt, there are no areas remaining undeveloped that would permit the sort of property that your plan describes, and it would surely be counterproductive to demolish what is there and meeting an important need, in order to build something completely of different character. “Large buildings with strong frontages” are completely inappropriate to an area immediately abutting the green belt, and are surely out of step with the buildings in the rest of Selsdon. Nor do they meet the need for 3 bed family homes. I ask that my objection be formally noted, and that this element of the plan be revised to enhance and not destroy what Forestdale currently offers.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mrs J Middleton

Object DM31.4

I object to the focussed intensification associated with the gradual change of an area's local character.

Change Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I would like to put in writing my objections to the following local plans:
I am listing the relevant Policy Numbers:
10.DM31.4 Areas of Special Character

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am unaware that I have missed public meetings or been sent details of these plans as it affects my local area. I think that were you to have had a local referendum as I think you should have done, these proposals would receive practically zero support except possibly by those who stand to gain from it.

My wife and I are longstanding Shirley residents. While I understand the need for more housing, the Croydon plan as it affects Shirley seems extreme in extent and its likely impact on Shirley.

I am especially concerned with policy DM31.4 and the proposed focussed intensification of the Shirley Road Shopping parade and Shirley local centre which is tantamount to the destruction of Shirley as it exists and its replacement by new developments of unknown nature. Apart from the unknown endpoint it is clear that the impact in terms of inconvenience and disruption to local residents would occur over many years during this redevelopment for no benefit to existing residents. It is also not evident why that part of Shirley as opposed to any other reasonably pleasant suburban area in Croydon should have been chosen for ‘intensification’.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Fifth, the draft Local Plan identifies two other areas of Shirley as locations where the Council wants to see "focused intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character" under Policy DM31.4 (page 129, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). It goes on to describe what this means:

"New development located in designated areas would be significantly larger than existing and may be associated with merging smaller properties. The promoted character types are: ‘Medium-rise blocks with associated grounds’, ‘Large buildings with spacing’ and ‘Large buildings with strong frontages’. Their gradual introduction will alter over time the predominant character of intensified areas" (page 132, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals).

The two areas are the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the Shirley local centre (the area around Shirley Library). The former is quite tightly drawn and I therefore don’t object to it, but the latter includes not just the Wickham Road itself but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Davonshire Way (page 166, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals).

The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I object to this very strongly.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object DM31.4

I strongly object to the areas listed being earmarked for 'intensification' as this will dramatically change the character of these areas.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
With reference to the Local Plan which has been proposed, please note my objection to the following policies:

More Protection; Less "Intensification"

Policy DM31.4

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon's local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr Tony Sales

Object DM31.4

I am emailing to record my objection to the following policies within the 'Local Plan':

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure, accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM31.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Protection: Less ‘Intensification’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The loss of Local Area of Special Character protection for many roads such as West Hill, Campden and Spencer Roads, the Woodcote Estate and Hartley Farm will open these roads up to inappropriate development. Roads such as Oakwood Avenue in Purley should also be included as new Local Heritage Areas. In Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sandelstead and South Croydon are earmarked for ‘Intensification’ which is a euphemism for more building. This will change the character of those areas and should be opposed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object DM31.4

Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre;

To take away the semi-detached houses from these areas and put in medium height blocks of flats would take away the character of the local area which is the reason Shirley is a sought after area to live and would again, increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
This suggests that some areas of South Croydon, Sanderstead and Kenley are going to be assigned for "intensification" (in building?) I strongly oppose these changes in way of the proposed areas of consideration. These areas should be protected and remain areas of Special Character.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The loss of Local Area of Special Character protection for many roads such as West Hill, Campden and Spencer Roads, the Woodcote Estate and Hartley Farm will open these roads up to inappropriate development. Roads such as Oakwood Avenue in Purley should also be included as new Local Heritage Areas. In Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for ‘intensification’ which is a euphemism for more building. This will change the character of those areas and should be opposed.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
In Policy DM31.4 (p126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for "intensification". I believe this is a euphemism for more building, which will change the character of those areas and I am opposed to that.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity.

Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object Soundness - Effective DM31.4

Intensification - the areas designated for intensification will lead to pressures to consider inappropriate developments, and the areas will risk becoming undesirable zones, which will suffer from lack of care. The approach towards building additional properties needs to be far more selective and carefully thought-through.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
In Policy DM31.4 (p.126) some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are earmarked for “intensification” – which is a euphemism for more building. This will change the character of those areas and should be opposed.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity.

Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I sincerely hope that my objections will be noted. I have lived in this borough for many many years and I hate seeing it gradually destroyed.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity.

Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Please note I am horrified at all of the following proposed planning proposals Policy No: DM31.4. Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of Forestdale’s local character.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object DM31.4

Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre;

This proposal would completely change the character of the area.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM 31.4 "Intensification" of building in Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon will destroy the nature of these pleasant areas. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am writing to object to:
2. focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of Forestale:

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
We cannot afford more intensification of our area generally. It is a shortsighted policy as the environment cannot cope with largely increased numbers without corresponding improvements in services. Additionally, we need to preserve the character of the area and consider the impact on the environment of too much construction and large numbers of people. Our green spaces are a necessity not a luxury.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Ms E Rudduck

Object

DM31.4

Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre;

To take away the semi-detached houses from these areas and put in medium height blocks of flats would take way the character of the local area which is the reason Shirley is a sought after area to live and would again, increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Object</strong></th>
<th>DM31.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestside, Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgmount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestside with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Change** | Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan. |
More than enough dense development exists, both old and recent, new development must be open and green and to the minimum density, there is already far too much intensification in the borough, consideration should be given to quality of life. We do not want to return to Victorian concepts. Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I object to the focused intensification associated with gradual change of an area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestside. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgmount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestside with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon's local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestside. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgmount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennets Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestside with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mr C Rudduck

Object

DM31.4

Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre;

To take away the semi-detached houses from these areas and put in medium height blocks of flats would take away the character of the local area which is the reason Shirley is a sought after area to live and would again, increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity.

Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object

DM31.4 Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre;

To take away the semi-detached houses from these areas and put in medium height blocks of flats would take away the character of the local area which is the reason Shirley is a sought after area to live and would again, increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am a resident of Shirley and strongly object to the current proposals to build on green belt land on the Shirley Oaks and surrounding areas. There are plenty of brown sites that are unoccupied and could fulfil the purpose of providing new homes. Shirley is already tight for school places. St John's, in Spring Park Road, is increasing to 2 form entry already with the number of children living locally requiring education. The 367 bus serving the Shirley Oaks Village is infrequent and much more transport will be required. Parking is already a nightmare and with the lack of parking contemplated with the new build supply the problem will only get worse. There will be an incredible build up of traffic on the already congested Wickham Road and other local roads.

I believe this proposed building of traveller's sites and homes will change the whole ethos of Shirley and cause resentment and the lowering of living standards. This is a particular area of standard housing and should not be changed by the building of blocks of houses. Garden land should not be built on and this is an inappropriate development and should not be allowed to go ahead. Metropolitan Open Land has the same protection as the Green Belt and the rules should be followed accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Policy Numbers:</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM31.4 DM28 DM2</td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM31.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DM31.4

Mrs R Jennings

Object

Policy DM 31.4 - I oppose “intensification” in these areas, it will change and damage the character of the area.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
We are strongly against the planning ideas you have over green spaces. Please add these six against to planning ideas with references below:

DM40.1
DM2
DM44.2
DM28
DM31.4

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
We are also against the badging of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon for “intensification”. Please protect our town rather than harming it.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am grateful to the Council for consulting on the detailed policies and proposals that will make up the Croydon Local Plan. There is much in the document that I agree with, but some of the proposals would, in my opinion, change the character of parts of Croydon very much for the worse. I hope you will forgive me if I focus on these areas of contention. I am therefore writing to formally object to:

1. de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;
2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   - land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   - land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
   - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.
   
   If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

3. the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:
   - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502;
   - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; and
   - Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 756.
   
   As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site Change.
of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

“Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is);

4. Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too;

5. Policy DM2 on development on garden land, which is too subjective and therefore too weak. There should be a much stronger presumption against development on garden land; and

6. Policy DM28, which should allow higher levels of parking in developments of low public transport accessibility. Restricting parking spaces in such areas doesn’t lead to fewer people owning their own car; it just leads to greater competition for existing spaces.
Object

I object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennets Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgmount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennett Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestside. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgmount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestside with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Given the existing levels of brownfield sites in the area, these should be exhausted before encroaching on areas that would significantly alter the character of the area.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am writing to object to:

DM31.4

More Protection: Less "Intensification". In Policy DM31.4 some parts of Kenley, Sanderstead and South Croydon are designated for "Intensification" meaning more building. This has already happened in some areas which has significantly changed the character of these areas for the worse and therefore any further changes must be opposed.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The loss of Local Area of Special Character protection for West Hill, Dorrington Road, Campden Road, and Spencer Road, as they are heritage assets that deserve protection as a Local Heritage Area under Policy SP4.13.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
DM31.4: I am strongly opposed to your proposal to intensify building in the South borough wards. There is not the health or educational infrastructure to support this and it is important that we are protecting our green spaces.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
DM31.4 (p126) – We object as this will not only change the character of these areas but will lead to inappropriate development.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough.

Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object

I am writing to object to:

1. Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character under Policy DM 31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre.

This policy is lacking in sufficient detail or thought, and actually perpetuates the poorly planned and thought out development that the Croydon Local Plan refers to, which it seeks to avoid.

The idea that largely semi-detached buildings in the residential roads surrounding Shirley library should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is entirely unsuitable, and wholly unacceptable.

This policy would completely change the character of Shirley for the worse (not better), with particular and direct effect on those residential streets encompassed by the suggested policy on the south side of Shirley that sit off/beside the main Wickham Road and library.

Adopting such a policy would also significantly devalue and detract from Shirley as a whole, and would have negative consequences in respect of the existing residential properties surrounding any such development that would remain. It is also likely to result in at least a perceived element of blight if pursued.

The policy does not indicate a respect for the local area and the existing character, which would be destroyed by adopting such a policy. It also shows little regard to the impacts on what is a settled and well established community, which would be eroded fairly quickly. The policy also shows no regard for the local environs, as well as local and public services, traffic considerations, and existing infrastructure. The transport system has been struggling in peak hours with slow moving traffic and passengers having to stand on buses from Shirley to East Croydon, increasing the number of multi-occupied residences will add to this problem. While some areas have benefited from addition forms of public transport such as the tram Shirley has seen the number of bus routes and services reduced.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon's local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Policy DM31.4: Positive Character of the Places of Croydon, should be amended so that it does not include the hinterland of many of the areas selected. This policy sets out locations where the Council will support intensification associated with gradual change of the area's local character. This policy seems to focus around existing shopping parades where they may well be scope for intensification. However, the areas as detailed on pages 163 – 167 include large areas of hinterland that would not be appropriate for such intensification.

The boundaries should be re-drawn to remove the predominantly two storey residential roads that should not be subject to change and should instead show the following boundaries:

- **Kenley and Old Coulsdon**, page 163, Godstone Road, Hayes Lane up to Kenley Lane and Station Road;
- **Sanderstead**, page 164, Limpsfield Road from the roundabout at Sanderstead Hill to Riding Hill and Cranleigh Close;
- **Selsdon**, page 165, Selsdon Park Road from Farnborough Avenue to the roundabout at Kent Gate Way and Holmbury Grove;
- **Shirley**, page 166, Shirley Avenue to the BP Service Station and a further zone on Wickham Road from Verdayne Avenue to Cheston Avenue;
- **South Croydon**, page 167, Brighton Road from Napier Road to Kingsdown Avenue.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity.

Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object

I understand that there are two areas in Shirley where four storey buildings are planned: Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the area around the Shirley Library. Whilst I don’t object to the Shirley Road development, the latter includes not just Wickham Road itself but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way (page 166, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable – it would completely change the character of Shirley and I object to it very strongly.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context whilst recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object DM31.4

I am writing to object to DM31.4: The areas in Shirley should not be zones for intensification as this type of development would be out of keeping with the character of the area.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Mrs S Rudduck

Object DM31.4

Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre; To take away the semi-detached houses from these areas and put in medium height blocks of flats would take away the character of the local area which is the reason Shirley is a sought after area to live and would again, increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object DM31.4

The construction of medium rise buildings to replace the existing mostly semi detached buildings will not be conducive to the village atmosphere currently existing.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object DM31.4

Whilst recognising the need for more housing there seems to be no sense whatsoever in knocking down high quality family houses that young families desperately need now and will increasingly so. Therefore, to replace them with flats of which there is a significant supply in Croydon town centre where the demand for flats can be more appropriately and sympathetically accommodated would appear to be detrimental to providing a sufficiently varied range of types of accommodation in the Borough. This also seems to be contrary the policy of opposing back garden development which has demonstrated until now the council’s recognition of the importance of high quality private outdoor space with associated environmental benefits. The result of the implementation of any of these proposals would be the dramatic loss and detrimental change to the character of the area.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The areas in Shirley should not be zones for intensification as this type of development would be totally out of keeping with the character of the area.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness.

The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Areas in Shirley should not be zones for intensification as this type of development is out of character.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I object to the focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too.

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object to the focussed intensification associated with the gradual change of local character at Forestdale under policy 31.4

Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I understand that there are two areas in Shirley where four storey buildings are planned: Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the area around the Shirley Library. Whilst I don't object to the Shirley Road development, the latter includes not just Wickham Road itself but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennets Way and Devonshire Way (page 166, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The idea that the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads should be replaced by medium-rise blocks is unacceptable - it would completely change the character of Shirley and I object to it very strongly.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am writing to object to focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under policy DM31.4 of Forestdale Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
I am writing to object to focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and Shirley local centre; Change

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Object DM31.4  

Policy DM31.4 - Facilities are already stretched across the borough, intensification in quite residential areas is not the answer and these areas should remain as they are.

Change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon's local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility, deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
The two areas identified are the Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the local Shirley Centre. The latter includes not just Wickham Road but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennets Way and Devonshire Way. We believe that such an approach to the area is both wholly unjustified, unnecessary and frankly without any added value for the area for the following reasons. There is no justification for the potential demolition of numerous houses whose design and character is consistent with the total area of Shirley. The properties are in great demand and are well maintained. The roads identified have well established and supportive communities which would be lost by redevelopment. The centre and shopping area, the heart of the ‘village’, would be totally destroyed. The proposed use of medium rise blocks would completely change the nature of the area in a wholly negative way. The suggestion of gradual change is itself fraught with hidden danger. One might suggest that the changes are likely to be piecemeal with the area being subject to change over a long period with the centre continually having the appearance of an ongoing building site, with continual disruption to both pedestrians and traffic flow. Without any guarantee of the finance required for the whole project being available there would be a grave danger of a partial and ill considered scheme being the result. There is no reference to resulting ‘hidden’ costs such as additional school places or potential replacement medical facilities. Additional traffic on local roads appears to be ignored. In short there is no suggestion of any benefits that these proposals would bring to the area. Indeed for the local population these proposals would seem only to produce a future of unwanted change, disruption, a loss of the quality of life and general blight of the area.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Although some boundaries have been amended for specific areas of Focussed Intensification, the challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is still to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Unfortunately, we already have an example of how a similar proposal approved by Croydon Council can fundamentally change an area. There is already an end of terrace house on Markfield for which, inexplicably, permission has been given for its conversion into a multi-occupancy hostel for single men where they are allocated their own room with shower and spend their leisure time in a communal area and share the kitchen. Unsurprisingly, this has led to instances where residents escape their cramped conditions to drink beer on the terrace above the garages outside their lodgings, in full view of neighbours and their children. This was never the intention of the original developers of Forestdale and I doubt it is the wish of the majority of current residents either. (See attached Application and Approval dated 28.07.2014)

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the real intention of Croydon Council is to fundamentally change the character of Forestdale to replace the current mix of housing types with flats only suitable for single or two person occupancy. This would be truly dreadful. (Policy DM31.4 Croydon Local Plan: Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area's local character)

The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council's website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
These proposals, if approved, would almost certainly ‘plight’ the entire housing stock on the Forestdale development by damaging future housing sales. Potential buyers would be reluctant to purchase any house or flat on Forestdale fearing that at some point their home would be designated for ‘compulsory purchase’ by Croydon Council. The same ‘planning plight’ might apply to those home owners unfortunately located next to a property with a large garden. (Policy DM2-Croydon Local Plan - proposed policy of development of Garden Land)

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
Since I started writing this letter I have been struck by the number of my neighbours who have stayed in the same property for the past 20, 30 or even 40 years. We have attended celebrations together—weddings and funerals too. Many are now retired and their children live nearby. I assume that many have planned to stay in the same home, content in the knowledge that they could continue to rely on the support of family, friends and neighbours they have known for many years. I deeply resent these unwelcome proposals to destroy the community spirit that it has taken years to establish.

No change  Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. The challenge for the Croydon Local Plan is to enable growth and regeneration in the local context while recognising the local character and distinctiveness. The objective of policy DM31.4 is to maximise use of the existing growth capacity, to focus growth in sustainable locations and to support a smart spatial vision for the borough. Croydon’s local and proposed neighbourhood centres have a linear layout and are at present only using a fraction of their land capacity. Spatially, additional growth would strengthen the potential for further development of public transport and other uses which require a certain level of localised demand. The proposed areas meet criteria referring to infrastructure availability and accessibility; deliverability of growth based on local character. The policy opens up opportunities for more intensive development in selected areas and enables gradual change of character over time. It would also positively encourage spatial quality and distinctiveness of Croydon local and neighbourhood centres. The complete review is available on the Council’s website on the evidence base pages which support the Croydon Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0357/03/05/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Ms H Farley</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Your proposal for 12 storey tower blocks in New Addington are also inappropriate. There are already 3 eye sores there which have always spoilt the landscape, and would be better demolished.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0431/01/001/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Mr S Williams</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Policy DM32.1B which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827/01/15/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Jane &amp; Paul Riley</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>While I do want to see the regeneration of the western side of Central Parade, I don't believe 12-storey tower blocks are appropriate nor do I think this is what the people of New Addington want. I will therefore be objecting to this policy.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Objector</td>
<td>Soundness</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918/01/01</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>Mr Gareth Champion</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926/01/02</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>Councillor Luke Clancy</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929/02/02</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>Mr Charles Marriott</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2056/01/01</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Dudley Mead</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>DM32.1 should not allow for 12 storey development within Central Parade as this will not enhance the district centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2062/01/02</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Jason Perry</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>DM32.1 should not allow for 12 storey development within Central Parade as this will not enhance the district centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2071/01/02</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Mario Creatura</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>DM32.1 should not allow for 12 storey development within Central Parade as this will not enhance the district centre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cllr Steve O'Connell AM

Object DM32.1

DM32.1 should not allow for 12 storey development within Central Parade as this will not enhance the district centre.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon’s district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.

No change

Andy Stranack
Croydon Council

Object Soundness - Justified DM32.1

DM32.1 should not allow for 12 storey development within Central Parade as this will not enhance the district centre.

Your objection is noted; however not substantiated in planning terms. New Addington is a district centre with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate substantial amount of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.

No change

Lynn Colthart

Object Soundness - Justified DM32.1

Object to allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade West. One document there is reference of up to 290 homes - where will their cars be parked & this will add to the existing problem of getting in and out of the estate by car due to Lodge Lane being the only access road. You have this noted as a Medium for Public Transport Accessibility, however no mention of Road usage. The estate only has one main road in & out and this could have High Impact to the existing problems the estate has with road access.

Your objection is noted; however not substantiated in planning terms. New Addington is a district centre with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate substantial amount of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.

No change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object/Comment</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Text Content</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2723/01/001/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Mr Christopher Knight</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>Policy DM32.1B which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2755/01/001/DM32.1/C</td>
<td>Mrs Ann-marie Shortland</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>Development in New Addington Central Parade West is needed with sympathetic design and consideration given to environmental weather as there are already problems with high winds around structures and difficulties parking in Chertsey Crescent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2775/01/028/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Cllr Tim Pollard</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>DM32.1 should not allow for 12 storey development within Central Parade as this will not enhance the district centre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>DM32.1</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>DM32.1 should not allow for 12 storey development within Central Parade as this will not enhance the district centre.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2776/01/028/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Cllr Helen Pollard</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2779/01/001/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Elsa Zeelie</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>With Regards to Policy DM32.1b, I am against the building of more housing here as we need to function as a community, and this little area with pool/hall is what the keep this New Addington community together. There is more green belt around Kenley, Purley or coulsdon where it is not overcrowded already. New Addington is not the area for more housing, we are suffering already with too many people living off benefits in this area. We are trying to make this community a better community. We would benefit more from more decent smaller shops and less of the monopoly on the parade. Provide us with a new leisure centre, Centre for Families and the Elderly. Same goes for the traveller site: we do not need more bad vibes here, please let us get ourselves on our feet first. We all are standing together trying our best to give New Addington a better name as we have loads of good people around here too.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/09/2016</td>
<td>DM32.1/C</td>
<td>Peter Staveley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, I want to see redevelopment of the area. However, imposing a 12-storey block in the area is out of character. The existing block is around 6-stories so any new development should not exceed that and certainly not be higher than, say, 8 storeys. There needs to be a height restriction on any development</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/09/2016</td>
<td>DM32.1/D</td>
<td>Cllr Jan Buttinger</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>DM32.1 should not allow for 12 storey development within Central Parade as this will not enhance the district centre.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>Soundness</td>
<td>Justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/017/DM32.1</td>
<td>Cllr Vidhi Mohan</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>DM32.1 should not allow for 12 storey development within Central Parade as this will not enhance the district centre.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cllr Richard Chatterjee
London Borough of Croydon
Object Soundness - Justified DM32.1
DM32.1 should not allow for 12 storey development within Central Parade as this will not enhance the district centre.
No change
Your objection is noted; however not substantiated in planning terms.
Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.

Mr Paul Newton
Addington Village Residents Assoc
Object Soundness - Justified DM32.1
While I do want to see the regeneration of the western side of Central Parade, I don't believe 12-storey tower blocks are appropriate nor do I think this is what the people of New Addington want. I will therefore be objecting to this policy.
No change
Your objection has been noted; however it has not been substantiated in planning terms.
New Addington is a district centre with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate substantial amount of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.

Clare Greaves
Object DM32.1
> I am writing to object to: Policy DM32.1b which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade
No change
Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.
There are also proposals which will change New Addington for the worse. Policy DM32.1b says the Council will welcome applications that: “create buildings with smaller footprints that complement existing predominant building heights of 3 storeys up to 12 storeys within Central Parade” and “Additional policies are required to manage the area to the west of Central Parade where there are precedents of large and tall buildings. This location presents opportunities for growth through the creation of large or tall buildings. It identifies this site as suitable for 50 to 250 homes. While I do not object to the regeneration of the Central Parade, I do not on any level believe that 12-storey tower blocks are appropriate anywhere in Croydon and do not think this is what the people of New Addington would want. I am therefore objecting to this policy.

No change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.

I object to policy DM32.1b creating buildings 3-12 storeys in Central Parade Reference number 44. They should not be over 5 storeys

No change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.

It has come to my attention what Croydon council are planning to do...

No change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maria Hickey</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>I am a home owner in new addington and would like to object the plans croydon council have put forward. Also to build more tower blocks in new addington would take away the skyline we have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Roger Williams</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>While I do want to see the regeneration of the western side of Central Parade, I don't believe 12-storey tower blocks are appropriate nor do I think this is what the people of New Addington want. I will therefore be objecting to this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Rishi Gohill</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>While I do want to see the regeneration of the western side of Central Parade, I don't believe 12-storey tower blocks are appropriate nor do I think this is what the people of New Addington want. I will therefore be objecting to this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Harris</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>While I do want to see the regeneration of the western side of Central Parade, I don't believe 12-storey tower blocks are appropriate nor do I think this is what the people of New Addington want. I will therefore be objecting to this policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy DM32.1b says the Council will welcome applications that:

"... create buildings with smaller footprints that complement existing predominant building heights of 3 storeys up to 12 storeys within Central Parade" (p.133, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals).

The document goes on to say:

"Additional policies are required to manage the area to the west of Central Parade where there are precedents of large and tall buildings. This location presents opportunities for growth through the creation of large or tall buildings" (ibid.).

It identifies this site as suitable for 50 to 290 homes (pages 181-183, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 44).

While I do want to see the regeneration of the western side of Central Parade, I don't believe 12-storey tower blocks are appropriate nor do I think this is what the people of New Addington want. I will therefore be objecting to this policy.

No change
Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.

While I do want to see the regeneration of the western side of Central Parade, I don't believe 12-storey tower blocks are appropriate nor do I think this is what the people of New Addington want. I will therefore be objecting to this policy.

No change
Your objection has been noted; however it has not been substantiated in planning terms. New Addington is a district centre with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate substantial amount of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Reference</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3430/01/028/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Mr Donald Speakman</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>DM32.1 should not allow for 12 storey development within Central Parade as this will not enhance the district centre.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3555/01/001/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Mr I Williams</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>I object to Policy DM32.1b which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade. Just because there are a few blocks at each end of Central Parade (which have never been in keeping with how the original New Addington area should have been) does not mean we should infill between and in any case nothing higher than Central Parade itself should be built, 3 stories max.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3565/01/001/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Mr I Williams</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>I object to Policy DM32.1b which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade. Just because there are a few blocks at each end of Central Parade (which have never been in keeping with how the original New Addington area should have been) does not mean we should infill between and in any case nothing higher than Central Parade itself should be built, 3 stories max.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3566/01/015/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Maureen Wilcox</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>While I do want to see the regeneration of the western side of Central Parade, I don’t believe 12-storey tower blocks are appropriate nor do I think this is what the people of New Addington want. I will therefore be objecting to this policy.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon’s district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.
Object DM32.1
It has come to my attention that you propose several changes to New Addington. I object to these proposals. As a resident of New Addington for over 31 years, I feel I have to have my say. Very many people who live here, regard it as a village or small town - and no more.

1) Policy DM32.1B ... “create buildings with smaller footprints that compliment the existing predominant building heights of 3 storeys up to 12 storeys within Central Parade.”

This is absurd. How can you go back to the sixties when in the end they had to tear down the high rises as they were not fit for purpose? The same will happen again. Thrown up high rises with no thought for the people living there with the damp, lifts not working etc. this will happen, because you will throw them up on the cheap and will not fix them because we don't have the money' (usual garbage) and they will be a blot on a very beautiful landscape. If you want to house people, why not put them into some of the empty office blocks (Converted of course) in the centre of Croydon?

No change
Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.

Object Soundness - Justified DM32.1
DM32.1 should not allow for 12 storey development within Central Parade as this will not enhance the district centre.

No change
Your objection is noted; however not substantiated in planning terms. Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.
Mr Tim Duce: Object Soundness - Justified

12 storey tower blocks in New Addington? No thanks.

No change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.

Diane Simpson: Object Soundness - Justified

While I do want to see the regeneration of the western side of Central Parade, I don’t believe 12-storey tower blocks are appropriate nor do I think this is what the people of New Addington want. I will therefore be objecting to this policy.

No change

Your objection has been noted; however it has not been substantiated in planning terms. New Addington is a district centre with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate substantial amount of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.

Jenny Greenland: Object

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Policy Text</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3789/01/015/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Mr Paul Slaughter</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>While I do want to see the regeneration of the western side of Central Parade, I don't believe 12-storey tower blocks are appropriate nor do I think this is what the people of New Addington want. I will therefore be objecting to this policy.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3804/01/026/DM32.1/C</td>
<td>Cllr L Hale</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>DM32.1 should not allow for 12 storey development within Central Parade as this will not enhance the district centre</td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3809/01/022/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Mr Ian Leonard</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>Policy DM32.1 states the Council will welcome applications that: &quot;...create buildings with smaller footprints that complement existing predominant building heights of 3 storeys up to 12 storeys within Central Parade&quot; (p.133, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals). The document goes on to say: &quot;Additional policies are required to manage the area to the west of Central Parade where there are precedents of large and tall buildings. This location presents opportunities for growth through the creation of large or tall buildings&quot; (ibid.). It identifies this site as suitable for 50 to 290 homes (pages 181-183, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 44). While I, among many, would like to see the regeneration of the western side of Central Parade, I do not believe twelve storey tower blocks are appropriate nor do I think this is what the people of New Addington want. Consequently, I therefore object to this policy.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your objection has been noted; however it has not been substantiated in planning terms.

New Addington is a district centre with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate substantial amount of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.
I write to you having received this email from Gavin Barwell MP, the tone of which I find inflammatory and discriminatory towards the Gypsy and Traveller communities, and smacks of "not in my backyard".

I write as a resident of Addiscombe who recognises the huge problem of lack of affordable housing to buy and to rent in London promulgated by this Conservative government and the previous coalition government.

I fully support Croydon Council’s proposals.

**DM32.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Welcome support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cllr M Neal</td>
<td>DM32.1 should not allow for 12 storey development within Central Parade as this will not enhance the district centre;</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr R Morley-Smith</td>
<td>While I do want to see the regeneration of the western side of Central Parade, I don’t believe 12-storey tower blocks are appropriate nor do I think this is what the people of New Addington want. I will therefore be objecting to this policy.</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms S Wheeler-Kiley</td>
<td>While I do want to see the regeneration of the western side of Central Parade, I don’t believe 12-storey tower blocks are appropriate nor do I think this is what the people of New Addington want. I will therefore be objecting to this policy.</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are also proposals which will change New Addington for the worse. Policy DM32.1b says the Council will welcome applications that “… create buildings with smaller footprints that complement existing predominant building heights of 3 storeys up to 12 storeys within Central Parade” (p.133, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The document goes on to say: “Additional policies are required to manage the area to the west of Central Parade where there are precedents of large and tall buildings. This location presents opportunities for growth through the creation of large or tall buildings” (ibid.). It identifies this site as suitable for 50 to 290 homes (pages 181-183, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 44). I object strongly to all new proposals for ghastly council flats full of ghastly people. Are there already not enough drug dealers and vanquishers in Croydon borough?

While I do want to see the regeneration of the western side of Central Parade, I don’t believe 12-storey tower blocks are appropriate nor do I think this is what the people of New Addington want. I will therefore be objecting to this policy.

While I do want to see the regeneration of the western side of Central Parade, I don’t believe 12-storey tower blocks are appropriate nor do I think this is what the people of New Addington want. I will therefore be objecting to this policy.

Your objection has been noted; however it has not been substantiated in planning terms. New Addington is a district centre with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM32.1</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4117/01/025/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Cllr S Brew</td>
<td>DM32.1 should not allow for 12 storey development within Central Parade as this will not enhance the district centre.</td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4122/01/001/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Mr David Hazzard</td>
<td>Policy DM32.1B which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade.</td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4125/01/028/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Councillor M Fisher</td>
<td>DM32.1 should not allow for 12 storey development within Central Parade as this will not enhance the district centre.</td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document ID</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>Policy DM32.1b which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4160/01/001/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Mr T.C Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4163/01/001/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Mrs J Webb</td>
<td></td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4172/01/002/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Mr B Cooke</td>
<td></td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr & Mrs Potter

Object DM32.1

Policy DM32.1B which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade.

No change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.

Mr David Stagg

Object DM32.1

Policy DM32.1B which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade.

No change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.

G.A Dale

Object DM32.1

I am writing to object to:
1. Policy DM32.1b which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade;

No change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Policy DM32.1B which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade.</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4185/01/001/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>L Gorrie</td>
<td></td>
<td>Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon’s district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Policy DM32.1B because it would allow development up to twelve storeys in Central Parade</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4187/01/001/DM32.1/C</td>
<td>Mr Mark Tatum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon’s district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Policy DM32.1</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4210/01/004/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Mr K Arnold</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the policy which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade.</td>
<td>Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon’s district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr R.C Syred  
Object to DM32.1b because it would allow development up to twelve storeys in Central Parade. 
No change. 
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon’s district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 story high buildings are already present in the area.

Mrs Brenda Taylor  
Object to DM32.1  
I am writing to object to policy DM32.1b which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade. 
No change. 
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon’s district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 story high buildings are already present in the area.

Susan Piggott  
Object to DM32.1  
Policy DM32.1b which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade. 
No change. 
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon’s district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 story high buildings are already present in the area.
4233/01/001/DM32.1/O  Mr & Mrs White  Object  DM32.1  Policy DM32.1B which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade.  No change  Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.

4240/01/002/DM32.1/C  Mr & Mrs Galer  Object  DM32.1  Object to DM32 1b because it would allow development up to twelve storeys in Central Parade  No change  Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.

4246/01/001/DM32.1/O  Mr & Mrs McManus  Object  DM32.1  Policy DM32.1B which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade.  No change  Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM32.1</th>
<th>Policy DM32.1B which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade.</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4249/01/001/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Grinham</td>
<td></td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4250/01/001/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Rasell</td>
<td></td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4251/01/001/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Westbrook</td>
<td></td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4252/01/002/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Worman</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>Object to 32.1b as it would allow buildings up to 12 storeys in Central Parade</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4270/01/001/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Mr D Payne</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>Policy DM32.1B which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4273/01/002/DM32.1/C</td>
<td>Mrs A Dada</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>Object to DM32.1b because it would allow development up to twelve storeys in Central Parade</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are precedents of large buildings to the west of Central Parade. However any redevelopment would be subject to the submission of a planning application and would be considered on their merits taking account of the character and layout of the surrounding area.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.
Policy DM32.1B which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon’s district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.

Policy DM32.1B which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon’s district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.

Policy DM32.1B which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade.

Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon’s district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.
Policy DM32.1B which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4326/01/001/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Mr M Norman</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>Policy DM32.1B which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4335/01/006/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Mr P Cornish</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>I am writing to object to policy DM32.1 which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4344/01/001/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Rasbrook &amp; Pickford</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>Policy DM32.1B which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4350/01/001/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Mr W Pook</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Policy DM32.1B which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4352/01/001/DM32.1/O</td>
<td>Mrs I Pegrum</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Policy DM32.1B which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4362/01/002/DM32.1/C</td>
<td>Mrs G Syred</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.1 Object to DM32.1b because it would allow development up to twelve storeys in Central Parade.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.
Mrs J.M Martin

Object DM32.1

Policy DM32.1B which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade.

No change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.

Mr & Ms Sagar & Allen

Object DM32.1

Policy DM32.1B which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade.

No change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.

Kate Adams

Object DM32.1

Policy DM32.1B which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade.

No change

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>DM32.2</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Addington Pathfinders</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>We understand housing is also to be built around the Fisher Farm recycling site, the 21 Club and beyond. Whilst local people do appreciate housing needs to be built - they have also questioned the lack of infrastructure this potential influx of all these combined properties - sited on Northdowns and also planned for Central Parade west, will highlight. Also a worry is the change to TfL bus routes has seen an added length to every journey around the estate, further afield is worse - it took children from Rowdown School visiting the Pantomime at the Fairfield Halls 1 hour and 20 mins to get back from East Croydon to New Addington. Road congestion has also been flagged as an issue. To build a substantial amount of housing, the Council needs to look at providing another road off the estate. Pathfinders take it personally that residents have been lied to - hoodwinked - and this is not right. Does this regeneration need yet more protracted legal arguments, or will the weight of residents voices actually be listened to? Where are the long-awaited plans which should have been out for viewing before these plans were commented on? This would have at least provided residents with a more comprehensive knowledge of the Council's ideas and how this would look.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. New Addington is one of Croydon's district centres with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. 11-12 storey high buildings are already present in the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Morris</td>
<td>DM32.1</td>
<td>Policy DM32.1B which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Comment/Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949/01/02/DM32.2/C</td>
<td>Beth Havelock</td>
<td>Transport for London</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2242/02/002/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mrs Marion Burchell</td>
<td>New Addington Pathfinder</td>
<td></td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2244/01/002/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Bettine Scott-Grindrod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2690/01/008/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Miss Nicola Hume</td>
<td>Persimmon Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Paragraph(s)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2690/02/008/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Miss Nicola Hume</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.2</td>
<td>We would like to take this opportunity to draw the attention of the Council to a site controlled by Persimmon Homes located in Addington. This site currently lies within the Green Belt, however to what extent this land meets the purposes of the Green Belt, outlined in paragraph 80 of the NPPF is contentious. We believe that this site could accommodate residential development and help in meeting the housing requirement over the plan period. We believe that this site should be considered deliverable and available as one of the leading UK house builders is positively promoting the site. In allowing development to be brought forward on this site it will allow the Strategic Policies of the Local Plan to be met.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3206/01/002/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Steve Kenney</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.2</td>
<td>Hello, we would like to object to yet another ludicrous proposal to deface New Addington and have a massive effect on the community. No doubt the council are putting this forward due to being a deprived area!</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0790/01/137/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Mathew Frith</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified DM32.2 120</td>
<td>The Trust has a few concerns relating to loss of greenspace and re-designation of greenspaces and objects to the allocation of this site for residential use.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929/02/005/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Charles Marriott</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.2 120</td>
<td>I particularly object to your proposals for Addington.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Number</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM32.2 120</td>
<td>The strategic objectives may be met long term but there may be more appropriate ways of ensuring the community continues to receive the required support during this time. Delivery of new community facilities may be possible but will require extensive planning and organisation to ensure existing provision is maintained both during redevelopment and afterwards. Any new development of a community centre will need to encompass the Family Centre provision. Constant provision of service by existing facilitators must be maintained.</td>
<td>The area is well served by public open space, however should any development of the site incur the loss of playing fields, these would need to be reprovided. The allocation will be amended setting out that any loss of playing fields must be reprovided and that provision of a family centre shall be continuous during the construction stage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM32.2 120</td>
<td>Existing provisions must be maintained for correct community and this cannot happen if the Family Centre is demolished. Use of land at Timebridge for residential development including replacement community services raises questions concerning the number of new residents requiring community support. As currently provided by The Family Centre. In itself, the development of the land is not an issue but if the Family Centre is demolished, there will inevitably be a period where no provision is possible and this will seriously affect the existing community. Any new development of a community centre will need to encompass the Family Centre provision. Constant provision of service by existing facilitators must be maintained. Experienced, well-trained staff must not be lost/redundant as this will not allow or continued service provision during any redevelopment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM32.2 120</td>
<td>The more specific site allocations represent a large reduction in the amount of designated and non-designated open space. While we acknowledge the need to build new homes and associated infrastructure such as schools, Croydon’s growing population also needs quality open spaces for all the human amenity and ecosystem services which they provide. We object to the allocation of this site for residential use. The site is already well used by the local community and the proposed development will lead to the loss of this green space.</td>
<td>The area is well served by public open space, however should any development of the site incur the loss of playing fields, these would need to be reprovided. The allocation will be amended setting out that any loss of playing fields must be reprovided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Richard Jeffies  
Object  

Other Sites that the Council should reconsider instead of both Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm are the following:
- 16 - Heath Clark playing fields, Stafford Road, Waddon
- 120 - Timebridge Community Centre, Field Way, New Addington
- 518 - Land adjacent to 103 Goodenough Way, The Admirals Walk, Old Coulsdon
- 822 - Wandle Road surface car park, Wandle Road, Croydon
- Opportunity Area
- 536 - Land of former Croydon Airport runway, south of Imperial Way, Waddon
- 552 - Land adjacent to Ashburton playing fields at rear of 2-88 C勘tidge Road, Addiscombe
- 553 - By Pavilion Playing Fields, Purley Way, Waddon
- 632 - Land south of Thrushfieldway Woods, Kent Gate Way, Bridle Way, Addington
- 636 - Land west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, Elmerside, Addington
- 767 - Cane Hill south part, Hollymeak Road / Portnalls Road, Coulsdon

Use as a Gypsy and Traveller site  
No change

The site is in an area of the borough with the highest deprivation and is not suitable for a Gypsy and Traveller site.

Ms S Kemp  
Object  

It makes me want to weep when i read what you have planned for Croydon. I myself live in New Addington, it was a horrible place but now it has vastly improved, your ideas for it no doubt will cause more uproar again, nowhere no green spaces left in the end for the children or dog walkers to go. Tower blocks, school we dont actually need it all so vile. Lets be honest you could built on brown land why choose green land. I can forsee such a horrible Croydon in the future, when i moved to Croydon from Fulham many years ago it was so different to what it is now, by the time you ruin it it will be one of the worse neighbourhoods in London. Of course we mustnt say Surrey as we have been taken over.

Change  
The area is well served by public open space, however should any development of the site incur the loss of playing fields, these would need to be reprovided. The allocation will be amended setting out that any loss of playing fields must be reprovided.

Mrs G Syred  
Object  

object to the dedesignation of Green Belt on land to the west of Timebridge Community Centre

Change  
The area is well served by public open space, however should any development of the site incur the loss of playing fields, these would need to be reprovided. The allocation will be amended setting out that any loss of playing fields must be reprovided.
**New Addington Pathfinders**

Object | Soundness - Justified | DM32.2 | Many local people appreciate the need to build affordable housing, it is the placement and reasoning that we are objecting to. Pathfinders liaised with the Council CEO, Officers and Legal Departmment at the time of the 2nd Village Green application which, if passed, would have effectively halted any regeneration. We offered residents the opportunity to support or oppose the TVG2 and, as we were asked various questions regarding the longterm plans for GP West, we asked for and received, in writing, various answers from the CEO of Croydon Council one of these being that there would be NO housing associated with any regeneration on this area, and many signed on this premise. We would also draw your attention to the history of the previous regeneration with many unhappy with the height of dwellings - this has been echoed throughout every public and costly consultation since. Residents are clear that they do not want high-rise dwellings, but do want a decent sized supermarket together with other amenities on this site.

| 1112/01/001/DM32.2/O | No change |

| 1929/02/009/DM32.2/O | Mr Charles Marriott | Object | DM32.2 | I object to the proposals for Addington. |

| 1968/01/004/DM32.2/O | Gavin Barwell | Object | DM32.2 | Policy DM32.1b Central Parade. Which would allow buildings of up to 12 storeys on Central Parade. While I want to see the regeneration of the western side of Central Parade, I don't believe 12 storey tower blocks are appropriate nor do I think this is what the people of New Addington want. |

| 2136/02/005/DM32.2/O | R. W. Taylor | Object | DM32.2 | 12 storey Flats in New Addington parade would be out of place. Forestsite is low rise buildings. To try and change it would destroy the character of the estate. |

No change Each planning permission is considered on its merits and will be subject to all relevant policies of the Local and London Plan. This includes assessing the application with regards to outlook, overlooking and privacy.
Site 44 - I think the site needs updating as long as all current provisions are rebuilt to a better standard without losing any current facilities or downsizing. The community centre is used by many groups/clubs and organisations at the moment. I don’t think we need anymore housing on this site as we don’t have enough facilities for local people as it is. The local dance school provides a great service to many children and other groups for children and adults need to continue.

I cannot see this being delivered to local’s satisfaction. I think it will cause many problems and some current facilities will be lost New Addington residents pride themselves with the facilities it offers to the whole community. Please don’t take any of this away.

It seems that it is a way to solve the current housing issues but many other facilities will definitely be compromised i.e. facilities for children, the elderly and GP services are stretched as it is. Please make sure the community are kept well informed and are asked what they want/need. But above all please listen to us not ignore us.

No change

The site is suitable for mixed use development of the range outlined in the detailed policies and proposals.

Object | DM32.2 44
---|---
Amanda Rapley

What is the need for retail on this site. At the Lidl appeal the Council argued that that New Addington could not sustain more than three supermarkets (Iceland, Co-op and the now permitted Lidl). As the Lidl is now open is there still a need for further retail in New Addington?

No change

The site is suitable for mixed use development of the range outlined in the detailed policies and proposals; it is considered an acceptable use in this location and it's size cannot therefore be restricted.

Object | Soundness - Justified | DM32.2 44
---|---|---
M Fuller

Object | DM32.2 44
---|---

02 September 2016
With the proposal to provide new residential, community, healthcare facility, leisure and retail with large footprint, the recent past proposal to provide more open space is not an option if the Council's wish to maintain the garden village character of the area. The larger footprint proposal could be suggesting development of up to 3 storeys and with numerous developments proposed little open space would appear available after allowance is made for the motor car.

DM32.1b is not an accurate statement. In the area proposed development there are no influential structures to the height of 12 storeys. There is an isolated 11 storey residential tower block in the centre of Chertsey Crescent and an 8 storey residential tower block near each end of Overbury Crescent, neither of which could be considered to be predominant or respect and enhance local character (DM15.1) and the addition of further high rise will not improve the situation nor be compatible with the Council’s wish to maintain the garden village character of the area.

Neither does the development proposed fit well with the Council’s claim to protect Local Green Spaces including the space around the public buildings on the west side of Central Parade.

The number of homes proposed for this site should be reduced.

Each planning permission is considered on its merits and will be subject to all relevant policies of the Local and London Plan. This includes assessing the application with regards to outlook, overlooking and privacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Policy Reasoning</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2242/02/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mrs Marion Burchell</td>
<td>New Addington Pathfinder</td>
<td></td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>DM32.2</td>
<td>This area has been up for development for years the first plans were objected to because of the level of housing. This is the case I object to the scale of housing proposed and the height of the proposed housing as it will affect peoples privacy. Also the extra amount of cars will cause even more of a problem for the elderly residents in the tower block on Chertsey Cres, who already are unable to park near to their homes. For the elderly, disabled and frail this is already a problem. The area is part of a dispersal and drink free zone because of anti-social behavior already filling the area with more people, I feel will increase the problem. I understand that Croydon Council has a commitment to build a huge amount of housing to ease the housing crisis but here is not the place.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2325/01/003/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Miss Kirsty Pearce</td>
<td>New Addington Pathfinders</td>
<td></td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>DM32.2</td>
<td>New Addington - west side Central Parade Your plans indicate you have not listened or appreciated what local people have been feeding back to you since the consultation since 2007 as it show too much housing, not enough retail. Pathfinders worked with the Council to alley resident’s fears and overturn the 2nd village green application as it was confirmed to us that there would be no housing on this site. It seems you have lied. We will consult again as I strongly suspect you will hear the same from residents now as you did then. They want a supermarket, new leisure centre, community centre and will not want high-rise housing.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2635/01/017/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Paul Sandford</td>
<td>Bourne Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DM32.2</td>
<td>DM32.1 should not allow for 12 storey development within Central Parade as this will not enhance the district centre</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2671/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Lara Fish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DM32.2</td>
<td>Although I agree that there is always demand for housing, I do not think that New Addington is the right place. We are already stretched for dental and medical services in the area and although I do not personally know anyone at out local schools, I have been led to believe that they are also at a capacity.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We do not need or want anymore tower blocks at New Addington, nor do we need another school on Rowdown fields. The travellers when up here cause trouble being rude to people and stealing from the shops, which I have witness, also this happen many years ago on Forestdale shops, where I worked, do you really want to spoil all the green belt, there is the old Stewart Plastic site at Purley Way which has been left empty for years.

It has come to my attention what Corydon council are planning to do, such as building on green belt land, or the building of high rise flats on or near centre parade. This is rank out of order! And most others think, as you are laying out to build high rise flats in or around centre parade.

As well as building on green belt land. A gypsy/traveller's site on the said green belt land, nor do I agree to building of a second school on land next to Rowdown school, this also being on green belt land. This I see as very under handed by this labour council.
Policy DM32.1b says the Council will welcome applications that:
- create buildings with smaller footprints that complement existing predominant building heights of 3 storeys up to 12 storeys within Central Parade” (p.133, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals).

The document goes on to say:
- Additional policies are required to manage the area to the west of Central Parade where there are precedents of large and tall buildings.
- This location presents opportunities for growth through the creation of large or tall buildings” (ibid.)

It identifies this site as suitable for 50 to 290 homes (pages 181-183, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 44).

Whilst it would be important to see the regeneration of the western side of Central Parade, I don’t believe 12-storey tower blocks are appropriate. Tower blocks in central London are mostly discontinued and examples of these are those in Elephant and Castle area and Harlesden. The high tower blocks in these areas were eventually destroyed and the residents who lived in them were resettled into lower rise blocks bungalows and duplex type accommodations.

So, my question to you is as follows:- Why are you proposing to build structures that other councils and boroughs are fast withdrawing from? I live in New Addington and have done so for a decade, this is definitely not what we want in this area as we all love the greenery and village atmosphere. A lot of people here have moved from the “lego” brick like areas of central London to New Addington for the air quality, tranquility and rural setting.

My question to you is:- Do you value the well being of the residents of New Addington and if so why are you putting forward proposals that would drastically change the setting,atmosphere entire environment and well being of the people who currently live in this area without any seemingly forethought?

No change

The site is suitable for mixed use development of the range outlined in the detailed policies and proposals. Any applications received for the development of the area will be subject to all relevant policies of the local plan which include those pertaining to local character, design and amenity space.
Ms E Randall

I strongly object to the following proposals which will have a negative impact on either green belt land or the character of Addington.

Wanting to build tall housing property will change the landscape drastically and create a grotesque barrier of concrete between Croydon and the countryside. It will also put immense pressure on the primary school system of the local area where a majority of schools are over subscribed.

Changes to Forestdale will have a negative impact on local services and the housing prices of Forestdale for existing residents. The local schools are over subscribed and therefore additional resident numbers cannot be supported. The areas around Forestdale are managed by a management company which is paid for by residents. Additional rubbish along footpaths and general maintenance of the footpaths gets ignored by the council as it happens within the estate. Would this change if the council insist on throwing their weight on changing the quiet family demeanour of the estate?

Mr Ian Leonard

Policy DM32.1b states the Council will welcome applications that: “...create buildings with smaller footprints that complement existing predominant building heights of 3 storeys up to 12 storeys within Central Parade” (p.153, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The document goes on to say: “Additional policies are required to manage the area to the west of Central Parade where there are precedents of large and tall buildings. This location presents opportunities for growth through the creation of large or tall buildings” (ibid.). It identifies this site as suitable for 50 to 290 homes (pages 181-183, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 44). While I, among many, would like to see the regeneration of the western side of Central Parade, I do not believe twelve storey tower blocks are appropriate nor do I think this is what the people of New Addington want. Consequently, I therefore object to this policy.

The site is suitable for mixed use development of the range outlined in the detailed policies and proposals.
Ms S Kemp

Comment

It makes me want to weep when I read what you have planned for Croydon. I myself live in New Addington, it was a horrible place but now it has vastly improved, your ideas for it no doubt will cause more uproar again, nowhere no green spaces left in the end for the children or dog walkers to go. Tower blocks, school we dont actually need it all so vile. Lets be honest you could built on brown land why choose green land. I can forsee such a horrible Croydon in the future, when I moved to Croydon from Fulham many years ago it was so different to what it is now, by the time you ruin it it will be one of the worse neighbourhoods in London. Of course we mustn't say Surrey as we have been taken over.

DM32.2

44

No change

The site is suitable for mixed use development of the range outlined in the detailed policies and proposals.

Victoria Moore

Object

There are also proposals which will change New Addington for the worse. Policy DM32.1b says the Council will welcome applications that: "... create buildings with smaller footprints that complement existing predominant building heights of 3 storeys up to 12 storeys within Central Parade" (p.133, Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies & Proposals). The document goes on to say: "Additional policies are required to manage the area to the west of Central Parade where there are precedents of large and tall buildings. This location presents opportunities for growth through the creation of large or tall buildings" (ibid.). It identifies this site as suitable for 50 to 290 homes (pages 181-183, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 44). I object strongly to all new proposals for ghastly council flats full of ghastly people. Are there already not enough drug dealers and vanquishers in Croydon borough?

DM32.2

44

No change

The site is suitable for mixed use development of the range outlined in the detailed policies and proposals.
Mr Bob Sleeman call for a review including increased weighting for needs for transport, education and health facilities for all sites suitable for 15+ pitches with site area greater than 4.0:636: LAND west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, Elmside, Addington CR00QA

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Ms H Farley Object I particularly object to your proposals for the Forestdale & Addington, Selsdon & Shirley areas and the proposed secondary school on the Green Belt land of Rowdown Fields. Totally inappropriate siting for an additional secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr S Williams

Object

DM32.2
636

The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr Mathew Frith

London Wildlife Trust

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM32.2
636

The Council's Green Belt Review concluded that this site met Green Belt criteria; the proposed development is inappropriate. We object to the proposed designation of this site for a new secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
| Object | Soundness - Justified | DM32.2 636 | Pathfinders questioned a Ward Councillor several years ago as to why they had not ever proposed the building of a supermarket (who would then redevelop the badly run-down Timebridge Centre) as more affordable and easier to access shopping facilities are desperately needed for Fieldway residents. We were told this couldn't happen as the road in and out of Fieldway would be unable to cope with the added traffic. Are we now to understand that this will be the first step to the erosion of our green space and that the road will now be able to cope with regular deliveries to a Secondary School, plus more pressure on our bus route and more road traffic from parents cars? It should also be noted that our present Secondary School is under-subscribed and at present, has pupils from across the Borough attending. We believe this will be the wrong siting to best serve pupils in the years to come. |
| No change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. |

| Object | DM32.2 636 | A R Jones | I wish to object to the loss of Greenbelt at Rowdown Fields. Such loss will allow further urban sprawl and increase atmospheric pollution in Croydon and damage Public Health |
| No change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. |
A R Jones

Object

I wish to object to the loss of Greenbelt at Rowdown Fields. Such loss will allow further urban sprawl and increase atmospheric pollution in Croydon and damage Public Health.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Jane & Paul Riley

Object

Soundness - Justified

We certainly need additional secondary school places in certain parts of the borough, but there isn't a shortage of secondary school places in the New Addington area. I will therefore be objecting to the de-designation of this land as Green Belt and the use of this site for a secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
We certainly need additional secondary school places in certain parts of the borough, but there isn’t a shortage of secondary school places in the New Addington area. I will therefore be objecting to the de-designation of this land as Green Belt and the use of this site for a secondary school.

I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews:

- Land to the west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, site reference 636. The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr Charles Marriott

I object to the proposed secondary school on the Green Belt land of Rowdown Fields. This is a wholly inappropriate siting for an additional secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Gavin Barwell

I am writing to formally object to - The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane, reference 636, so that it can be used for a new secondary school. We certainly need additional secondary school places in parts of the borough, but there isn't a shortage of secondary school places in the New Addington area.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Object I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as to what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews:

- Land to the west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, site reference 636.

The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
2071/01/017/DM32.2/O Councillor Mario Creatura
London Borough of Croydon
Object Soundness - Justified DM32.2 636
I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews:
Land to the west of Titebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, site reference 636.
The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change
There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

2128/02/013/DM32.2/O Cllr Steve O'Connell AM
Object DM32.2 636
I object to the loss of Green Belt. The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change
There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

2242/02/003/DM32.2/O Mrs Marion Burchell
New Addington Pathfinder
Object Soundness - Justified DM32.2 636
The need for a secondary school up here is not needed the local senior school is not full. I am aware of the need for places in other parts of the borough and feel you would be better placed to find an area nearer where the need is. The road that runs through Fieldway that would service this is far from fit for that purpose. The one road in and out of New Addington is often so congested that it can take almost an hour to travel Lodge Lane which is approx. 1 mile.

No change
The site has met the criteria for the de-designation of Green Belt and has been identified to meet the need for school places in the borough. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. The Council is working with TfL to assess the impact of the proposal on the tram network.

2242/01/001/DM32.2/O Mrs Marion Burchell
New Addington Pathfinder
Object DM32.2 636
I would prefer to see a supermarket development (similar to Selsdon) instead. Not a school which will attract people from across the borough and congest even more our one road in and out of the estate.

No change
The site is not an appropriate location for a supermarket.
2351/01/007/DM32.2/O Mr & Mrs A.M. & K.M. Bean

Object DM32.2

636

I am writing to strongly object to:

6. De-designation of the green belt land to the west of Timbridge Community Centre and east of Lodge Lane. Reference number 636

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

2448/01/17/DM32.2/O Andy Stranack

Croydon Council

Object Soundness - Justified DM32.2

636

I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews:

Land to the west of Timbridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, site reference 636.

The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

2629/01/002/DM32.2/S Jamie McFarland

Education Funding Agency

Support DM32.2

636

The Education Funding Agency has approved 3 new Free Schools currently looking for sites within Croydon. This site has been identified as being potentially suitable options for the permanent location of the Ark Croydon Secondary Academy. We would welcome the opportunity to work with Croydon Council and the respective trust to make these sites available options for these schools.

Welcome support
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Support/Object</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2634/01/02/DM32.2/S</td>
<td>Charlie Fagan (ARK)</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>We are confident that a successful secondary school could be developed on this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The site is situated in an area which has been identified as requiring secondary pupil places in the coming years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The site is an excellent size to accommodate a secondary school and could therefore make a substantial contribution to meeting this demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The site is in an area which meets the demographic criteria for Ark schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The site is located near Ark Oval Primary Academy and would therefore create an opportunity to establish a link between the two schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2635/01/010/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Paul Sandford (Bourne Society)</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I also object to the de-designation of the following areas: Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; Land to the west of Timbridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, site reference 636, which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews. The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM32.2 636</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Object Soundness - Effective** | The more specific site allocations represent a large reduction in the amount of designated and non-designated open space. While we acknowledge the need to build new homes and associated infrastructure such as schools, Croydon's growing population also needs quality open spaces for all the human amenity and ecosystem services which they provide.

We object to the proposed designation of this site for a new secondary school. The council’s Green Belt Review concluded it met its Green Belt designation and the proposed development is inappropriate. It has also been suggested that school places are not actually needed in this catchment area (Local MP, Gavin Barwell) and, in any event, school place requirements constitute a general pressure and not the ‘exceptional circumstances’ required by the NPPF or London Plan to justify development on Green Belt. |
| **No change** | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM32.2 636</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Object** | At this point it would be time to say that a new school on Rowdown Fields is not the answer to this. Lodge Lane is the only way in and out of New Addington and is always busy. A school at the top end would not be conducive to keeping traffic flowing.

Moving on from this, although the transport structure here is not totally inadequate, more housing and school would mean that the current timetables would not be good enough. Trams are already overcrowded with standing room only at all times of the day, not just during the peak hours. The new bus timetable, which has recently been introduced, does not realistically cater for journeys towards Croydon anymore. |
| **This site should not be allocated as a school.** | This site should not be allocated as a school. |
| **No change** | The site has met the criteria for the de-designation of Green Belt and has been identified to meet the need for school places in the borough. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. The Council is working with TRL to assess the impact of the proposal on the tram network. |
Object | Soundness - Justified | DM32.2 636
---|---|---
The main reason for my objection on this point is not just use of green belt land but mainly the impact this will have on travelling in and out of the New Addington estate. As you are aware there is only one main road in and out of the estate and travelling time by bus & car is excessive as it is due to current levels of traffic - what are your plans for the local roads? Travelling along Kent Gate Way from Coney Hall to the round about at the bottom of Lodge Lane is also a congested route, so this route will also have to be reviewed. In addition at peak times trams are completely full so more trams would need to run during these peak times - how could the tram (and bus) network possibly ever cope with 100% of additional school children going to school when it can't even cope with current passenger levels. You have this noted as a Medium for Public Transport Accessibility, however this must be Extremely HIGH impact.
Again no mention of Road usage. The estate only has one main road in & out and this could have Extremely High Impact to the existing problems the estate has with road access - the 'school run' effect of parents dropping children at school will be a disaster for the local road network.

No change

Object | DM32.2 636
---|---
The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.

No change

No change

The site has met the criteria for the de-designation of Green Belt and has been identified to meet the need for school places in the borough. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. The Council is working with TfL to assess the impact of the proposal on the tram network.
I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews:

Land to the west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, site reference 636.

The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.
2791/07/002/DM32.2/O Peter Staveley

Object

DM32.2

636

2. Do you think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3? Whether yes or no please state your reasons...

No, the land is current Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land or otherwise designated green land and should not be built on.

Yes there is, or will be, a shortage of secondary school spaces in Croydon but there is no shortage (and unlikely to be a shortage) of secondary school spaces in Addington. Yes, it is deliverable but should not be delivered on that land.

No. It is not sustainable because it removes the need for green space for future generations. It is also not sustainable because all the demand for spaces will occur outside of the Addington area so a new secondary school here will impose additional pollution from unnecessary transport journeys.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

2812/01/017/DM32.2/O Cllr Jan Buttinger

London Borough of Croydon

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM32.2

636

I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews:

Land to the west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, site reference 636.

The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews: Land to the west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, site reference 636. The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews:

- Land to the west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, site reference 636.

The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

We both agree that we do not want to lose any of our green belt. And the parking in the area is truly so bad especially in Coulsdon.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
We do not need or want anymore tower blocks at New Addington, nor do we need another school on Rowtown fields. The travellers when up here cause trouble being rude to people and stealing from the shops, which I have witness, also this happen many years ago on Forestdale shops, where I worked, do you really want to spoil all the green belt, there is the old Stewart Plastic site at Purley Way which has been left empty for years.

We certainly need additional secondary school places in certain parts of the borough, but there isn’t a shortage of secondary school places in the New Addington area. I will therefore be objecting to the de-designation of this land as Green Belt and the use of this site for a secondary school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3074/01/005/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Christine Younger</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I strongly object to this council building or using Green Belt sites for this and any other purpose. Also high rise flats will upset the balance of the areas. I do accept that we need more housing but these should be built on existing empty or land filled sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3070/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Christine Denney</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I should like to protest against the site chosen for gypsy camps and a new secondary school being built on green belt. There must be better sites for them as we must protect our green belt sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No change: There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>DM32.2 636</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>DM32.2 636</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>307T/01/007/DM32.2/O Mrs Clare Gardner</td>
<td>2. The de-designation of:</td>
<td>2. The de-designation of:</td>
<td>2. The de-designation of:</td>
<td>2. The de-designation of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation;</td>
<td>• Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation;</td>
<td>• Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation;</td>
<td>• Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662;</td>
<td>• Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662;</td>
<td>• Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662;</td>
<td>• Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Land at Shirley Oaks;</td>
<td>• Land at Shirley Oaks;</td>
<td>• Land at Shirley Oaks;</td>
<td>• Land at Shirley Oaks;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rowdown Fields site reference 636 (New Addington does not need another secondary school) as the de-designation of these sites would not comply with Policy SPT.2 and protection of the green grid;</td>
<td>• Rowdown Fields site reference 636 (New Addington does not need another secondary school) as the de-designation of these sites would not comply with Policy SPT.2 and protection of the green grid;</td>
<td>• Rowdown Fields site reference 636 (New Addington does not need another secondary school) as the de-designation of these sites would not comply with Policy SPT.2 and protection of the green grid;</td>
<td>• Rowdown Fields site reference 636 (New Addington does not need another secondary school) as the de-designation of these sites would not comply with Policy SPT.2 and protection of the green grid;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307B/01/002/DM32.2/O Clare Greaves</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.2 636</td>
<td>DM32.2 636</td>
<td>DM32.2 636</td>
<td>DM32.2 636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am writing to object to The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (ref 636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school</td>
<td>I am writing to object to The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (ref 636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school</td>
<td>I am writing to object to The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (ref 636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school</td>
<td>I am writing to object to The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (ref 636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another proposal that concerns me is the de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (most people refer to this site as Rowdown Fields) so that it can be used for a new secondary. We certainly need additional secondary schools in certain parts of Croydon, but I don’t feel there is a shortage of secondary school places in the New Addington area. I am therefore objecting to the de-designation of this land as Green Belt and the use of this site for a secondary school.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

I object to the de-designation of Green Belt Land and building of a secondary school reference number 636.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr James Barnes

It has come to my attention what Corydon council are planning to do such as building on green belt land or the building of high rise flats on or near centre parade. This is rank out of order! And most others think as you are laying out to build high rise flats in or around centre parade.

As well as building on green belt land A gypsy/traveller site on the said green belt land. nor do I agree to building of a second school on land next to rodown school. This also being on green belt land. This I see as very under handed by this labour council.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr Steve Simms

I strongly object to any of these new proposals to build on any green belt land

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr Roger Williams

Object Soundness - Justified DM32.2 636

We certainly need additional secondary school places in certain parts of the borough, but there isn’t a shortage of secondary school places in the New Addington area. I will therefore be objecting to the de-designation of this land as Green Belt and the use of this site for a secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr Richard Jeffries

Object DM32.2 636

Other Sites that the Council should reconsider instead of both Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm are the following:

16 - Heath Clark playing fields, Stafford Road, Waddon
120 - Timebridge Community Centre, Field Way, New Addington
518 - Land adjacent to 103 Goodenough Way, The Admirals Walk, Old Coulsdon
522 - Wandle Road surface car park, Wandle Road, Croydon Opportunity Area
536 - Land of former Croydon Airport runway, south of Imperial Way, Waddon
552 - Land adjacent to Ashburton playing fields at rear of 2-88 Colesridge Road, Addiscombe
553 - By Pavilion Playing Fields, Purley Way, Waddon
632 - Land south of Threehalfpenny Woods, Kent Gate Way, Bridge Way, Addington
636 - Land west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, Elmside, Addington
767 - Cane Hill south part, Hollymeak Road / Portnalls Road, Coulsdon

Use as a Gypsy and Traveller site

No change

This site is not acceptable for a gypsy and traveller site due to its Green Belt designation and is required to meet the need for school places in the borough.
Mr Rishi Gohill

Object Soundness - Justified

We certainly need additional secondary school places in certain parts of the borough, but there isn't a shortage of secondary school places in the New Addington area. I will therefore be objecting to the de-designation of this land as Green Belt and the use of this site for a secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Joy Harris

Object Soundness - Justified

We certainly need additional secondary school places in certain parts of the borough, but there isn't a shortage of secondary school places in the New Addington area. I will therefore be objecting to the de-designation of this land as Green Belt and the use of this site for a secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Rowdown Fields would become an unnecessary secondary school under the Council’s plans. Another proposal that concerns me is the de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (most people refer to this site as Rowdown Fields) so that it can be used for a new secondary school (pages 186-187, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 636). We certainly need additional secondary school places in certain parts of the borough, but there isn’t a shortage of secondary school places in the New Addington area. I will therefore be objecting to the de-designation of this land as Green Belt and the use of this site for a secondary school.

Mr Andrew Bushell

I'm objecting to the de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and to the east of Lodge Lane (reference number 636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.
Another proposal that concerns me is the de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (most people refer to this site as Rowdown Fields) so that it can be used for a new secondary school (pages 186-187, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 636). We certainly need additional secondary school places in certain parts of the borough, but there isn’t a shortage of secondary school places in the New Addington area. Why are you proposing to designate a secondary school in this area that is almost in the middle of the bus terminus / interchange?

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Another proposal that concerns me is the de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (most people refer to this site as Rowdown Fields) so that it can be used for a new secondary school (pages 186-187, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 636). We certainly need additional secondary school places in certain parts of the borough, but there isn’t a shortage of secondary school places in the New Addington area. I will therefore be objecting to the de-designation of this land as Green Belt and the use of this site for a secondary school.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM32.2 636</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3416/01/002/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>C Mortreuil</td>
<td>Croydon is currently running out of space and actually letting more people in through building more flats is putting pressure on our services: we do not have enough schools in the area to cater for all new arrivals. However taking green belt land is a step too far. Similarly a site for travellers with amenities which would prevent them from invading current green spaces is a good idea, but where to put it needs to be sensibly planned and the current proposal in my view is not adequate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3422/01/003/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Dave Fasham</td>
<td>The Rowdown Fields area is Green Belt but the Council's draft Local Plan intends that it be de-designated so as to allow it to be used to build a new secondary school. I strongly object to further loss of Green Belt land particularly as the building of a new school here is misguided since there is no shortage of secondary school places in the New Addington area. In addition, early de-designation of Rowdown Fields is likely to mean that the site would be lost from the Green Belt even if the school was never actually constructed. This would happen because some other development would most likely be proposed for such a prime site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Object | Soundness | DM32.2 636
---|---|---
Mr Donald Speakman | Justified | I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews:

Land to the west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, site reference 636.

The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Object | DM32.2 636
---|---
Ms E Potman | | As a mother I know how important it is in this day and age to have open green spaces to go in the city, that are natural, unspoiled, spacious and adventurous. In this fast paced and pressured computer era, children and families and everyone else, need spaces to go to unwind, to re-energise, to connect to the real, living world and to have clean air to breath. With down grading green belt land and woods, we jeopardise the physical and mental health of our children and fellow citizens. We disrespect the need for green spaces for wild life and trees to bring healthy air and a healthy eco-system. If we do not teach our children and everyone else the importance of green in a city, we set a bad precedent for the next generation.

If we let money be our main aim, choices like this will become easier and easier made and we would be left with no green at all. The strongest thing that Croydon has going for itself are the green spaces and woods. The green belt had been established for a reason. It is not meant to be touched! It is meant to be preserved for the good of all!

Please re-consider your plans and leave the green spaces protected in the green belt. Don’t let it be eroded in the name of ‘progress’. 

No change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Ms F Wood

Object

DM32.2

636

Please do not build on greenbelt areas. There is plenty of space in the empty building in central Croydon and in West Croydon. Spend money on empty land and leave the last green parts of Croydon alone. When those green belt areas are gone so will nature. We are not inner city. We have a history of enjoying our green spaces in Croydon.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Linda Stevens

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM32.2

636

I wish to voice my concerns regarding the following:

I totally object to any reduction of green space in the borough of Croydon in favour of development.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr I Williams

Object

I object to the de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference number 636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school. Over many years and persuasion of politics various schools have been demolished and the land sold or used for building, yes green belt is cheaper and easier to build on but this should not be the pre requisite. Some of our existing schools seem to have people from outside the borough so why do we need new schools when the previously demolished ones were perfectly usable.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
3566/01/016/DM32.2/O Maureen Wilcox

Object Soundness - Justified

DM32.2 636

We certainly need additional secondary school places in certain parts of the borough, but there isn’t a shortage of secondary school places in the New Addington area. I will therefore be objecting to the de-designation of this land as Green Belt and the use of this site for a secondary school.

No change

3569/01/002/DM32.2/O Mr Harris & Mrs Irene & Chamberlain

Object DM32.2

636

As regards Reference Number 636. Why? They are extremely beautiful fields, used for children to play on safely. Why divest New Addington of extra green fields? No sense (and therefore no feeling). A Secondary school? Why? It is not necessary. As I understand it, we actually don't need any Secondary Schools in this area. What are you going to do? Bus them in? More bad behaviour by 'non Addingtonites', and New Addington youth will get the blame yet again.

No change
Cllr J Cummings

Object: DM32.2

Soundness: Justified

I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews:

- Land to the west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, site reference 636.

The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Ms J Fasham

Object: DM32.2

Rowtown Fields, New Addington the Councils plan to de-designate the area to allow building of a secondary school, there is no shortage of school places in this area, and should the school not be build, the Green Belt Land will be lost probably to another development.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr Tim Duce

Object Soundness - Justified DM32.2 636

We certainly need additional secondary school places in certain parts of the borough, but there isn't a shortage of secondary school places in the New Addington area. I object to the de-designation of this land as Green Belt and the use of this site for a secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Diane Simpson

Object Soundness - Justified DM32.2 636

We certainly need additional secondary school places in certain parts of the borough, but there isn't a shortage of secondary school places in the New Addington area. I will therefore be objecting to the de-designation of this land as Green Belt and the use of this site for a secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Object DM32.2/636  
I am emailing you to express my concerns about Croydon Council’s Plans to build houses on some of our precious green spaces, back gardens. I understand that there is a great need for housing in the Croydon area and that the number of homeless people in Croydon is high. However, I need assurance that in providing this need we do not destroy our few remaining green spaces as these are vital to the well-being of our environment and people’s health. When I received the information about these proposals from my MP and local residents association I had been away from home and so have not studied these plans in depth. However, with the information I have I cannot visualize how these proposals would work without destroying the character of the Shirley area and the destruction of our few remaining green areas. In order for me to agree to these proposals I would not only require the assurance that these environmental issues were taken into account but the homes that are planned for were affordable to those who are in need of a home, and that they were of good quality, energy efficient homes. Finally, having lived in Shirley for many years I have seen the increase in traffic which has brought about an increase in air pollution which is detrimental to our health. This is another important factor that has to be borne in mind when increasing the density of the population of the area.

No change

Object DM32.2/636  
I fully oppose the proposals to build on green land.

No change

Object DM32.2/636  
I am emailing you to express my concerns about Croydon Council’s Plans to build houses on some of our precious green spaces, back gardens. I understand that there is a great need for housing in the Croydon area and that the number of homeless people in Croydon is high. However, I need assurance that in providing this need we do not destroy our few remaining green spaces as these are vital to the well-being of our environment and people’s health. When I received the information about these proposals from my MP and local residents association I had been away from home and so have not studied these plans in depth. However, with the information I have I cannot visualize how these proposals would work without destroying the character of the Shirley area and the destruction of our few remaining green areas. In order for me to agree to these proposals I would not only require the assurance that these environmental issues were taken into account but the homes that are planned for were affordable to those who are in need of a home, and that they were of good quality, energy efficient homes. Finally, having lived in Shirley for many years I have seen the increase in traffic which has brought about an increase in air pollution which is detrimental to our health. This is another important factor that has to be borne in mind when increasing the density of the population of the area.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
We have lived in the Borough of Croydon for 30 years and value its vibrancy and diversity.

As Croydon ratepayers we object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land generally, especially land detailed above, which will change forever Croydon's character.

We would ask you to encourage policies/development to:

1. Build new housing on brown field sites by all means AND preserve invaluable green space for the benefit of the community of Croydon;
2. Protect green belt land and preserve the green corridors we desperately vital for wildlife and biodiversity;
3. Amend the tall buildings policy and keep the tall building zone where it is suited in the centre of town;
4. Utilise brownfield sites for new low-level housing only where it can be developed alongside new GP surgeries, schools and improved public transport;

"Nowadays people know the price of everything and the value of nothing". Green Belt is vital and precious. Once lost for future generations and will not be replaced by developers.

We understand the need for housing, schools, hospitals and infrastructure. Are the Developers investing these also alongside their building investments?

Please protect our few remaining green spaces on the borough map, by making better use of brown field sites.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
If there is a need for additional secondary school places in certain parts of the borough, locations should be considered. There isn't a shortage of secondary school places in the New Addington area. I therefore be object to the de-designation of this land as Green Belt and the use of this site for a secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

We certainly need additional secondary school places in certain parts of the borough, but there isn't a shortage of secondary school places in the New Addington area. I will therefore be objecting to the de-designation of this land as Green Belt and the use of this site for a secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews: Land to the west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, site reference 636.

The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid

Object DM32.2 636

Another proposal that concerns me is the de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (most people refer to this site as Rowdown Fields) so that it can be used for a new secondary school (pages 186-187, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 636), which I find strange as then Rowdown Fields would become a secondary school superfluous to requirements under the Council's plans!

We certainly need additional secondary school places in certain parts of the borough, but there is not a shortage of secondary school places in the New Addington area so, on the basis of logic, I will therefore be opposing the de-designation of this land as Green Belt and the use of this site for a secondary school.

Object DM32.2 636

I write to you having received this email from Gavin Barwell MP, the tone of which I find inflammatory and discriminatory towards the Gypsy and Traveller communities, and smacks of "not in my backyard".

I write as a resident of Addiscombe who recognises the huge problem of lack of affordable housing to buy and to rent in London promulgated by this Conservative government and the previous coalition government.

I fully support Croydon Council's proposals.

Support DM32.2 636
Ms L Pinkney

Rowdown Fields, New Addington the Councils plan to de-designate the area to allow building of a secondary school, there is no shortage of school places in this area, and should the school not be build, the Green Belt Land will be lost probably to another development.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr Neil Morrison

We as a nation have maintained the principles of "the Green Belt" since its first inception in 1935 when it was part of a plan devised by the Greater London Regional Planning Committee eventually becoming law by virtue of the Town and Country Planning Act 1947. Recently the Government formally set out its policies and principles towards green belts in England and Wales in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: Green Belts, but this planning guidance was superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in March 2012. Planning Authorities are strongly urged to follow the NPPF's detailed advice when considering whether to permit additional development in the green belt. In the green belt there is a general presumption against inappropriate development, unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated to show that the benefits of the development will outweigh the harm caused to the green belt. The NPPF sets out what would constitute appropriate development in the green belt. I can not find any justifiable cause for allowing building on any "Green Belt" having viewed Gavin Barwell's email on the matter. This series of developments cannot seriously be described as "Appropriate Development" under any circumstances. Please do not build on land which we, as a nation, have preserved for future generations.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM32.2 636</td>
<td>Mr Neil Morrison</td>
<td><strong>Object</strong></td>
<td>Please do not build on &quot;Green Belt&quot;. There is no necessity for it and our parents had the foresight to develop the legislation please don't soil their good intentions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM32.2 636</td>
<td>Cllr M Neal</td>
<td><strong>Object</strong></td>
<td>I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews: Land to the west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, site reference 636. The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr & Mrs Shutter

Object  
DM32.2  
636  
The de-designation of Green belt and Metropolitan Open land for building is quite frankly the sort of policy which is incredibly short-sighted; the green belt was put in place to provide open space for local residents, not to provide cheap building land for development.

Ms S Kemp

Object  
DM32.2  
636  
It makes me want to weep when I read what you have planned for Croydon. I myself live in New Addington, it was a horrible place but now it has vastly improved, yet your ideas for it no doubt will cause more uproar again, nowhere no green spaces left in the end for the children or dog walkers to go. Tower blocks, school we dont actually need it all so vile. Lets be honest you could built on brown land why choose green land. I can foresee such a horrible Croydon in the future, when I moved to Croydon from Fulham many years ago it was so different to what it is now, by the time you ruin it it will be one of the worse neighbourhoods in London. Of course we mustnt say Surrey as we have been taken over.
Ms P Titchener

Object

DM32.2

636

I would like to record my opposition to the use of green belt land to build 12-storey tower blocks secondary school and a traveller camp site. We have other sites and new Addington needs the green belt land as the population is the size of a town yet it needs improvement but it doesn’t need more pressure on our roads. We need green belt land.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr R Morley-Smith

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM32.2

636

We certainly need additional secondary school places in certain parts of the borough, but there isn’t a shortage of secondary school places in the New Addington area. I will therefore be objecting to the de-designation of this land as Green Belt and the use of this site for a secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4022/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Ewin</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>Objection to Croydon Council's proposal to provide sites for travellers &amp; the building of houses, etc on green land in Shirley &amp; other areas. No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4036/01/016/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Ms S Wheeler-Kiley</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>We certainly need additional secondary school places in certain parts of the borough, but there isn't a shortage of secondary school places in the New Addington area. I will therefore be objecting to the de-designation of this land as Green Belt and the use of this site for a secondary school. No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools.
- Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land.
- This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

02 September 2016 Page 1092 of 4384
Another proposal I object to is the de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (most people refer to this site as Rowdown Fields) so that it can be used for a new secondary school (pages 186-187, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 636).

No change There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

I have lived all my life in New Addington. I love the fact we have wood and greenland all around us and you are stripping OUR land from us which is ment to be protected GREENBELT LAND!

It seems to me that everything now days has a price regardless of the Law and certain things arnt adhered to when it suits.

I OBJECT STRONGLY to what you are suggesting and do NOT want to turn around and see concrete blocks all around me with limited views of the sky and the trees and green grass. DO NOT take this away from us.

No change There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4099/01/006/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Vivienne Murray</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>We need more housing further out from Croydon and surrounding we are already becoming overcrowded - don’t spoil our landscapes by building on Green Belt land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4104/01/016/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Terrence &amp; Jacqueline Spriggs</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>We certainly need additional secondary school places in certain parts of the borough, but there isn’t a shortage of secondary school places in the New Addington area. I will therefore be objecting to the de-designation of this land as Green Belt and the use of this site for a secondary school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4104/01/016/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Terrence &amp; Jacqueline Spriggs</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cllr S Brew

Object DM32.2 636

I object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews:

- Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662;
- Land to the west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, site reference 636.

The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SPT 2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

Mr David Hazzard

Object DM32.2 636

The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.

No change
Councillor M Fisher

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM32.2 636

I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews:

- Land to the west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, site reference 636.
- The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

Mr T.C Martin

Object: DM32.2 636

The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.

No change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM32.2 636</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4163/01/002/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mrs J Webb</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.2 636</td>
<td>I wish to object to the de-designation of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference number 636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4172/01/003/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr B Cooke</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.2 636</td>
<td>I oppose to the de-designation of green belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference number 636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.2 636</td>
<td>The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Object | DM32.2 636 | The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school. | No change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. |
4183/01/002/DM32.2/O G A Dale
Object
DM32.2
636
The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.
No change
There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

4185/01/002/DM32.2/O L Gorrie
Object
DM32.2
636
The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.
No change
There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

4187/01/004/DM32.2/C Mr Mark Tatum
Object
DM32.2
636
object to the de-designation of Green Belt on land to the west of Timebridge Community Centre
No change
The site has met the criteria for the de-designation of Green Belt and has been identified to meet the need for school places in the borough. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Number</th>
<th>Objecting Party</th>
<th>DM32.2 Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4210/01/005/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr K Arnold</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Center and the east of Lodge Lane so that can it be used for a new school.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4219/01/002/DM32.2/C</td>
<td>Mr R.C Syred</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>Object to the de-designation of Green Belt on land to the west of Timebridge Community Centre</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Susan Piggott

Object

DM32.2 636

The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr & Mrs White

Object

DM32.2 636

The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Mr &amp; Mrs Galer</th>
<th>DM32.2 636</th>
<th>Object to the de-designation of Green Belt on land to the west of Timebridge Community Centre</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Jaques</td>
<td>DM32.2 636</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Object DM32.2 636</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4246/01/002/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs McManus</td>
<td><strong>Object DM32.2 636</strong></td>
<td>The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.</td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4246/01/002/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Grinham</td>
<td><strong>Object DM32.2 636</strong></td>
<td>The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.</td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr & Mrs Rasell

Object DM32.2 636

The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr & Mrs Westbrook

Object DM32.2 636

The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr & Mrs Worman

Object to the de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

---

Mr D Payne

Object to the de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM32.2</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Mrs A Dada</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Mr E Mills</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr G Drinkwater
Object
DM32.2 636

The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

---

Mr G Meacock
Object
DM32.2 636

The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Object: The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM32.2 636</th>
<th>I object to the de-designation of green belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Page 1109 of 4384</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr P Cornish

Object

DM32.2 636

The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr & Mrs Rasbrook & Pickford

Object

DM32.2 636

The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr W Pook

Object

DM32.2  636

The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mrs I Pegrum

Object

DM32.2  636

The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mrs J M Martin

Object

DM32.2
636

The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr & Ms Sagar & Allen

Object

DM32.2
636

The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
The de-designation of Green Belt to the west of Timebridge Community Centre and the east of Lodge Lane (reference no.636) so that it can be used for a new secondary school.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and bus interchange and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

“Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.”

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough (which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is), the site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Hidden in the depths of the documents without any detailed maps and no backing documentation are plans to allocate Traveller sites: Addington, Shirley, South Croydon

Ref no
755 Pearl Tree Farm & Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane Gypsy and traveller site
502 Coombe Farm, Oaks Road Gypsy and traveller site
661 Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane Gypsy and traveller site

There is no reference to any national mechanism for rating such sites, so has Croydon invented a scoring regime without any accreditation? There should be a review including increased weighting for needs for transport, education and health facilities for all sites suitable for 15+ pitches with site area greater than 4.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number ID</th>
<th>Site Area</th>
<th>Nos of pitches at 500 m² each</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>15+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>15+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>15+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>15+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635</td>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>15+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>661</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>15+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Addiscombe Residents Association

**Object**

Croydon has very few green places that are actually loved and residents are proud of so they need to be left as they are or enhanced. The proposal to place travellers site is not acceptable. These sites are stated by the Council to be in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. Also these sites are far from schools and shops therefore not suitable for the proposed change of use.

**The site should not be allocated as gypsy and traveller site.**

**Change**

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0120/02/21/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Addiscombe Residents Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0122/05/007/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mrs Hilary Chelminski Addiscombe &amp; Shirley Park RA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Object**

Soundness - Consistent with National

3. the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:

- Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502;
- Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; and
- Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 755;

As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

“Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

**Change**

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr Tarsem Flora
Flora Associates

Object  DM32.2
755

We note the council comment "should not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the biodiversity of the borough. In spite of this we feel that the 3 sites that are being offered will have a biodiversity impact. I have received many comments on the wrong choice of sites, but do understand that the choice is limited. Any chance of a review?"

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Ms H Farley

Object  DM32.2
755

I am emailing to formally object to your worrying proposals to build 3 gypsy traveller sites in Croydon on Green Belt sites, and your proposals to build housing on some of our precious green spaces and back gardens. We have to protect our green belt at all costs, and we feel that as residents that we are under constant attack having to protect land which is sacrosanct. You can’t just keep changing the goal posts to suit your purposes. I have lived in the area all my life and have never been so alarmed about council proposals. It is hugely stressful for residents, who use and appreciate the green spaces, to be threatened with your proposals. I fully support and agree with the objections raised by my MP Gavin Barwell, and ask you to reconsider your plans to prevent irreversible damage to Croydon and its green spaces.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mrs Mira Armour
HOME Residents Association

Object  DM32.2
755

similar to REP 4
Gypsy/traveller sites: OBJECT
Croydon has very few green places that are actually loved and residents are proud of so they need to be left as they are or enhanced. The proposal to place travelers site is not acceptable. Also, these sites are far from schools and shops therefore not suitable.

Reference 502: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road – within Lloyds Park
Reference 661: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane – with Coombe Tea Room
Reference 755: Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane;

These sites are stated by the Council to be in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 0391/01/01/04/DM32.2/O | Mrs Mira Armour | HOME Residents Association | DM32.2 755 | similar to REP 4 Gypsy/traveler sites: OBJECT Croydon has very few green places that are actually loved and residents are proud of so they need to be left as they are or enhanced. The proposal to place travelers site is not acceptable. Also, these sites are far from schools and shops therefore not suitable.
Reference 502: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road – within Lloyds Park
Reference 661: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane – with Coombe Tea Room
Reference 755: Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane;
These sites are stated by the Council to be in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. It has also been found unsuitable as part of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment due to high risk of surface water flooding.
As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use. |
| 0431/01/003/DM32.2/O | Mr S Williams | Object | DM32.2 755 | The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/traveller site (site reference 755)                                                                 |
| Change     | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use. |
Whilst we welcome the approach to meeting these two Vision elements:

- **A Sustainable City**: A place that sets the pace amongst London boroughs on promoting environmental sustainability and where the natural environment forms the arteries and veins of the city.
- **A Caring City**: A place noted for its safety, openness and community spirit where all people are welcome to live and work and where individuals and communities feel empowered to deliver solutions for themselves.

London Wildlife Trust is concerned at the assessment undertaken to identify potential new travellers' sites (Assessment and Selection of sites for Gypsy and Travellers, Evidence for the Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (P&A Options), August 2015). It sets out criteria and scoring for the assessment of sites in Table 1.

**For Green Belt/MOL:**
- No built form -10
- Built form -5
- Not GB/MOL +10

There is no +5 score amber or green. Yet for the GB/MOL scoring of each site in Table 5, a score in amber of +5 is sometimes used. This is incorrect as it overscores sites by 10 points (i.e. +5 when it should be -5). Therefore the accumulated site scores in Table 8.2 are incorrect.

London Wildlife Trust has particular concerns over one of the 'preferred' sites (755, Pear Tree Farm), in the evidence report. We are managers of three nature reserves in immediate proximity of the site: Hutchinson’s Bank, Threecorner Grove (both with entrances on the opposite side of Featherbed Lane), and Chapel Bank (which is to the immediate south). All three sites are identified as a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation, consist of nationally important habitats (chalk grassland, ancient woodland), and are a statutory Local Nature Reserve (LNR).

Our experience of nature reserve management with travellers has not been wholly positive; some of our other nature reserves have been occupied and/or damaged. Reserves which have been adjacent to travellers sites have experienced high levels of anti-social behaviour, such as fly-tipping and scrambling.

Two of the above reserves are grazed with livestock, and our experience elsewhere in London suggests that travellers often illegally...
(fly-) graze their stock (usually ponies) which is very difficult to control, makes it difficult for us meet our conservation objectives, and not an issue our volunteers or staff would want to deal with on a daily basis.

In our view the choice of Pear Tree Farm would directly and adversely impact on our ability to continue to conserve these reserves with the resources we are likely to bring to bear. This would very likely result in a net adverse impact on their biodiversity qualities, thereby not helping to meet the Council’s Strategic Objective 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0790/01/139/DM32.2/O</th>
<th>Mr Mathew Frith</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>DM32.2 755</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it no longer be considered for this use.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Wildlife Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1112/01/004/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>New Addington Pathfinders</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The draft Local Plan identifies Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site (pages 188-189, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 755). The Council acknowledges that this site is in the Green Belt. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. I object to this.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. The site is also some distance from public services. If the Council needs to increase the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough – it should develop the existing site off the Purley Way.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I am appalled by the proposal to create traveller sites on Green Belt land.

I wish to object to the use of Peat Tree Farm as a Traveller site within the designated Greenbelt. Loss of Greenbelt will allow further urban sprawl and increase atmospheric pollution in Croydon.

I wish to object to the use of Pear Tree Farm as a Traveller site within the designated Greenbelt. Loss of Greenbelt will allow further urban sprawl and increase atmospheric pollution in Croydon.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/01/002/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>D Northcoote</td>
<td>Object DM32.2 755</td>
<td>Please note that my family and I are absolutely against a site being set up. We had trouble with ‘travellers’ very recently and are very aware of the trouble they cause.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Grahame Lamb</td>
<td>Object DM32.2 755</td>
<td>I wish to notify you of my objections to some of the Council’s proposals in the Croydon Local Plan, which has recently been brought to my attention. As I understand from Gavin Barwell MP (Croydon Central) there are plans to build three gypsy/traveller camps in the Green Belt (eg Coombe Farm), and to allow large housing developments on some of our precious green spaces. Once gone these are gone forever. The character of parts of the Borough could be dramatically changed for the worse and this might discourage people from living, working, shopping and investing in the area. Whilst I acknowledge that there is a need for more accommodation in Croydon it is preferable to utilise effectively those brownfield sites which I am given to understand do exist in the area. More brownfield sites might become available in the future and I should like to think that the Council is establishing and/or maintaining and updating a list of suitable locations.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/01/013/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Jane &amp; Paul Riley</td>
<td>Object DM32.2 755</td>
<td>Objection to the use of either of those locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: Traveler sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 755; As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

We want to object to the locating of three traveller sites in and around South Croydon. The building of these sites on green land is wrong and will change significantly the area we live in. We live in Gravel Hill between Featherbed Lane and Coombe Lodge Nurseries and we will therefore be impacted by two if not all three of these sites. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development" and the Council’s approach is clearly a breach of this policy.

Gypsy and Traveller sites should not be located in the Green Belt.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.

If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy 6 of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites', published by the Government in August, states very clearly that 'Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development'. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the 'Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers'. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of 'extensive political consultation'. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be 6. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr Charles Marriott

Object DM32.2 755

objection to extremely worrying proposals to build 3 gypsy traveller sites in Croydon on Green Belt sites.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Gavin Barwell

Object DM32.2 755

Objection to the use to the site 755 Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage on Featherbed Lane for a gypsy and traveller site

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

David Newman

Object DM32.2 755

Respondent draws the Council’s attention to Policy E of the Planning for Traveller Sites published by the Government. In addition to this, the following questions are posed:
1. What is the cost to the Council of clearing the existing sites and the installation of whatever is required to make the sites legal and habitable?
2. Regarding Pear Tree Farm, will the existing owner have to bear some or all of the cost of restoring and clearing the land from all the material, including any toxic waste which has been deposited?
3. What will be the impact on local schools?
4. Can local health services cope with the influx of the travellers?
5. Why are there so many sites being proposed in such a small geographic area?

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object

I object to the proposal as Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage on Featherbed Lane is Green Belt Land. Policy E of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August states very clearly that “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. Previous use does not mitigate this policy.

The close proximity of the proposed sites to one another has not been taken into account. All three sites are proposed for a small area in the South of the Borough which seems to be a successful site in Purley Way which could be expanded. None of these sites proposed has good access to schools, shops and other services. The consequent need for private transport goes against environmental and climate initiatives. Government Guidelines ask that local planning authorities policies ensure that children can attend school on a regular basis. These three sites are well away from schools, particularly primary schools and clearly do not reflect the aims of Guidelines or facilitate regular school attendance.

The number of Gypsy/Traveller sites in Croydon is to increase from 1 to 4 when our recent experience locally is of travellers responsible for damage, parking illegally, leaving piles of rubbish behind when they are moved on and even engaged in firearms confrontation with the police.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object Soundness - Justified

All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Furthermore, Policy E of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites', published by the Government in August, states very clearly that 'Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development'. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the 'Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers'. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of 'extensive political consultation'. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria.

Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object Soundness - DM32.2

1.1 Object to use of Pear Tree Farm site 755, as stated in Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015 that 'Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development'. Previous use does not mitigate against this policy.

1.2 Featherbed Lane is a narrow rural road with a number of blind bends, making it unsuitable for large vehicles. The Local Plan does not take sufficient account of the proposed increased danger for motorists and other road users. None of the three sites have good access to schools, shops and other services. The consequent need for private transport goes against environment and transport initiatives. Government Guidelines ask that local planning authorities' policies ensure that children can attend school on a regular basis. These three sites are well away from schools, particularly primary schools and clearly do not reflect the aims of the Guidelines or facilitate regular school attendance.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Objection to Site 755 for Travellers site as goes against Government policy.

Objection to location as narrow road, Featherbed Lane, leading to the site. None of the three sites have good access to schools, shops and other services. The consequent need for private transport goes against environment and transport initiatives. Government Guidelines ask that local planning authorities' policies ensure that children can attend school on a regular basis. These three sites are well away from schools, particularly primary schools and clearly do not reflect the aims of the Guidelines or facilitate regular school attendance.

None of the three sites take into account the need for good access to roads as in CLP1.1 Para 4.19. Oaks Road, Coombe Road, Conduit Lane and Featherbed Lane are unsuitable for safe increased movement and manoeuvring of larger vehicles, especially entering and exiting these sites.

DM32.2

02 September 2016
The site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites. I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political…consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

The site should not be allocated as a Gypsy and Traveller site.

I object to the planned new sites for travellers, why not expand the site they have at present, on the same basis as the expansion of the housing that is being mooted for estates such as Forestgate and New Addington. I object to Travellers being treated differently. Why should they be given new private prime sites?

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object: The application site is not served by public transport. There are no shopping of other facilities i.e. doctor’s surgeries within the recommended walking distance of the site. The PPTS advises that sustainability is a test for the suitability of sites for Gypsies and Travellers. The current site would fail this test. Furthermore there is no public footpath along Featherbed Lane for pedestrians. This is significant for their safety.

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object: The site adjoins an extensive area of Ancient Woodland. Natural England make it clear that when proposing development that there should be a minimum buffer strip of 15 metres between a development and Ancient Woodland.

continue with current use of the site

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object: Attached at Appendix 2 is an extract from the adopted South London Waste Plan being the front cover and the site allocation details of part of Pear Tree Farm as a Waste Transfer Site. The adjoining commercial vehicle parking area and vehicle repair workshop are also essential to the use. The loss of the waste transfer facility would be contrary to the South London Waste Plan. Such sites are safeguarded because it is difficult to obtain planning permission.

continue the current use of the site

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object: The Council say that they are not aware of any developer interest for the site. However the owners have been approached by an operator that was prepared to offer them £4 million for the waste transfer site. They rejected this offer out of hand two years ago. They have no desire or intention to sell the waste transfer site or the remainder of land. The owners are committed to opposing the use of their site suggested by the Council and will oppose any such allocation at the forthcoming Examinations in Public and oppose any Compulsory Purchase notice as appropriate.

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2163/04/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Ron and Sam Smith</td>
<td><strong>Object</strong> The site is located in the Green Belt. The revised Planning Policy for Traveller sites (PPTS) issued in August 2015 makes it clear that Traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The National Practice Guidance (PPG) makes it clear that the need to undertake the sequential test falls upon the Council to undertake when plan making. No evidence has been produced to demonstrate how this was undertaken and what sites were rejected. <strong>Change</strong> The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2163/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Ron and Sam Smith</td>
<td><strong>Object</strong> Further to the above I am writing to you on behalf of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage, Featherbed Lane Mr. Ron and Mr. Sam Smith. They strongly object to the proposed option to allocate site no. 775 as a Gypsy and Traveller site for 15-20 pitches. In this regard we attach the completed response form together with a brief initial statement as to why the site is not suitable nor deliverable. <strong>Change</strong> The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2163/03/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Ron and Sam Smith</td>
<td><strong>Object</strong> No, as the owners have no desire to sell the site having rejected an offer of £4 million for part of the site. <strong>Change</strong> The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2163/04/006/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Ron and Sam Smith</td>
<td><strong>Object</strong> There are 26 businesses that operate from the site employing in excess of 140 workers. Many of the businesses have taken out loans to purchase new vehicles on the basis that they have a settled base to operate from. The loss of employment would be contrary to the adopted employment policies in the Croydon Plan. <strong>Change</strong> The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2163/04/007/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Ron and Sam Smith</td>
<td><strong>Object</strong> The only reason that one of the owners and his wife live at the site in Pear Tree Farm Cottage is because their business operates from the site and to ensure proper night time security. They have no desire to move as they want to continue to monitor their business interests at the site <strong>Change</strong> The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2163/04/005/DM32.2/O Mr Ron and Sam Smith
WS Planning and Architecture
Object DM32.2 755
The site is contaminated and will require decontamination in the event that the preferred option for a Gypsy and Traveller site is pursued. It is estimated that the cost of £250,000
Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

2163/02/001/DM32.2/C Mr Ron and Sam Smith
WS Planning and Architecture
Comment DM32.2 755
map of the ancient woodland
Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

2163/05/001/DM32.2/C Mr Ron and Sam Smith
WS Planning and Architecture
Comment DM32.2 755
South London Waste Plan attached as a supplementary information to Representation 4
Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

2163/04/009/DM32.2/O Mr Ron and Sam Smith
WS Planning and Architecture
Object DM32.2 755
The proposal for 15-20 pitches is contrary to established Government Guidance for the layout of Gypsy and Traveller pitches.
Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

2164/02/001/DM32.2/O Mr John Mills
Object DM32.2 755
Croydon Council’s plans to build three gypsy/traveller sites in the Green Belt, allow housing on some of our precious green spaces and back gardens and completely change the character of parts of the borough. I agree with Gavin Barwell With regards this destruction of our green belt land.
Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr John Mills

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM32.2 755

The respondent objects to the proposal to site three gypsy and travellers sites in the green belt, allowing housing on some of the precious green space and back gardens and would completely change the character of the borough. The sewage and water is up to the limit.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Anne Barnes

Object

DM32.2 755

I am writing to object to the following:

1 The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/travellers site (ref No 775)

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Anne Barnes

Object

DM32.2 755

I am writing to object to the following:

6 The use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries as a location for a gypsy/travellers site (ref No 755)

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr Rodney Beale

Object

DM32.2 755

Objection to the proposals for gypsy and travellers as not the most appropriate for Croydon and unsuitable for the lovely country area of Croydon visited throughout the year by families, residents and visitors. The approach is deliverable but undesirable and will ruin the only real part of the country area in Croydon, which grows with housing and office blocks almost daily. The preferred approach will not enable sustainable development as it will spoil the existing areas where sites are suggested and which will never be the same again. It will also affect schooling, health, and cause disturbance around all areas. If Croydon must comply, areas such as Purley Way or an extension of facilities at Leyhams Farm should be the correct options.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I understand that Croydon Council are considering within their draft local plan the establishment of gypsy/traveller sites at Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane. These sites are on Green Belt Land and this is clearly in breach of the Government’s planning policy for Traveller Sites on Green Belt Land.

I object in the strongest possible terms to these proposals which appear completely ill considered.

While I understand that Croydon needs to provide a site for travellers, this site is not appropriate. The entrance is on a small country lane that is used as cut through and is very busy. It is also used by a youth group that has a motorcycle track and a bus parked there full of youth equipment. New Addington already has Layhams Farm which has previously caused problems.

This site is on a small country lane that has quite a blind entrance. The area around it has Hutchinson conservation area, a local nature reserve and a metropolitan important site for conservation. The site at the moment houses a dirt track for motorbikes from Croydon Auto Bike Schama that train young people that have been involved in riding them illegally or have a passion for them to maintain and ride off road safely. What happens to them? New Addington has a huge problem with motorbike being ridden on green spaces and on the roads by underage youths, surely this is reason enough not to consider using this space. The site is a long way from shops, doctors, schools etc. and therefore it is not I feel a suitable site.

Pearl Tree Farm Travellers Site
New Addington has suffered the anti-social behaviour and roaming travellers around the estate, plus those who are "permanent" at the Hayham Farm area on our doorstep for a long time. Featherbed Lane is very fast and dangerous for a site with many children. Not particularly near health or retail facilities and the local schools are very small. Please consider site other than Pearl Tree Farm.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
This is wholly against the wishes of the local community whom I speak on behalf of with reference to the NPPF which makes it entirely clear that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. It is absolutely against national planning policy for Croydon Council to ignore this fundamental aim. Forcefully imposing a traveller's site on designated Green Belt land which is also ancient woodland and private property is wholly unacceptable and unsupported. The Council's own Local Plan Policies Map designates that land as a 'Site of Nature Conservation Importance' and a 'Local Nature Reserve' which affords the land here with absolute policy protection against this proposed use. Further to this, the Council's own adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance No.5 'Nature Conservation' acknowledges that maintaining a variety of species and plants is one of the most important goals of sustainable development. The proposed use of Pear Tree Farm is wholly against the sustainability and biodiversity goals. Save for criteria D (flood risk) the site fails on all of the policy criteria for which site must comply in order to be suitable to accommodate a traveller/gypsy community as set out SP2. Under appendix 2 the Council has stated where the deliverable is to provide 10 new pitches for Gypsy and Travellers that the Council will work with Registered Providers and public sector landowners in Croydon to identify other potential for new pitches. This is clearly not the approach being taken where private landowners are under threat from Purchase, fully against their wishes and interests. The proposed use would also considerable impact upon the amenity currently enjoyed by local residents in the vicinity of Pear Tree Farm and upon this section of country lanes whereby the additional vehicular journeys would cause considerable impact. The suggestion is that the Council identifies far more suitable land for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation at sites along the Purley Way, which is far more suitable as an urbanised area to meet this need. Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM32.2</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs A.M. &amp; K.M. Bean</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>I am writing to strongly object to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site - reference number 755.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Cole</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>I believe the proposed traveller sites are inappropriate in these Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soundness -</td>
<td></td>
<td>Belt areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites', published by the Government in August, states very clearly that 'Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development'. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the 'Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers'. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of 'extensive political consultation'. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria.

Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be 6. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2450/02/010/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Jeffrey</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I will be objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is). The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2510/01/002/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Karen Fitzgerald</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>A traveller's site on Green Belt land which is also ancient woodland and private property is wholly unacceptable and unsupported. A Gypsy and Traveller site should not be permitted on ancient woodland and private property. The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2510/01/003/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Karen Fitzgerald</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>The Local Plan Policies Map designates the land as a ‘Site of Nature Conservation Importance’ and a ‘Local Nature Reserve’ which affords the land here absolute policy protection against the proposed use. The Council’s own adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance No.5 ‘Nature Conservation’ acknowledges that maintaining a variety of species and plants (biodiversity) is one of the most important goals of sustainable development. The proposed use of Pear Tree Farm is wholly against these sustainability and biodiversity goals. A Gypsy and Traveller site should not be proposed for a Site of Nature Conservation Importance. The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adopted SP2 states that proposals for sites should meet the following criteria:

A. Should be available and deliverable;
B. Should have good access to essential services including health and education facilities and access to local shops;
C. Have good means of access from roads and be near bus routes and other transport nodes;
D. Not be located in areas of high flood risk; and
E. Should not have acceptable adverse impact on the biodiversity of the borough.

The site only meets Criteria D.

Pear Tree Farm is not suitable for a Gypsy and Traveller site based on the criteria set out in SP2.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM32.2</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2541/01/010/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Ms Susanne Million Object</td>
<td>DM32.2</td>
<td>Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 755 for the use as a Gypsy/Traveller site.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2546/01/004/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Robert &amp; Patricia Cole Object</td>
<td>DM32.2</td>
<td>The plans for travellers sites on the local green belt are unacceptable and will change the character of the area and also overburden the already problematic local road infrastructure.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2563/02/003/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Sean McDermott Object</td>
<td>DM32.2</td>
<td>Objects to the site being used as a gypsy and traveller site.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2571/01/002/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Jennifer Radford Object</td>
<td>DM32.2</td>
<td>I would also like to be provided with further details of the following matters that have been used as reasons to discount many of the proposed sites that scored significantly higher than the Site and site no. 755 in the Proposal:</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2571/01/003/DM32.2/C</td>
<td>Jennifer Radford Comment</td>
<td>DM32.2</td>
<td>I would also like to be provided with further details of the following matters that have been used as reasons to discount many of the proposed sites that scored significantly higher than the Site and site no. 120: Proposed community facility in the Proposal:</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>I would also like to be provided with further details of the following matters that have been used as reasons to discount many of the proposed sites that scored significantly higher than the Site and site no. Site 522: Proposed district energy centre in the Proposal.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Object | DM32.2 755 | Residential access to essential services would be by car only as there are no tarmac footpaths to/from the site - a huge problem for mothers/adults and buggies. Site currently has potentially dangerous entrance/exit point which is close to a blind bend with a history of accidents - one fatal. Proposed location will have an unacceptable and adverse impact on the unique biodiversity of this area due to the Council's appalling reputation in managing and monitoring the current Pear Tree Farm operation. Any intentions on your part to effectively monitor and manage a travellers site will be met with a complete lack of confidence. Subsequent abuse of the site is inevitable. The cost of purchasing the land and effecting decontamination procedures to make it fit for human habitation is prohibitive - and this comes at a time when you announce £90 million budget cut since 2010. £7 million is a current estimate of securing and executing this proposal. This probably excludes additional costs which will be required for road and access improvements. Current (narrow) road access from Tandridge is totally unsuitable for HGV's and trailers - as is the stretch of Featherbed Lane at the 'pinch point' by Silverwood and Addington Court golf courses. Without private transport, residents will be hampered in accessing medical area/drop-in centres. The site is within both Croydon and Surrey health authorities. Gypsy and traveller sites are not appropriate in the green belt. In the preferred option it states that only part of its built form would be accommodated within the area of the original buildings - one could easily assume from this that there would be an increase in the number of buildings on the site which no amount of landscaping could conceal. Respondent also questions the | Change | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use. |
Croydon has very few green places that are actually loved and residents are proud of so they need to be left as they are or enhanced. The proposal to place travellers site is not acceptable. These sites are stated by the Council to be in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. Also these sites are far from schools and shops therefore not suitable for the proposed change of use.

The site should not be allocated as gypsy and traveller site.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object 755

I object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:

- Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site 661
- Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site 502
- Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane, site 755

As all three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political’ consultation. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be 6. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

Change 755

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

DM32.2
Objects to all gypsy and traveller sites (as chairman of Campion Close Freeholders Limited and Parkland Management Company Limited which comprise 75 properties). The proposals conflict with Policy E 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' which states that temporary or permanent sites are inappropriate development in the green belt. What happens if the travelling community outgrow these sites? Surely the many industrial sites in the area would be more suitable, or Valley Park?

The proposals would clearly harm the green belt and would have a negative impact on the environment and wildlife in Coombe Wood, Shirley Hills and Lloyd Park some of which is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest and it would create a precedent for further erosion of our valuable local amenity.

Coombe Road and Coombe Lane are already very busy roads. These proposals would exacerbate this problem if significant road improvements were not carried out. These proposals would also exert pressure on local services that are already stretched. The junctions at Coombe Road, Oaks Road and Conduit Lane are already dangerous.

What social and economic benefits would a gypsy and travelling community bring to the existing local community in this area as well?

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I am writing to object to: The use of the following locations as traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane Site reference 661, Coombe Farm off Oaks Road Site reference 502, Pear Tree Farm Featherbed Lane 755. Because these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. To build so close to award winning gardens such as Coombe Gardens, Heathfield or a picturesque Wedding Venue such as Coombe Farm will be detrimental for the local businesses and residents. People from the wider area also enjoy these places. People travel from miles around - even by the coachload - to see these parks in Croydon. If they are built right up to with mobile homes or prefabs and other semi-permanent residences, they cannot fail to appear less attractive. With regard to homes for Travellers, I do not wish to stereotype any group in our society, but first-hand experience of travellers staying recently in Sunken Lane has shown that they do not respect our precious green areas in the same way as the Heathfield and Ballards Farm residents do. I visited Sunken Lane after their recent departure and saw a bathroom suite, mattresses and piles of other waste including dirty nappies and rubbish dumped in and around the beautiful Shirley Hills area. Pathways were blocked and cars could not turn in Sunken lane. Street lights in the local area had been broken so that this fly-tipping could not be filmed by CCTV. In the days before, my sons had felt intimidated when travelling home from school by the travellers’ children and had to call me to collect them by car from the Coombe Rd tram stop. I took the time to visit the Layhams Farm Traveller site so that I could make an informed opinion and I was greeted by dogs off leads and groups of men gathering as soon as I approached. They did not trouble me, but I was made to feel decidedly unwelcome. Outside of the area some of the teenagers were crouched in the road and were smashing the top off bottles and then sprinkling glass in the road where cars were passing. If the sites proposed are to be like this, then I would be very unhappy if the plans were to go ahead.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
The more specific site allocations represent a large reduction in the amount of designated and non-designated open space. While we acknowledge the need to build new homes and associated infrastructure such as schools, Croydon's growing population also needs quality open spaces for all the human amenity and ecosystem services which they provide.

This site still meets the criteria for inclusion within the green belt and therefore its allocation for a Gypsy and Traveller Site constitutes inappropriate development. Any proposals for development at this site must meet the NPPF, in that the existing footprint of buildings should not be exceeded. We are also concerned that the proposed development would lead to the relocation of the existing waste facility which must not lead to loss of green space elsewhere.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Use of Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a gypsy/traveller site.

Is similar to standard rep 10 but includes mention of the need to relocate a scouts encampment in the vicinity and if the site was proposed and offered to the travellers and refused by them will this be the same as people on the council list get pushed to the bottom.

There is concern that sites that have been identified as locations for gypsies and travellers are considered inappropriate in green belt and constitute a dangerous precedent.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Such development is in breach of Policy Eat Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that ‘Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites now, and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough. If the number of Gypsy/Traveller sites really needs to be increased by this amount then a more appropriate location would be around the existing site at Purley Way. The positioning of a Gypsy/Traveller site adjacent to the car park for Coombe Woods, between the Chateau Restaurant and the Hotel/restaurant, would probably deter me from using any of these attractions.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I have restricted my objections to those plans that primarily affect the area of Shirley I which I live, but the same objections apply to other proposals in other parts of the borough.
Object

DM32.2 755

We wish to object to the proposal Gypsy/Traveller site Ref 755 for the following reasons:

- Sustainability of the proposed site and the need for any such provision

The current proposals seem to have been produced in isolation from the other neighbouring Councils as the above clearly indicated that nearby councils such as Sevenoaks, Tandridge and Bromley have a higher demand. Proposals in the Housing and Planning Bill 2015-16 are to remove the statutory requirement on local authorities to assess the specific accommodation needs of Gypsy and Travellers - the emphasis being that when authorities are carrying out a review of housing need that it considers the needs of all the people residing in or resorting to their district, without any references to Gypsies or Traveller.

We hope that the Council will consider the needs of our neighbours and local services and businesses as weighty as those of the Gypsy and Traveller people. There is a lot of opposition to the proposed site from people currently residing in the district due to the threat of the Green Belt, increase traffic and increased pressure on local services.

The Assessment selection for the sites for Gypsies and Travellers scored lowly would have resulted in an acceptance that none of the sites are really particularly suitable and that the Council will need to liaise with other Councils if determined to make provision.

With regard to the sustainability of the sites, following on utilising the scoring assessment, we strongly object on a number of grounds:
- All sites lie within the Green Belt. This raises concerns about the impact on the Green Belt as a result of having to provide amenity blocks, communal facilities, safe play areas and areas for grazing horses.
- All three sites are unsuitable because they do not have good means to transport.
- Sites should have access to essential services including health and education facilities and access to local shops. None of the sites have good access to local schools (the nearest primary is over subscribed and the nearest post office is 1.7 miles away).

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr Christopher Knight

Object

DM32.2

755

The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr E Tilly

Soundness - Justified

DM32.2

755

Object to the travellers sites all 3 are in Green Belt and one next to a site of Nature Conservation. This would constitute inapppropriate development and is against Govt guidance.

None of these sites have easy access to Local infrastructure

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Tal Kleiman

Tandridge District Council

Comment

DM32.2

755

The document proposes the allocation of the above site for between 15 and 20 Traveller pitches. The site, as you will be aware, lies on the border of our two authorities. We recognise that this proposed allocation is of concern to nearby residents in Tandridge and therefore we ask that any comments from neighbouring communities are taken seriously, including those from Chelsham and Farleigh Parish Council. Whilst the site is within the Green Belt, we acknowledge that due to its current brownfield nature and screenining, it is possible that the redevelopment of the site would have a lesser or similar impact on the Green Belt than it does now.

It would have been beneficial had the Council, in its Sustainability Appraisal Report, been able to allow for an easy comparison of all of the potential allocations, including proposed Gypsy and Traveller sites. This would have been useful for those potentially affected by proposed allocations, including residents in Tandridge District, to understand why certain options had been prefered. Accordingly we would advise that efforts are made to present such information, in a simpler form, at the next stage of the plan making process.

At this stage we do not object to the aforementioned site being identified as a preferred option for allocation but do reserve the right to make alternative comments if further information is forthcoming as the plan progresses, or in response to detailed plans that would accompany any future planning application. We would advise that comments are sought from Surrey County Council, as Highways Authority for the area to the immediate south, in order to confirm that the site would not have an inappropriate impact on our local highway network.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
2772/01/003/DM32.2/O Ms Janet McQuade

Object

DM32.2

755

The Council acknowledges that the site is in the Green Belt (and one of the sites borders an SNCI). The Planning Policy for Traveller Sites states that traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The Council's approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Brownfield or industrial land should have been proposed not green belt. Why does the Council need to quadruple the number of sites for gypsy and travellers. The intention may be to do away with illegal encampments but may instead mean the area becomes a hub for travellers.

Why were no appropriate sites suggested for Coulsdon? Opening sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm will be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining owners. There is a lack of amenities close as hand. There are insufficient local infrastructure to accommodate the plans.

Other sites the council should reconsider instead of both Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm are:

- Expand existing permanent sites in Lathams Way off Beddington Farm Road
- Heath Clark playing fields, Stafford Rd, Waddon
- Timebridge Community Centre, Field Way, New Addington
- Land adjacent to 103 Goodeough Way, Old Coulsdon
- Wandle Road, car park, Wandle Rd, Croydon
- Land of former Croydon Airport runway, south of Imperial Way, Waddon
- Land adjacent to Ashburton playing fields at rear of 2-88 Colerdige Rd, Addiscombe
- By Pavilion Playing Fields, Purley Way
- Land south Of Threehalfpenny Woods, Kent Gate Way, Biddle Way
- Land west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, Elmside, Addington
- Cane Hill south part, Hollymeak Road, Portnalls Rd, Coulsdon

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

2774/01/003/DM32.2/O Cllr Susan Winborn

Object

DM32.2
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would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

London Borough of Croydon
Object Soundness - DM32.2 755

All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object Soundness - Justified 755

All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Traveller site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites', published by the Government in August, states very clearly that 'Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development'. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the 'Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers'. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of 'extensive political consultation'. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be 6. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

DM32.2
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The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Maureen Foster

Object

DM32.2 755

I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:

- Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 755;

As the Council acknowledges, these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough – which I would question – they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is);

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
John O'Neill

Object: Pear Tree & Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane, Addington:
- Detrimental to the amenities of adjoining owners.
- Inappropriate use of green belt land.
- Site that are located on green belt, considered to be inappropriate development for traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and against Government Policy (*Planning policy for Traveller Sites* DCLG, August 2015).
- Lack of relevant amenities close to hand.
- Insufficient Local Infrastructure to accommodate plans.
- Selection of proposed site should have bias towards brownfield or industrial land not green belt.
- Why are two sites in very close proximity to one another being proposed.
- Imbalance across the borough with all sites being proposed in the south of Croydon.
- Why not expand the existing permanent gypsy site in Lathams Way off Beddington Farm Road.
- If one has to select one of the proposed sites, the preference is for Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane.

Other sites that the Council should reconsider instead of both Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm are the following.

- 16 Heath Clark playing fields, Stafford Road, Waddon
- 120 Timerge Bridge Community Centre Field Way, New Addington
- 518 Land adjacent to 103 Goodenough Way, The Admirals Walk, Old Coulsdon
- 522 Wandle Road surface car park, Wandle Road, Croydon Opportunity Area
- 536 Land of farmer Croydon Airport runway, south of imperial way, Waddon
- 552 Land adjacent to Ashborough playing fields at rear of 2.88 Caledridge Road, Addiscombe
- 533 By Pavilion playing fields Purley Way, Waddon
- 632 Land south of Threehavenbury Woods, Kent Gate Way, Birdle Way, Addington
- 636 Land west of Timerge Bridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, Elmside, Addington
- 767 Cane Hill south part, Hollymeak Road/Portals Road, Coulsdon

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Our client is deeply concerned about the manner in which the Evidence for the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options) (“the Evidence Paper”) has been prepared. The scoring assessment applied by the Council is reductionist and disregards the wider context (for example outreach programme and supports) within which sites sit. Without that appreciation we do not consider that the Evidence Paper adequately supports the Council’s Strategic Objectives. The Evidence Paper identifies four “absolutes” for the initial screening. In the absence of any justification and evidence backed rationale behind these “absolutes” we are left to conclude that there is none. A site should be available and deliverable. We consider that to be an appropriate test in determining the suitability of a site for development. There is little explanation as to what factors the Council has taken into account for the purposes of scoring whether a site is deliverable—particularly over a 20 year period. No consideration is given to the use of CPO powers where a site for example could be suitable save for possible issues over deliverability. The use of CPO powers should be a consideration for the purposes of deliverability.

The existence of contamination cannot be considered in isolation. There does not appear to be any detailed analysis of whether the extent of contamination on some sites, and the costs of remediating that contamination, would render that site undeliverable in the plan period. A failure to acknowledge the need for sites to be located in proximity of public transport services does not support the principle of sustainable development.

In adopting this flawed approach the Council have failed to consider the contribution that smaller sites could make in delivering sites for gypsy and traveller communities. As a result, the initial screening process was biased towards larger sites despite the evidence base showing that such sites were not supported by the gypsy and traveller community. As a result, the Council has not properly considered if there are exceptional circumstances which justify any of the identified Green Belt sites coming forward for use as traveller sites.

To ensure transparency in the planning process the same tests should be applied to allocated sites and windfall sites.

For the reasons detailed above, the assessment proceeded from an erroneous starting point of “absolute” requirements that were neither justified nor supported by the Council’s existing gypsy and traveller policy. The Evidence Paper is lacking in detail, and the scoring criteria overly simplistic. As a result, the evidence put forward by the Council is lacking in transparency and is an unsound base for policy making.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object: Soundness - Justified

All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. I am concerned that all three sites are also some considerable walking distance away from GP practices, shops, schools, public transport and other local services which would be contrary to the Council’s Health and Wellbeing Strategy.

Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Having previously worked with gypsies and travellers on established sites in other boroughs, I agree in principle to Croydon meeting their obligations to provide sites and if these are properly managed they can benefit all residents as the travellers have a legal space and proper services and should not have recourse to encamp on public or private land and leave a substantial mess. However, I have concerns about the proposed site at Pear Tree Farm, Featherbed Lane, Addington. It would be situated in land designated Green Belt, with no local amenities, no public transport, shops, healthcare etc. which are all 1.6 miles away. Also in Appendix 1, Page 192 it states “Gypsy and Traveller pitches are initially considered in the same way as a site for housing as in planning terms it is the same use of land.” Therefore, surely if new houses would not be permitted on Green Belt, then a Gypsy/Traveller site should be treated in the same way. Is isolation and segregation the best way forward for a minority group?

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Traveller site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
This would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1996). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge sites suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political...consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 861 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985).

Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria.

Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be 6. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Support

I write in strong SUPPORT for the proposed development of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage as an additional travellers site. Living on Forestdale I am well aware of the nature of the local area and know this to be effectively an industrial site with no visual amenity value, green belt in name only. There has long been an obvious shortage of facilities for travellers in this area and I can think of no better location locally for such a facility.

Welcome support

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Traveller site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object

I have similar concerns about the proposed use of Pear Tree Farm (Table 11.5, reference 755, page 134) for a gypsy and traveller site. There is a substantial risk of major environmental damage to the surrounding area, both within Croydon and in the adjoining council area. It would also pose a risk for the scouting centre and golf courses in the area.

The site should not be allocated as a Gypsy and Traveller site.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object

I strongly object to the Council proposal for this very inappropriate traveller site at Pear Tree Farm on Featherbed Lane. My reasons are:

1. The consultation period is simply not long enough nor appropriate or in-depth given the vast impact this will have on thousands of us living in the community.
2. The site entrance is extremely hazardous and totally unsuitable for this proposal and the extra traffic will generate. It will cause accidents, delays and then cost millions to change the local road structure.
3. The council money wasted on this project is considerably disproportionate to any benefits for such a small number of families and is not good value - they could be housed for 1% of the money proposed.
4. The site is in a designated Green Belt area and so must not be developed. You could build a small site on your local Jubilee Gardens for a fraction of the cost and then the travellers will be close to shops and public transport and you could deal with any anti-social behavior easily as the policy station is close by.

Object

You could build a small site on your local Jubilee Gardens for a fraction of the cost and then the travellers will be close to shops and public transport and you could deal with any anti-social behavior easily as the policy station is close by.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Traveller site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object

You could build a small site on your local Jubilee Gardens for a fraction of the cost and then the travellers will be close to shops and public transport and you could deal with any anti-social behavior easily as the policy station is close by.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Traveller site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Andrew Green

Object

DM32.2
755

Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site with 15-20 pitches

I am strongly opposed to this proposal as it is a completely unsuitable area. As well as going against government guidelines that traveller sites should not be built on Green Belt land, I object to the building of permanent traveller sites. Local residents' money should not be going on providing services in this area. This is a group of people who chose to live outside of convention and have a proven record of paying extremely little in to central funds, those funds should not therefore be used to subsidise their chosen way of life. The area highlighted is close to where travellers turned up in the last year (the field opposite Courtwood Lane) and local residents had them removed within 48 hours. They had broken in and in a very short space of time covered the area in filth, used nappies being one example. This is not the sort of people who should be having areas turned over to them by our council using funds acquired from local residents.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr David Brown

Object

Soundness - Justified
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I object to the location of Gypsy and Traveller pitches on Featherbed Lane as it is Green Belt and contrary to government policy. The site is also some distance from public services.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
This is wholly against the wishes of the local community whom I speak on behalf of with reference to the NPPF which makes it entirely clear that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. It is absolutely against national planning policy for Croydon Council to ignore this fundamental aim. Forcefully imposing a traveller's site on designated Green Belt land which is also ancient woodland and private property is wholly unacceptable and unsupported. The Council's own Local Plan Policies Map designates that land as a 'Site of Nature Conservation Importance' and a 'Local Nature Reserve' which affords the land here with absolute policy protection against this proposed use. Further to this, the Council's own adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance No.5 'Nature Conservation' acknowledges that maintaining a variety of species and plants is one of the most important goals of sustainable development. The proposed use of Pear Tree Farm is wholly against the sustainability and biodiversity goals. Save for criteria D (flood risk) the site fails on all of the policy criteria for which site must comply in order to be suitable to accommodate a traveller/gypsy community as set out SP2. Under appendix 2 the Council has stated where the deliverable is to provide 10 new pitches for Gypsy and Travellers that the Council will work with Registered Providers and public sector landowners in Croydon to identify other potential for new pitches. This is clearly not the approach being taken where private landowners are under threat from Purchase, fully against their wishes and interests. The proposed use would also considerable impact upon the amenity currently enjoyed by local residents in the vicinity of Pear Tree Farm and upon this section of country lanes whereby the additional vehicular journeys would cause considerable impact. The suggestion is that the Council identifies far more suitable land for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation at sites along the Purley Way, which is far more suitable as an urbanised area to meet this need.

Object

755

DM32.2

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2912/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mrs J Webb</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>I object to the use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy and traveller site. Why do law payers have to pay for any site for non-paying non-resident travellers? Really not happy at any site near Forestdale and I am sure the people right near them won't be happy about this either.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2918/01/003/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Michael Sims</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>I further understand that it is proposed that Pear Tree Farm on Featherbed Lane will be transformed into a site for travellers notwithstanding that the property is on the Green Belt. The use for this purpose is clearly deemed inappropriate by Government Planning Policy.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2931/01/014/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr John Newman</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>I object to the use for the site for a gypsy and traveller site. All three sites are in the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of Planning for Traveller Sites published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the borough, it would be more appropriate to expand existing sites eg. Off the Purley Way. None of these sites have easy access to local schools, healthcare, retail and other amenities.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2965/01/002/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Janet Nightingale</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>Recently I have heard of Croydon Council’s plans for the borough over the next 20 years. I object strongly to the plans for permanent sites for travellers using green belt land. My experience of travellers is not a happy one. In my opinion they are inclined to make a dreadful mess of any area they occupy. They then move on leaving the Council to clear up after them. If they have to be provided with another permanent site please choose somewhere which is not green belt.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Document ID</td>
<td>Object/Change</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2992/01/002/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Swift</td>
<td>Object DM32.2 755</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the following: The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage, Featherbed Lane, as a location for a traveller/gypsy site (Ref No. 755). This site is in the Green Belt and therefore is in breach of the Government’s Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published in August. This policy clearly states that temporary or permanent traveller sites “in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. This proposed site is far from public services with no public transport, no pavements and no street lighting. In addition it would require millions of public money to purchase and then de-contaminate the land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2993/01/002/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Cecile Griggs</td>
<td>Object DM32.2 755</td>
<td>I wish to object to the proposals to locate traveller sites on green belt land. In my own area this is Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage. As you are aware this is in breach of the Government’s own planning policy for traveller sites, published as recently as August, which states that traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3009/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Jonathan Butcher</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Justified DM32.2 755</td>
<td>I object in the strongest possible terms to the Council’s proposal to build gypsy/traveller sites in Croydon!! We absolutely mustn’t lose our green open spaces. We have too few of them as it is.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to this proposal on the following grounds:

3.1 Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage are Green Belt Land. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly that "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". Previous use does not mitigate against this policy.

All of the three preferred sites are on Green Belt Land, contrary to Government Policy.

The close proximity of the proposed sites to one another has not been taken into account. All three sites are proposed for a small area in the South of the Borough when there seems to be a successful site in Purley Way which could be expanded.

None of the three sites proposed has good access to schools, shops and other services. The consequent need for private transport goes against environment and climate initiatives. Government Guidelines ask that local planning authorities policies ensure that children can attend school on a regular basis. These three sites are well away from schools, particularly primary schools, and clearly do not reflect the aims of the Guidelines or facilitate regular school attendance.

The proposed plan does not take into account the need for good access to roads. The Croydon Local Plan paragraph 4.19 refers to the need for good access to roads. "Oaks Road, Coombe Road, Conduit Lane and Featherbed Lane are unsuitable for safe increased movement and manoeuvring of larger vehicles, especially entering and exiting these sites.

The number of Gypsy/Traveller sites in Croydon is to increase from 1 to 4, when our recent experience locally is of travellers responsible for damage, parking illegally, leaving piles of rubbish behind when they are moved on and even engaged in firearms confrontation with the police.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I am emailing to object to the proposed travellers sites to be built in the Shirley/Croydon/South Croydon areas.

There are numerous reasons for my objections.
1. This is green belt land and should remain as such. We are lucky to have local green areas that I have enjoyed since my childhood and that my own family benefit from now. Green belt land is not appropriate for any form of dwelling. We need to preserve what we have in the area. Travellers are know to leave there mess around them, this is not what we want on our green belt land
2. There are insufficient local school places as it is. The children (including my own) in the area will be adversely affected by in influx of travellers who normally have large extended families
3. Travellers cause trouble, my son was set upon by a group of travellers in Lloyd's Park recently and we now avoid this area when the travellers are illegally staying there. I would like my children to be able to use the local parks and amenities without worrying about people who regularly do not abide by the law of the land.
4. My elderly parents who live in the Shirley Hills area are vulnerable victims of crime as it is. Do we really need to add to their fears by making the area less safe with a group of people who generally have no regard for the law
5. Crime rates in Croydon are up as it is. Do we really need more residents for our already overstretched police force to watch over
6. And finally, the clue is in the name. These people are travellers and therefore travel, meaning there is no need for a permanent dwelling for them

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris Lynam</td>
<td>Policy DM43, reference Site 502 Coombe Farm reference Site 661 Coombe Lodge Nurseries and reference Site 755 Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage. I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and Coombe Farm is on a site of an Archaeological Priority Zone and contains an area of Nature Conservation Importance. Such development is in breach of Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that “traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites by 2017 and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Paul Newton</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Want</td>
<td>A travelers site at Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage, this is completely inappropriate for green belt land in my opinion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sarah Stenning
Object DM32.2 755
The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a Gypsy/traveller site. (reference number 755). You know that this is Greenbelt Land. It is not appropriate for a site to be placed there particularly as you are planning to make it larger in the future and it has no local amenities close by; No transport links and already there is a vast amount of fly tipping in that area, which is a site of natural beauty with a scout camp nearby. Look at Policy E of planning policy for traveller sites published by the government which states that it is inappropriate development whether temporary or permanent. In all these areas I believe you should be looking at brownfield sites and not greenbelt, let us protect the little greenbelt we have left.

Christine Denney
Object DM32.2 755
I should like to protest against the site chosen for gypsy camps and a new secondary school being built on green belt. There must be better sites for them as we must protect our green belt sites.

Mrs Christine Hardy
Object DM32.2 755
I am writing to object to:
The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site (reference number 755).

Christine Younger
Object DM32.2 755
I strongly object to this council building or using Green Belt sites for this and any other purpose. Also high rise flats will upset the balance of the areas. I do accept that we need more housing but these should be build on existing empty or land filled sites.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I am writing to object to:

1. The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:
   - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661;
   - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502;
   - Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference 755
   as all these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

     (If the Council really needs to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough they should look elsewhere, e.g., off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I am writing to object to the use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a Traveller site (ref 755)

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I object to the use of the site for a gypsy and traveller site. As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Natural Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3087/01/002/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mrs Halina Tutt</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>The draft Local Plan identifies Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site with 15-20 pitches. I am objecting to this. The Council acknowledges that this site is in the Green Belt. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. The site is also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough – they should look elsewhere (as I said previously off Purley Way where the existing site is).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3097/01/008/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Ben Lynam</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Policy DM43, reference Site 502 Coombe Farm, reference Site 661 Coombe Lodge Nurseries and reference Site 755 Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage. I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and Coombe Farm is on a site of an Archaeological Priority Zone and contains an area of Nature Conservation Importance. Such development is in breach of Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that “Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites by 2017 and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3109/01/010/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Dominic Quinn</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Object to the 16 Travellers site as it would be in breach of government guidance and there would be no services local to the area</td>
<td></td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM32.2 755</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Laurie King</td>
<td>Gypsy / Traveller sites in Featherbed Lane and off Coombe Road / Conduit Lane / Oaks Lane - These areas are Green Belt so why would the Council consider these suitable for such developments when this contravenes the current legislation? Additionally, the areas currently have considerable residential and community leisure activities and facilities, so again why would the Council be wanting to destroy the environment to create these Gypsy/Traveller sites for persons of no fixed abode and who are temporary residents to the borough only. It strikes me that this is an imbalance of priorities over the current fixed residents of Croydon and a set of proposals that I object to most strongly.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole Shorey</td>
<td>I am emailing to object to a number of the proposals. My parents live in Forestside so are close to Addington and Shirley and I worry for them if there are more gypsy sites located in the area. My son was involved in a road traffic incident with a traveller from the Layhams Farm site, the traveller caused the accident by pulling out of the road next to the site in front of my son's oncoming right of way car, he then jumped out of his car and ran from the scene and the police were too frightened to enter the site. My view of the police has been very jaded since this incident. My son could have been killed in this crash. If the police are too frightened to patrol these sites,these people are above the law. I definitely do not want to see more sites in or around my local area, I feel very strongly about this. I basically do not agree with many of the plans listed in Gavins email. I do agree we need more housing but that is mainly because too many people are being let into the country in the first place, housing them all is not the answer as other amenities will not be able to cope even if we build more houses.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carolyn Heath  

I am writing to object to:  
1. The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:  
   • Coombe Lodge Nurseries (site ref 661)  
   • Coombe Farm off Oaks Road (site ref 502)  
   • Poppy Lane (site ref 128)  
   • Stroud Green Pumping Station (site ref 504)  
   • Shirley Oaks Road/Beech House (site ref 541)  
   • Shirley Oaks Road (site ref 542)  
   • Honeysuckle Gardens (site ref 548)  
   • Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Cottage (site ref 755)  
All areas provide vital green space in already densely populated areas, and there is insufficient infrastructure to cope with the additional traffic/population. Some of these areas are in the Green Belt, others are in Metropolitan Open Land. They would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Change  
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Lisa Dinnick  

I live on the Forestdale Estate and thankfully our management committee via Gavin have advised us of the Council's plans to build three gypsy/traveller sites in the Green Belt. I totally agree with Gavin that these plans will completely change the character of parts of the borough, including where I live. As resident of Croydon and employee of Croydon Council I completely understand the need for more housing and I am looking forward to the regeneration taking place in the town centre over the next few years. However one of the reasons I love Croydon and continue to defend its negative reputation is the mix of 'city' feel and countryside. If the Council continue with these plans you will effect the character of the area and you will ultimately fail in your efforts to change peoples perception of Croydon.

Change  
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr David Harwood  

(2) I object to the following sites for use of Traveller sites at the following locations  
Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Cottage reference number 755  

Change  
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3148/01/002/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Dawn Lambert</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I'm writing to protest about the Council's plan to designate two areas of Green Belt land (reference numbers 502, 661 and 775) suitable for gypsy/traveller sites. I acknowledge that such sites are needed but NOT on Green Belt land. I believe it is unlawful to build on such land and once this is ignored one wonders how far it will be allowed to encroach by default over the years. In fact I believe that Government policy states that traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3160/01/004/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr James Barnes</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>It has come to my attention what Corydon council are planning to do such as building on green belt land, or the building of high rise flats on or near centre parade. This is rank out of order I And most others think as you are laying out to build high rise flats in or around centre parade. As well as building on green belt land A gypsy/traveller site on the said green belt land nor do I agree to building of a second school on land next to roden school this also being on green belt land. This I see as very under handed by this labour council. Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3171/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr David Carter</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage on Featherbed Lane for a gypsy/traveller site. Additionally to use Pear Tree farm for gypsy/traveller use would cause many issues for the local community apart from the fact that Featherbed Lane is a LANE not designed for heavy volume of traffic, is away from public services and is in the green belt. Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3184/01/002/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Simon Martin</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I would like to send my uttermost objection to the proposed development above at Pear Tree Farm (Featherbed Lane). The area needs investment not a traveller site. It will be hugely detrimental to all local residents. Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sheila Childs

Object DM32.2

I attended the open meeting on Wed 25th in Selsdon and wish to express my concern over the 3 proposed travellers sites. Whilst I understand the council have to provide these I have to ask why are they all within a few miles of each other and all south of the borough? Indeed the Oaks Farm and Conduit lane are only yard away. If you could address these proximity issues I would be pleased to hear why they cannot be more evenly spread and assume the plans will improve assess to them.

Change

DM32.2

755

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Sue Hills

Object DM32.2

I am concerned about some of the proposals for Forestdale and Addington. The draft Local Plan identifies Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site with 15-20 pitches (pages 188-189).


I object to this. The Council acknowledges that this site is in the Green Belt. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

“Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. The site is also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object

Soundness - Consistent with National

DM32.2 755

3. the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:

• Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502;

• Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; and

• Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 755;

As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

“Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is);

Object

DM32.2 755

I object to the proposal to create three gypsy/traveller sites reference numbers 552/661/755. All sites are in the Green Belt which makes them an inappropriate development. In addition they are some distance from schools/public services etc.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Andrew Webb

Object: I live at 265 Markfield Courtwood Lane, the surrounding we have here has been deteriorating and the presence of police patrols have increase, we didn't have this before, the bus company has a fixed toilet without any water near a footpath and it smells. We are in dialog with Bus Company to remove this ghastly and hazard from our sight, which is opposite a conservation field. There was no consultation for this because the bus company knows that the citizens would not approved, likewise with your proposal, it is not suitable for our surroundings and reasons are detail below.

Consultation on Croydon Local Plan:

1. The use of Pear tree farm and Pear tree farm cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site(Reference number 755).

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Maria Hickey

Object: I am a home owner in new addington and would like to object the plans croydon council have put forward. We currently have traveller sites and feel as a community we already do our part.

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr Matthew Want

Object: A travelers site at Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage, this is completely inappropriate for green belt land in my opinion.

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Terry Lewin

Object: I object to the use of the site as a traveller site.

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Objecting to the use of either of those locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I appreciate that we all need somewhere to live. However, I have had severe problems with gypsies in the past (criminal damage with police involved and, separately quite a lot of fly tipping. As the 3 areas are generally quite attractive, I am loath to have them destroying the ambiance: they certainly have a reputation for doing so (and of not paying Council tax, so I have been told recently).

Conduit Lane, near the award winning Coombe Woods would be too busy for others to park and enjoy the amenity, albeit the site is away from Coombe Road. The school would also create traffic in the Lane and on the very busy Coombe Road at specific times but, maybe, this would be a pleasant site for the children. Similarly, the site in Oaks Road would be spoilt.

Coming to Featherbed Lane: sadly, the place is already an eyesore. If planning permission carries with it a responsibility to improve the look of the place from Featherbed Lane, great. However, I doubt it can: What is needed here is a tidy up, not an increase in the mess. I suspect the Council has a duty to provide a site. If so, Featherbed Lane
I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b;

I additionally comment that:
- The proposals are detrimental to the Amenities of Adjoining Owners.
- Development is on Green Belt and would therefore require a change of land use.
- The proposed Sites should be on Brownfield or Industrial Land not Green Belt.
- There is an imbalance, with all sites being proposed in the South of Croydon.
- Existing sites could should be expanded.

If a new site is to be developed for the travelling community, I would express a preference is for Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane. This already virtually developed to the point where there would be no further detriment if the site were to be developed.

However, there is no proposal as to where the existing activity would be relocated to.

The Pear Tree Cottage/Farm site, provides ample space for all or most to the 39 additional pitches. Any remaining pitches could be located at other brownfield sites within the borough.

If the nurseries site is to be redeveloped, it would be far better for this to be used for the relocation of a school, thus freeing up land elsewhere in the borough for housing.

The travelling community are by definition mobile whereas the proposed development(s) are permanent and in built form. This is contradictory and may suggest that the council is considering further redevelopment at some future point. If so, the council should either be open about this or unequivocally deny it.
Mr Robet Watson

Object DM32.755

I live in crofters mead forestdale and cannot see any benefits to the areas mentioned in the above proposals. I am sure it would be better to refurbish existing properties in the area concerned and create more green areas for residents and their children to enjoy. create more sensible car parking areas people will buy cars regardless of not having a parking space and simply park in and existing space thus creating a problem for somebody else. Transport for London have already created a problem by there introduction of double yellow lines witch in some areas are not required.why anybody would want to create a traveller camp at pear tree farm is beyond me surely a nice new housing complex would be more suitable. Forestdale and surrounding area is a very nice place to live and I cannot see any improvement to the area in your proposals. i understand that these proposals are inappropriate and unacceptable these are my views on the matter.

Mr & Mrs Leggatt

Object DM32.755

Particularly of concern are the recommendations regarding Forestdale which is the area which I live and grew up in. The draft Local Plan identifies Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site with 15-20 pitches (pages 188-189, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 755). I strongly object to this. This is in the Green Belt. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". The site is also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough I would suggest you look elsewhere.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr Rishi Gohill

Object
Soundness - Justified

DM32.2
755

Objecting to the use of either of those locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.

If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Joy Harris

Object
Soundness - Justified

DM32.2
755

Objecting to the use of either of those locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.

If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr Dan Camalich

Object
Soundness - Justified

DM32.2
755

I am writing in order to object to the use of Green Land, especially in and around Croydon, for use as any kind of residential use, or any other kind of development for that matter. Such new developments, for Travellers or any kind of development, would be better made on non-green land, or in any suitable properties which are currently unused. Green land should be cherished and preserved because it takes a long time to become like that and there is less and less of it these days. The only real exception to that rule might be playgrounds for kids; but, even then, sensitivity to wild life, habitats and a location's general "greenness" should always be employed.

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Alison Wanless

Object
Soundness - Justified

DM32.2
755

I am writing to you to object to the above plans for a Gypsy/Travellers site in Featherbed Lane. As this is Green Belt area developments like this should not be allowed as it is an inappropriate use of the land. One of the reasons people move to this area is for the fact that it is close to green belt land. This will adversely affect the local area.

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr Colin Hagreen

Object

DM32.2

755

I am writing to object to:
The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a traveller site (reference number 755). This site is a part of Green Belt land, which should be a last resort, and also abuts onto the scout site at Frylands Wood which is used by many local schools for educational visits and overnight stays. Building a 15-20 pitch traveller site in this area, with poor public transport access and amenities, would be a very poor decision.

Alison Larmand

Object

DM32.2

755

Please be advised that I would like to enter an objection to Croydon Council’s plans to de designate several land spaces in order to enable the positioning of three gypsy/traveller sites in the green belt and also the development of homes on some of the green spaces. The proposed locations for traveller sites brings great concern as to what impact this will have on the area as the locations are not really close to any public services. I believe there is also some question about whether the areas being proposed for the traveller sites can be used for this purpose due to a Government policy that states traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. As a resident of Shirley for the past 7 years I would be extremely disappointed to see any of these proposed developments come to fruition. Whilst I welcome the development of new homes I think Croydon Council should look for alternative locations instead of green land. I do hope to hear from your office in due course as to what the future may hold for our lovely green spaces that provide fresh air and outdoor enjoyment for our family and many others.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
The draft Local Plan identifies Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site with 15-20 pitches (pages 188-189, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 755). I will be objecting to this. The Council acknowledges that this site is in the Green Belt. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

“Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. The site is also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

The purpose of Green Belt legislation has always been to preserve areas of amenity land for the benefit of local people, and other potential users, against any form of building development. I therefore consider it totally unacceptable, indeed absolutely incredible, that the Council would even consider designating areas of the Green Belt for potential gypsy/traveller sites as the Plan proposes for Coombe Farm, Coombe Lodge Nurseries and 2 sites on Featherbed Lane. The Coombe Lodge Nurseries site is especially inappropriate as it is very adjacent to Coombe Gardens, an important local amenity, and to the land along Conduit Land that has strong conservation value.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I'm objecting to the use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site [reference number 755].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object Number</th>
<th>Objector Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3388/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr A Ostridge</td>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>I objecting to putting a new traveller sites up in New Addington the one up here now the traveller cause trouble in the shops and other places to put more up here would be more trouble for the peopel who live in New Addington.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3390/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Adrian Cowie</td>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>I object very strongly to the council proposals to create Traveller sites on Green Belt Land. I believe the Green Belt is a resource which should be protected at all cost. Our countryside is a precious resource which provides recreation for walkers, cyclists, horse riders and separates urban sprawl. It should be held in trust for the enjoyment of future generations. Once it is gone, it is gone forever! Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: &quot;Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development&quot; The Council's approach is clearly in breach of that policy. The site is also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is). This area is one, which I regularly walk &amp; cycle a. Any development, such as the one above, would completely ruin the surrounding countryside. The proposals go against the government policies on Green Belt. Before any development of Green Belt, Brownfield sites should be used.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3401/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Ms B Ani</td>
<td>The draft Local Plan identifies Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site with 15-20 pitches (pages 188-189). Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 755). You, the Council acknowledges that this site is in the Green Belt. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. You are clearly in breach of that policy. The site is also some distance from public services. If you the Council really needs, as you claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough:- 1) Why have you not explored the option of using off Purley Way where this exists? 2) Why exactly are you proposing to breach this policy and also ruin this lovely green belt area? 3) Why do you need to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3408/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Ms Christine Waring</td>
<td>This is in the Green Belt. Government planning policy for Traveller Sites stated that Traveller sites (permanent or temporary) in the Green Belt are inappropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3409/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mrs Candida de Poitiers</td>
<td>The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site (ref. no. 755). I feel this is an inappropriate area for such as site as it is in the Green Belt and quite a distance from public services. There are better suited brownfield sites, as traveller camps tend to be semi-commercial.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr Chris McInerney

Object Soundness - Justified

Objecting to the use of either of those locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.

If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

C Morteuil

Object DM32.2

Similarly a site for travellers with amenities which would prevent them from invading current green spaces is a good idea, but where to put it needs to be sensibly planned and the current proposal in my view is not adequate.

Mr & Mrs Colin Read

Object Soundness - Justified

Gypsy/traveller sites should not be built on existing Green Belt land. This is totally inappropriate, as Green Belt is designed to remain undeveloped.

Mr Dean Addis

Object DM32.2

My objection is based on the facts that this area is Green Belt Land and it should also be said that this area is a long way from public services and even to the point that the local bus was covering Featherbed Lane/Courtwood Lane has just been removed- and replaced with another bus service that has made the public transport/services much harder than they have ever been.

The site in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr Dave Fasham

Object

DM32.2

755

This area has apparently been identified as a location for a Traveller Site with up to 20 pitches. This is objectionable because the area is within the Green Belt. Now the Government planning policy for Traveller Sites specifically identifies such sites in the Green Belt, be they temporary or permanent, as being “inappropriate development”. This means that the Council’s intention here is in clear breach of that policy. As the Featherbed Lane site is somewhat remote from public services, it seems far more logical that if additional Traveller pitches are really necessary, then the focus should be in the area off Purley Way where the existing Traveller Site is located.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr David Haworth

Object

DM32.2

755

I am writing to object to: The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for gypsy/traveller site (reference number 755);

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr & Mrs McAvoy

We object to the use of the following locations in Green Belt areas as travellers/gypsy sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road (15-20 pitches); Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane (15-20 pitches); Pear Tree Farm on Featherbed Lane (15-20 pitches). National guidelines clearly state “Travellers Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s proposals, therefore, clearly breach such guidelines. Also, we question the Council’s assertion that it needs to quadruple the number of travellers/gypsy sites in the Borough. Apart from this major objection, the above sites identified for such use would have poor access via narrow roads/lanes for large vehicles; consequent impact upon local traffic congestion with movements of large vehicles; no safe paved walking routes to schools, shops, doctors, etc.; additional requirement for services and facilities for hygienic occupation; increased pressure on local schools, medical facilities, waste disposal, etc.; impact upon local facilities and amenities of current residents.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr D Lane

I object to the use of the site for a gypsy and traveller site. As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is);

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr & Mrs Shaw-Smith

We strongly object to the disturbing proposals of Croydon Council to quadruple the area of gypsy sites in the Croydon area, in particular to sites regarding Reference numbers 502, 661 and 755. Green Belt areas are invaluable and should be protected as per previous acknowledgements (c.f. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August).

Also Croydon already has a bigger than average share of "problematic and challenging" social make-up than the rest of the country, and as such quadrupling gypsy sites in the borough seems a gross overreaction to pressure to "meet targets". Policies and planning should focus on the development of an area rather than on enforcing undesirable land uses on the existing hard working population.

Existing traveller sites are appalling examples of living conditions, and building small blocks of flats in current sites could house a number of travellers either living there already or wishing to move to the borough.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr E Jakeman  
Object  
DM32.2  
755  
I object to the proposal to create three gypsy/traveller sites reference numbers 552/661/755. All sites are in the Green Belt which makes them an inappropriate development. In addition they are some distance from schools, public services etc.

Change  
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Ms E Randall  
Object  
DM32.2  
755  
I strongly object to the following proposals which will have a negative impact on either green belt land or the character of an area.

The draft Local Plan identifies Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site with 15-20 pitches (pages 188-189, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 755).

Change  
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr Dennis King  
Sanderstead Residents’ Association  
Object  
Soundness - Consistent with National  
DM32.2  
755  
The three locations earmarked for gypsy and traveller sites are all located on green belt land.

Conduit Lane  
Coombe Farm off Oaks Road and Pear Tree Farm  
Featherbed Lane  
Policy E, Planning Policy for Traveller Sites published by the Government and also backed by the London Plan states that they are inappropriate development. On what basis therefore do Croydon consider they are better advised than more experienced authorities. They are high cost implications for Croydon should they proceed with this policy.

Change  
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr T Gray  
Object  
DM32.2  
755  
I am writing you to inform you of my objections to use Pear tree farm and pear tree farm cottage on Featherbed lane as a location for a gypsy travellers site. Reference number 755. I am very worried that these plans will jeopardise the potential of my home increasing in value when the area is suffering from a lower than average property price increase and I strongly suggest that these plans are rejected.

Change  
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I have heard of Croydon Council's proposals for Traveller sites within the borough. I understand that "favoured sites" are Conduit Lane, Coombe Farm and Featherbed Lane.

As a resident of Croydon, I am extremely concerned that this green belt area is being considered for use as residence. Addington hills and Coombe woods are an area of outstanding beauty and home to the largest area of heathland in London. Locating Traveller's encampments sites right on the doorstep of this green belt area would undoubtedly have dire consequences for flora, fauna, the natural habitat and wildlife as a whole, leading to irreversible damage. Please could Croydon Council reconsider this issue and please consider not going ahead with this proposal. The consequences to the natural environment and the delicate socio-ecological balance that currently exists would be damaged permanently with travellers' communities housed in a wildlife locality. There are better options to house people in Croydon and right in the middle of a green belt area which the residents of Croydon hold a lot of regard and pride for is not one of them. I would strongly advocate considering urban areas of the borough which are fit for housing - such proposals must not be made or favoured without a thorough ecological and environmental impact assessment and evaluation. I am very concerned with this proposal also because Croydon Council is meant to work in partnership with the British Trust for Conservation (BTCV) and a regional office is located on the woodland premises. Scrapping this proposal is the right thing to do and the right thing for Croydon.
Object

I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502.

My objection is based on the fact that the use of both sites for such a purpose would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

To summarise my objections to the location of traveller sites at either (or both) Conduit Lane and/or Coombe Farm, these would be that:

• they would be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining owners
• it would constitute inappropriate use of Green Belt Land
• sites that are located on the Green Belt, considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) would be against Government Policy ("Planning policy for Traveller Sites", DCLG, August 2015)
• there would be a lack of relevant amenities close at hand
• there would be insufficient local infrastructure to accommodate the plans
• the selection of proposed sites should have a bias towards 'brownfield' or industrial land, not Green Belt

I would also ask:

• Why are the two sites in very close proximity to one another being proposed?
• What is the rationale for creating an imbalance across the borough with all sites being proposed in the South of Croydon?
• Why not expand the existing Permanent Gypsy Site in Latham’s Way off Beddington Farm Road?
• If one has to select one of the proposed sites, the preference is for Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane.

Support

I would also ask:

Why are the two sites in very close proximity to one another being proposed?

What is the rationale for creating an imbalance across the borough with all sites being proposed in the South of Croydon?

Why not expand the existing Permanent Gypsy Site in Latham’s Way off Beddington Farm Road?

If one has to select one of the proposed sites, the preference is for Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane.

Object

This site is in Green Belt and to create a Traveller site here constitutes 'inappropriate development' in contravention of Policy E of the Governments Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. I object to the proposal.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. The deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult and it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object

This is in Green Belt and to create a Traveller site here constitutes 'inappropriate development' in contravention of Policy E of the Governments Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. I object to the proposal.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. The deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult and it will no longer be considered for this use.
Jennifer Worstall
Object  DM32.2 755
I urge the Council to re-consider allowing traveller sites in the former Croydon nursery in Coombe Woods and at Coombe farm in Lloyd Park – both unsuitable sites, as they are not near amenities such as shops/schools etc which travellers may need to access. The A23 offers a better location for these traveller sites and has better road access too.

Julia Sims
Object  DM32.2 755
As a local affected resident, I am registering my comments and objections to the proposals as documented in the Croydon Local Plans CLP1.1 and CLP2.

Policy DM43 Creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites at Coombe Farm, off Oaks Road, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, off Conduit Lane and Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage, Featherbed Lane
As a local affected resident, I am registering my comments and objections to the proposals as documented in the Croydon Local Plans CLP1.1 and CLP2.

Policy DM43, reference Site 502 Coombe Farm reference Site 691 Coombe Lodge Nurseries and reference Site 755 Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage. I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and Coombe Farm is on a site of an Archaeological Priority Zone and contains an area of Nature Conservation Importance. Such development is in breach of Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that “Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites by 2017, and 39 by 2036 is extremely excessive and will have a significant adverse impact on the borough.
I wish to voice my concerns regarding the following:

I totally object to any reduction of green space in the borough of Croydon in favour of development. I agree wholeheartedly with Garvin Barwell MP and wish to oppose any such plans. In particular, the idea of a travellers site at the suggested sites is preposterous.

There have been problems in this borough with ‘travellers’ for many years. To the extent that defences, barriers built up grass mounds, have been created to keep out such illegal encampments. Whilst what the Council are proposing is to legalise such sites, I have witnessed the conditions these area have been left in when travellers have moved on, piles of rubbish including human waste and damaged the area! This has been a massive expense to the council over the years. Areas around Coombe Gardens and Lloyd park are much loved and used recreational areas for the people of Croydon and surrounding areas. A gypsy encampment would be a disaster!!

If there is an obligation for the council to provide facilities for travellers, any such area should be very carefully assessed and considered, taking into account all the attributes of the area and how such a camp would affect it. In this instance the suggested areas are totally inappropriate.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

And finally, I am also concerned about some of the proposals for Forestdale and Addington. The draft Local Plan identifies Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottages on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/travellers site with 15-20 pitches Ref No 755. I will be objecting to this. The Council acknowledges that this site is in the Green Belt!!

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

It is not a suitable location for travellers due to the high cost of buying it and making the site fit for permanent residency. The council would also need to find another waste site which currently exists on the site. The other key objection is that it is a Metropolitan green belt and surrounded by ancient woodland. I grew up living along featherbed lane and now live in Tandridge which borders the proposed site.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I have been a Croydon resident for many years (over 47), and have watched Croydon wax and wane. In all those years, Croydon has often been regarded as rather down at heel and a bit of a joke; it has been misrepresented in the media too many times in my view. Croydon remains a vital communications hub, which seems only recently to have been recognised. Given all the development in and around East Croydon station, your plan for these improvements is beginning to take shape. As we all know, London Victoria in 20 minutes, London Bridge in 20 minutes; not to mention the east/west Tramlink which has become so popular that TfL decided to grab it! Croydon’s communications should be more widely acknowledged. You were elected on a ticket to not only improve Croydon for ALL its residents but also to preserve its assets such as the green belt and areas of special scientific interest. Imagine my dismay and great disappointment when I discovered in your proposal that you considered it perfectly legitimate to build on green belt – absolutely at odds with your manifesto. AND that you are prepared to ignore your promises in preserving Croydon’s assets to the very people who elected you. How can the electorate trust you in the future, especially at the next council election, if you blatantly disregard your election pledges and set about to destroy the green spaces enjoyed by many of Croydon’s residents? All green belt is part of Croydon’s assets, it represents the lungs of Croydon, benefitting all and in many cases providing a haven for migratory birds as they stop-over en route and indeed other wild life whose habitat is likely to be destroyed/diminished if the green belt is built on. Altering the status of green belt or areas of special scientific interest enabling it to be built on does NOT alter the fact that once built on it will never revert to green belt and therefore will be lost (to Croydon and its electorate), forever. I would urge you to reconsider your proposals to destroy part of the green belt and to maintain the status of the open spaces as is. Croydon occupies a vast area and I am certain you could find suitable alternatives for the travellers which met their needs of access to public transport and retail amenities without destroying the green belt or areas of special scientific interest if you tried hard enough. I am sure you are aware that Government policy states “Traveller sites temporary or permanent in the Greenbelt are
### Mr I Williams

**Object**

I object to the use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site (reference number 755). This area is indeed a mess at the moment, but whose fault is that. You already have sites in Croydon and plenty of brown field sites not used even one near where the site off the Purley Way already exists. It is noted that many sites appear to be placed on the edge of boroughs as is the case with Layhams Road, but why here?

**Change**

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

---

### Mr Michael Gorman

**Object**

I write to you with regards to the proposed Traveller site's at Coombe Lodge Nurseries/Coombe Farm & Pear Tree Farm, Featherbed Lane. I was shocked and surprised to find out these sites are being proposed, can this really the vision of Croydon we want to promote? I have had the pleasure of travellers parking up in the park opposite where I live on Shirley Church Road and I can assure you the rubbish, destruction and human feces left were frankly disgusting. I appreciate sites have to be made available but why in such densely populated areas like Croydon? I know fellow local residents will be very upset and apprehensive regarding the safety of their property with a site so close.

**Change**

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

---

### Mr I Williams

**Object**

I object to the use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site (reference number 755). This area is indeed a mess at the moment, but whose fault is that. You already have sites in Croydon and plenty of brown field sites not used even one near where the site off the Purley Way already exists. It is noted that many sites appear to be placed on the edge of boroughs as is the case with Layhams Road, but why here?

**Change**

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.

If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I am writing to formally object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites: Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 755. As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).
All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. I am concerned that all three sites are also some considerable walking distance away from GP practices, shops, schools, public transport and other local services which would be contrary to the Council’s Health and Wellbeing Strategy.

Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.
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Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3702/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Ms J Fasham</td>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>This area has apparently been identified as another location for a Travellers site, which is objectionable because the area is within Green Belt Land – this means that the Council's intention here is in clear breach of Policy.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3711/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Ms J Powell</td>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>I am writing to express my concerns over the impact of Council's Local Plan on green areas. About 20 years ago I decided to move from Woodpecker Mount to Brockscroft on Forestdale. My decision was made because Brockscroft is a well managed estate with plenty of green spaces. When I brought the house, took on board that strict covenants were in place and that a management charge was in required to cover the cost of our lighting, gardening, upkeep of the roads and other maintenance issues. From time to time we have had problems from ill disciplined youths on quad bikes and misbehaving in the adjoining playground but I feel allowing travellers onto the site off Featherbed Lane. I suggest that establishing a travellers site on Featherbed Lane should be dropped.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3715/01/006/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Jenny Tighe</td>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>would also like to object to the following applications for traveler sites. Application numbers: 502, 661 and 755. All three are in green belt land and therefore inappropriate developments and should not be allowed to go ahead.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3724/01/002/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Mike Marcroft</td>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>Please do not allow the above to settle on Green Belt land. There must be other sites in the Borough that can be made available. Our Green Belt land is precious to us all.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sarah McNamara

I would just like to express my concern about Croydon Council's plans to build in these three Green Belt areas. I understand and appreciate the need for more homes across the borough but could you, again, consider using all the empty homes and office spaces instead of filling up beautiful and plentiful land?

Mr Tim Duce

I strongly object to the building of gypsy traveller sites on Green Belt, especially as one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". Nature Conservation is indeed a very low priority to the travellers that I have seen. I voluntarily clear up the dumping at Addington Hills and have witnessed the appalling environmental destruction wreaked by visiting travellers. Cleaning up after their visits is a very costly exercise, so putting travellers close by a Conservation Site would be extremely foolhardy. Over the next few years, it would cost council tax payers a fortune.

Tracy Clarke

I am writing to object to the following policies and proposals: traveller site - ref 755

Diane Simpson

Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

- Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.
I am objecting the the proposed sites - Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Coombe Farm, Pear Tree Farm - on the following grounds:

It is an inappropriate use of Green Belt land and the proposals are contrary to the Government policy (Policy E of the Planning Policy for Traveller sites) which states that "Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development"

Selection of proposed sites should have a bias towards Brownfield or Industrial land not Green Belt

It is detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining owners

There is a lack of relevant amenities close at hand

There is a lack of local infrastructure to accommodate the plans and additional traffic

All the proposed sites are in the south of the borough with two being very close together

There is already an existing permanent site in Lathams Way which could be expanded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>3753/01/006/DM32.2/O Moyra Ruffell</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>I am emailing you to express my concerns about Croydon Council’s Plans to build Gypsy/Traveller sites in Green Belt areas. I understand that there is a great need for housing in the Croydon area and that the number of homeless people in Croydon is high. However, I need assurance that in providing this need we do not destroy our few remaining green spaces as these are vital to the well-being of our environment and people’s health. When I received the information about these proposals from my MP and local residents' association I had been away from home and so have not studied these plans in depth. However, with the information I have I cannot visualize how these proposals would work without destroying the character of the Shirley area and the destruction of our few remaining green areas. In order for me to agree to these proposals I would not only require the assurance that these environmental issues were taken into account but the homes that are planned for were affordable to those who are in need of a home, and that they were of good quality, energy efficient homes. Finally, having lived in Shirley for many years I have seen the increase in traffic which has brought about an increase in air pollution which is detrimental to our health. This is another important factor that has to be borne in mind when increasing the density of the population of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3754/01/004/DM32.2/O Myra Rand</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>I fully oppose the proposals to build on green land, especially for travellers’ sites. I fully support Gavin Barwell’s objections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms K Kendall

I am writing to object to the following proposals in the Croydon Local Plan.

1. The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage as a location for a traveller site. (ref 755). This is green belt land and the Government has said very clearly that green belt land should not be used for traveller sites as this is inappropriate development. There must be non green belt sites available for this purpose in Croydon. Once you start developing the green belt, where will you stop? I also find it disingenuous that you give no indication of the number of pitches at any of the three sites you are proposing for travellers.

Mr & Mrs Nicholls

I would like to place on record our objection to the part of the draft Local Plan that identifies Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a Traveller site with 15-20 pitches (pages 188-189 Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 755). Our objection is on the same basis that is being made by our MP Gavin Barwell, that this area is in the Green Belt and would be in breach of Government policy that states that Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

Jenny Greenland

I object to the use of either of the two sites in the Shirley locations or Forrestate as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).
The Government formerly set out its policies and principles towards green belts in England and Wales in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: Green Belts, but this planning guidance was superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in March 2012. Planning Authorities are strongly urged to follow the NPPF’s detailed advice when considering whether to permit additional development in the green belt. In the green belt there is a general presumption against inappropriate development, unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated to show that the benefits of the development will outweigh the harm caused to the green belt. The NPPF sets out what would constitute appropriate development in the green belt. According to the NPPF, there are five stated purposes of including land within the green belt:  
• To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas  
• To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another  
• To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment  
• To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns  
• To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Once an area of land has been defined as green belt, the stated opportunities and benefits include:  
• Providing opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population  
• Providing opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas  
• The retention of attractive landscapes and the enhancement of landscapes, near to where people live  
• Improvement of damaged and derelict land around towns  
• The securing of nature conservation interests  
• The retention of land in agricultural, forestry and related uses.

This is a totally preposterous proposition and I am quite frankly astonished that such a ludicrous idea has been proposed.
Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.

If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of “extensive political...consultation”. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

Not use the location as gypsy and traveller sites

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>3809/01/015/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Ian Leonard</td>
<td>The draft Local Plan identifies Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site with 15-20 pitches (pages 188-189). Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 755). I also object to this as almost laughable. The Council acknowledges that this site is in the Green Belt. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: &quot;Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development&quot;. The Council's approach is clearly in breach of that policy. The site is also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough, they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>3826/01/003/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Ms L Pinkney</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>3862/01/010/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr M Blount</td>
<td>I have considered details of the proposed Croydon Local Plan and have the following objections on the basis that they will: detract from the local areas, dramatically change the local areas, dramatically change the character of local areas, have a significant adverse effect on an already overloaded infrastructure, including roads, public transport, public open space, environment and emergency, health and support services. 5. I object to the three proposed provision of Traveller sites at Conduit Lane, Coombe Farm and Featherbed Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Please note I am horrified at all of the following proposed planning proposals:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Stanbridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Ref No: 755. The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DK32.2 755</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 1. The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site (Reference number 755).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Anthony Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td></td>
<td>The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site. Policy E of &quot;Planning Policy for Traveller Sites&quot;, published by the Government in August, says: &quot;Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celia Baughan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 1. the use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site (reference number 755);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Catherine Fowler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites', published by the Government in August, states very clearly that 'Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development'. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the 'Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers'. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of 'extensive political...consultation'. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Ms L Chatfield

Object 755

I am writing my objections development on the following sites as a resident as well as in my capacity as Warden of Croydon Ecology Centre. The sites are in areas that are essential foraging grounds for wildlife, including badgers, which are a protected species. I believe that they are also all on Green Belt Land. I realise that local authorities are being given new powers that allows them to build on parts of Green Belt Land, but I sincerely believe that this will be a terrible mistake, for which future generations will not thank us. These sites are also part of one of the very few large stretches of open green spaces so close the the centre of Croydon, which makes an huge difference to the air quality in our town and to the visual aspect thereof. There is ample evidence to prove that these green urban spaces are essential for the mental well-being of crowded cities. All the open green spaces are there for the benefit of all Croydon's residents and those visiting our Borough, by building on them you are taking away this right from people all over the Borough. Please think again and make use of brown field sites instead. By using brown field sites you have the opportunity improve those sites with well planned and laid out housing and amenities.

Mr & Mrs Thacker

Object 755

Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 755; As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Crudham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object DM32.2

Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 755;
As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest.
Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object DM32.2

Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 755;
As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest.
Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Ms S Kemp

Object DM32.2 755

It makes me want to weep when I read what you have planned for Croydon. I myself live in New Addington, it was a horrible place but now it has vastly improved, your ideas for it no doubt will cause more uproar again, nowhere no green spaces left in the end for the children or dog walkers to go. Tower blocks, school we dont actually need it all so vile. Lets be honest you could built on brown land why choose green land. I can foresee such a horrible Croydon in the future, when I moved to Croydon from Fulham many years ago it was so different to what it is now, by the time you ruin it it will be one of the worse neighbourhoods in London. Of course we mustn't say Surrey as we have been taken over.

Ms S Ikpa

Object DM32.2 755

I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661, policy number DM44: and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502, policy number DM43 Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference number 755, policy number DM32. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites eg the site off the Purley Way. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards.

Ms Olive Anne Bowyer

Object Soundness - Justified DM32.2 755

Ref. 502. Proposed sites for gypsy/travellers in Green belt land. Government policy published in August says very clearly "travellers sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development ". This is in breach of this policy. Coombe farm and Ref. 755 Featherbed Lane (Pear tree Farm Cottage near to Hutchingsons Nature Reserve) are all Green Belt.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr & Mrs Thomas

Object Soundness - Consistent with National 755

Please can I object to the Labour Council's plans to build Gypsy/Traveller Sites in the Green Belt. Why is this Council determined to concrete over the leafy / green areas of Croydon? We do not need Traveller encampments anywhere near Pear Tree Farm or in Featherbed Lane. There are enough brownfield sites in the Borough for these camps to be built.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr & Mrs Jarrett

Object DM32.2 755

We strongly object to any alteration of properties on Forestdale which would prove to be unsightly also the proposed sites on Featherbed Lane and Conduit Lane. We are a Green Belt area!! Please let it stay that way.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr P Fitzpatrick

Object Soundness - Consistent with National 755

I am formally objecting to:
3. the use of the following locations as gypsy / traveller sights:
   - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road REFERENCE NUMBER 502;
   - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane REFERENCE NUMBER 661; and
   - Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane REFERENCE NUMBER 755;

As the Council acknowledges all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders on a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”, published by the Government in August says very clearly

"Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate Development" 

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of the policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy / traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example off the Purley Way where the existing site is).
4000/01/001/DM32.2/O  Ms P Titchener  Object  DM32.2  755  i would like to record my opposition to the use of green belt land to build 12story tower blocks secondary school and a traveller/camp site we have other sites and new Addington needs the green belt land as the population is the size of a town yes it needs improvement but it doesn’t need more pressure on our roads we need green belt land  Change  The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

4006/01/005/DM32.2/O  Ms R Lloyd  Object  DM32.2  755  I am a resident in Addington Village and am writing to add my voice to those in the community who thoroughly object to council plans to use green belt land in our area to provide sites for travellers and housing. The council does not have the right to take these spaces away to build traveller sites on them as it is clearly government policy that this is inappropriate development  Change  The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

4010/01/013/DM32.2/O  Mr R Morley-Smith  Object  Soundness - Justified  DM32.2  755  Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.  If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).  Change  The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

4018/01/002/DM32.2/O  Ms R Magee  Object  DM32.2  755  Proposed Gypsy/Traveller sites proposed for Addiscombe and East Croydon, Addington, Forresdale and Addington and Shirley - This sounds like a dreadful idea. I strongly object to the above proposal – This is a dreadful idea and surely anyone with any love or concern for Croydon would also object strongly.  Change  The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

4022/01/002/DM32.2/O  Mr & Mrs Ewin  Object  Soundness - Justified  DM32.2  755  Objection to Croydon Council’s proposal to provide sites for travellers & the building of houses, etc on green land in Shirley & other areas.  Change  The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
The use of land to provide pitches at Coombe Farm, Oaks Road or Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane is entirely out of keeping with the character of those areas. Why ruin such beautiful areas so close to central Croydon for future generations? Once gone, that land will be gone forever. We should treasure areas such as these and put them to a much more appropriate use in keeping with the use of similar surrounding land. Housing/Residential/Pitches are not good uses of this land.

The only real alternative if there has to be one is at Pear Tree Farm, Featherbed Lane where there already exists a large scale housing development and appropriate facilities including schools, transport and infrastructure nearby.

Objecting to the use of either of those locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Objecting to the use of either of those locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.

Reasons for objecting:
1) It will be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining owners
2) It is an inappropriate use of Green Belt land
3) Sites that are located on the Green Belt are considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and are against government policy (Planning policy for Traveller Sites, DCLG, August 2015)
4) There are a lack of appropriate amenities close at hand
5) There is insufficient local infrastructure to accommodate the plans
6) Selection of proposed sites should have a bias towards brownfield or industrial land, not Green Belt
7) the existing permanent site in Latham’s Way off Bedding Farm Road could be expanded

Alternative suggestions for sites: 636, Land west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, Elmside, Addington
I am grateful to the Council for consulting on the detailed policies and proposals that will make up the Croydon Local Plan. There is much in the document that I agree with, but some of the proposals would, in my opinion, change the character of parts of Croydon very much for the worse. I hope you will forgive me if I focus on these areas of contention. I am therefore writing to formally object to:

1. de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;

2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   - land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   - land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
   - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

3. the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:
   - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502;
   - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; and
   - Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 755;

As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Change.
Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

“Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is);

4. Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too;

5. Policy DM2 on development on garden land, which is too subjective and therefore too weak. There should be a much stronger presumption against development on garden land; and

6. Policy DM28, which should allow higher levels of parking in developments of low public transport accessibility. Restricting parking spaces in such areas doesn’t lead to fewer people owning their own car; it just leads to greater competition for existing spaces.
I am writing to object to some of the proposals within the draft Croydon London Plan, particularly in the area of Addington and Forestdale. Proposed Gypsy Traveller sites

The draft Local Plan identifies Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site with 15-20 pitches (pages 188-189, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 755). The Council itself acknowledges that this site is in the Green Belt which goes against current Government Policy. The site is also some distance from public services and very unsuitable for a site of this type.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).
As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

4062/01/010/DM32.2/O  Mr & Mrs Keith & Susan Hobbs

Object  DM32.2  755  Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 755; As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change  The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr Clive Jarvis

Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 755; As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Dr Chandra Pawa

I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference number 755, policy number DM3 as a gypsy and traveller site. This site is in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites eg the site off the Purley Way.
As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croydon). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

The draft Local Plan identifies Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site with 15-20 pitches (pages 188-189, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 755). I will be objecting to this. The Council acknowledges that this site is in the Green Belt. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. The site is also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I will be objecting to this. The Council acknowledges that this site is in the Green Belt. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. The site is also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough – which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr Vince Hemment

the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:
- Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502;
- Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; and
- Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 755;
As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is);
4099/01/001/DM32.2/O Vivienne Murray

Object DM32.2

1. The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site (Reference No. 755). There are no good facilities and transport - access to this area is not good (it’s on a bend) and when it’s icy it doesn’t get griddled as it’s border disputed - I think the whole area might come under Tandridge. Why not leave the travellers on Purley Way which is a huge, accessible area?

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

4104/01/013/DM32.2/O Terrence & Jacqueline Spriggs

Object Soundness - Justified

Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

4109/01/001/DM32.2/O Mr & Mrs Chang

Object DM32.2

We read with dismay and grave concern about Croydon council’s plans to build three gypsy/travellers sites in the Green Belt of Shirley. This ill conceived act of allowing housing on some of our precious Green spaces and back gardens will totally decimate and change the character and the environment of this area. The traffic infrastructure will be totally inadequate with traffic problems already a big issue during peak hours as it is. It is already terrifying to see the number of tower blocks going up along East Croydon station resulting in the ever changing skyline of Croydon, turning the town into a massive concrete jungle. We sincerely implore you to reconsider your plans and not to destroy our beautiful green belt and protecting the environment in and around this area. We have lived in Shirley for forty years and over this period we have seen so many new buildings and green open spaces lost to developers.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I would like to object to the proposed travellers sites for the following reasons which I believe are material grounds to refuse these plans:

- The Council has an obligation to consider all potential sites across the borough. It also needs to demonstrate this, and provide information that details what sites were considered (both private and publicly) together with full assessments on these sites. This I cannot see has been done.

- The suggested sites are in close proximity to each other in a huge borough. This cannot be correct. Fine, allow one - but all three? This is politically motivated.

- There is currently not enough amenities locally and no plans to increase them. School places and GPs are already full.

- Transport concerns. PTAL ratings or similar, where are they?

- Featherbed Lane site is verging on green belt. We should not be using these types of land for this - we have lots of brownfield sites that should be used.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I have been made aware of the proposals for Site References 661, 502 and 755 for use as traveller sites. I object on the grounds that these are Green Belt sites covered by Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and are therefore unsuitable for traveller camps. I use both sites near Coombe Lodge fairly regularly and was frightened by loose and dangerous dogs when the site was being used illegally by travellers, and I noticed that the woods were being used as a toilet. The amenities of that area would be lost to everyone else if these proposals were to proceed.

I object to the following location as a gypsy and traveller site: Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane, site 755;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4121/01/002/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Janet Norris</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of Pear Tree Farm on Featherbed Lane Ref 755 as a gypsy/traveller site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4121/01/003/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr David Hazzard</td>
<td>The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4122/01/003/DM32.2/O</td>
<td></td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by Section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM32.2</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4127/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>The Croydon Auto Bikes Scheme</td>
<td>No, as it would result in the business closing and loss of employment. No, because business does not want to vacate the site and would object to any Compulsory Purchase Notice. No, the site is in the wrong location for a Gypsy &amp; Traveller site. Sites should not be proposed for allocation when the users / owners of site have no desire to vacate.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4132/01/003/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Janet Harding</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of Pear Tree Farm on Featherbed Lane as gypsy / traveller site</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4138/01/003/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Ms S Rao</td>
<td>I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage on Featherbed Lane, (site reference 755 Policy DM32.2)</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4143/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Miss R Thorogood</td>
<td>The draft Local Plan identifying Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm College on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site with 15-20 pitches (pages 188-189. Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 755). This site is in the Green Belt and Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: 'Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development' This site is also a distance from public services so unsuitable for the potential Travellers anyway.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am grateful to the Council for consulting on the detailed policies and proposals that will make up the Croydon Local Plan. There is much in the document that I agree with, but some of the proposals would, in my opinion, change the character of parts of Croydon very much for the worse. I hope you will forgive me if I focus on these areas of contention. I am therefore writing to formally object to:
3. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:
   • Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502;
   • Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; and
   • Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 755;
As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the government in August, says very clearly:
“Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).
National guidelines clearly state that Travellers Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The Council’s proposals, therefore, clearly breach such guidelines. Also, we question the Council’s assertion that it needs to quadruple the number of travellers/gypsy sites in the Borough. Apart from this major objection, the above sites identified for such use would have:
- poor access via narrow roads/lanes for large vehicles;
- consequent impact upon local traffic congestion with movements of large vehicles;
- no safe paved walking routes to schools, shops, doctors, etc.;
- additional requirement for services and facilities for hygienic occupation;
- increased pressure on local schools, medical facilities, waste disposal, etc.;
- impact upon local facilities and amenities of current residents.
Also, we understand that the proposed pitches would accommodate considerably more caravans and associated vehicles than can be controlled by planning restrictions.

change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
The GTANA report (2013) does not consider why there is a requirement to provide such facilities and refers to the CLG's document Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (March 2014) which states that Local Authorities should in producing their local plans, consider joint development plans that set targets on a cross authority basis. This proposal seems to have been produced in isolation from other neighbouring councils even though the above clearly indicates that nearby councils such as Sevenoaks, Tandridge and Bromley have higher demand. Proposals in the Housing and Planning Bill 2015-2016 are to remove the statutory requirement on local authorities to assess the specific accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers - the emphasis being that when authorities are carrying out a review of housing needs that it considers the needs of all the people residing in their district, without any reference to Gypsies and Travellers. We hope this means that Croydon Council will consider our needs and the needs of our neighbours and local services and businesses as worthy as those of Gypsy and Travelling people. We understand that there is a lot of opposition to the proposed sites from people currently residing in the district due to the threat to the Green Belt, increased traffic and increased pressure on local services. Surely such low scores within the "Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers" (August 2015) should have resulted in an acceptance that none of the sites are really particularly suitable and that the council will need to liaise with other council if determined to make provision. All three sites are in Green Belt land - Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites - traveller sites (temporary and permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. Further concern for the impact upon Green Belt is highlighted in the GTANA Stakeholder consultation. The sites are contrary to the Strategic Policies (April 2013) in terms of access from roads and proximity to bus routes; and access to essential services including health and education facilities.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object DM32.2 755
The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)
Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object DM32.2 755
I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661, policy number DM44: and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502, policy number DM43 Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference number 755, policy number DM32. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites eg the site off the Purley Way. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards.
Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object DM32.2 755
I wish to object to the use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy and traveler site (Site reference 755).
Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object DM32.2 755
I object to the use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site (reference number 755)
Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4177/01/003/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Potter</td>
<td>Object The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4180/01/003/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr David Stagg</td>
<td>Object The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4183/01/003/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>G.A Dale</td>
<td>Object The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4185/01/003/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>L Gorrie</td>
<td>Object The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4187/01/003/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Mark Tatum</td>
<td>Object to the use of Pear Tree Farm as a Travellers site</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Such development is in breach of Policy Eat Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that ‘Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites now, and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough. If the number of Gypsy/Traveller sites really needs to be increased by this amount then a more appropriate location would be around the existing site at Purley Way. The positioning of a Gypsy/Traveller site adjacent to the car park for Coombe Woods, between the Chateau Restaurant and the Hotel/restaurant, would probably deter me from using any of these attractions.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I have restricted my objections to those plans that primarily affect the area of Shirley I which I live, but the same objections apply to other proposals in other parts of the borough.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object to the use of Pear Tree Farm as a Travellers site

DM32.2

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr R.C Syred

Object to the use of Pear Tree Farm as a Travellers site

DM32.2

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr R Fanthome

Object

DM32.2

I strongly object to the Council proposal for this very inappropriate traveller site at Pear Tree Farm on Featherbed Lane. My reasons are:

- The site entrance is extremely hazardous and totally unsuitable for this proposal.
- There are no direct transport links so the traffic increase in this local area would lead to more accidents.
- The consultation period is simply not long enough nor appropriate or in-depth given the vast impact this will have on all of us living in the community.
- The council money spent on this project is disproportionate to any benefits for such a small number of families - it is not good value.
- The site is in a designated Green Belt area and so must not be developed. Even the government says that this is an inappropriate development.
- There is a shortage of amenities needed for these travellers and there is potential for an increase in fly-tipping as well as noise pollution and other problems.

Mrs Brenda Taylor

Object

DM32.2

The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the Gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites: Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane (reference number 755). As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where..."

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661, policy number DM44; and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502, policy number DM43. Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference number 755, policy number DM32. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites eg the site off the Purley Way. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards. The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM32.2 755</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>The site is in private ownership and the landowners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Mr & Mrs Farrow

Object

DM32.2
755

5. Proposed Policy DM43 Creation of Gypsy Traveller sites at Coombe Farm, off Oaks Road, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, off Conduit Lane and Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage Featherbed Lane.

I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Such development is in breach of Policy Eat Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that ‘Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites now, and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough. If the number of Gypsy/Traveller sites really needs to be increased by this amount then a more appropriate location would be around the existing site at Purley Way. The positioning of a Gypsy/Traveller site adjacent to the car park for Coombe Woods, between the Chateau Restaurant and the Hotel/restaurant, would probably deter me from using any of these attractions.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I have restricted my objections to those plans that primarily affect the area of Shirley I which I live, but the same objections apply to other proposals in other parts of the borough.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Mr &amp; Mrs White</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM32.2</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4233/01/003/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs White</td>
<td>Object the use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DM32.2</td>
<td>Object to the use of Pear Tree Farm as a Travellers site</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4240/01/004/DM32.2/C</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Galyer</td>
<td>Object the use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4242/01/003/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Jaques</td>
<td>Object the use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4244/01/010/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Kellty</td>
<td>Object Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 755; As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward; one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Number</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs McManus</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Grinham</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Rasell</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Westbrook</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Worman</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Object to the proposed Travellers site at Featherbed Lane</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr A White

DM32.2 755

RE: Objection to Croydon Local Plan (Ref:755) — Pear Tree Farm as a proposed Traveller Gypsy site

I wish to strongly object to Croydon Council’s proposal to site a Gypsy/Traveller site at Pear Tree Farm. There are numerous reasons for my objection; including:

- Pear Tree Farm is in designated Green Belt and as a result should not be developed. The Government’s Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (published August 2015) states:
  o “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”
- Pear Tree Farm is not owned by the Council therefore the cost to the council and the tax payer to purchase the land could be considerable
- The cost to change the use of Pear Tree Farm from a waste transfer site to a traveller’s camp would also be considerable as there has been years of contamination from (amongst other things) asbestos, oil, diesel, chemicals etc.
- Pear Tree Farm is surrounded by Ancient Woodland
- Pear Tree Farm is surrounded by wildlife (deer, butterflies, sheep, horses, rare orchids etc) and is opposite Hutchinson’s Band which is a nature reserve. There could be a risk to the local wildlife
- Potential for extra litter/fly tipping on Featherbed Lane
- All three of Croydon’s proposed Gypsy/Traveller sites are within a 3 mile radius of one another and in adjacent wards. This is unfair and inequitable for those living in the area
- There is already a shortage of local school places
- There are no transport links to Pear Tree Farm
- There is no pavement along featherbed Lane beyond Farleigh Dean Crescent and no street lighting
- How will Croydon Council control & monitor official number of travellers — could easily be overrun
- How will the police the area as there is already very little police presence in the area (and even less going forward)
- Noise pollution — Featherbed Lane is in a valley and noise travels a long way
- The entrance to the site is extremely precarious as it is on a blind bend

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr D Nesterovitch

Object

I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661, policy number DM44: and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502, policy number DM43 Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference number 755, policy number DM32. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy 5P2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites eg the site off the Purley Way. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr D Payne

Object

The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mrs A Dada

Object

Object to the use of Pear Tree Farm as a Travellers site

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr E Mills

Object

The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM32.2/755</td>
<td>Mr G Drinkwater</td>
<td>The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult, it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM32.2/755</td>
<td>Mr G Meacock</td>
<td>The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult, it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM32.2/755</td>
<td>P.M Robertson</td>
<td>The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult, it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM32.2/755</td>
<td>Mr P Tyler</td>
<td>This is green belt land and government Policy states that such sites are inappropriate on such land.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult, it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM32.2/755</td>
<td>Mrs R Simking</td>
<td>Object to the use of Pear Tree Farm as a Travellers site</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult, it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM32.2/755</td>
<td>Mr Roberts</td>
<td>The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM32.2/755</td>
<td>Mrs Carol Mamora</td>
<td>I object to the use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a gypsy/traveller site (755).</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

02 September 2016
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I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Such development is in breach of Policy Eat Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that ‘Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites now, and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough. If the number of Gypsy/Traveller sites really needs to be increased by this amount then a more appropriate location would be around the existing site at Purley Way. The positioning of a Gypsy/Traveller site adjacent to the car park for Coombe Woods, between the Chateau Restaurant and the Hotel/restaurant, would probably deter me from using any of these attractions.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I have restricted my objections to those plans that primarily affect the area of Shirley I which I live, but the same objections apply to other proposals in other parts of the borough.
Mr M Norman
Object

The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr P Bhanji
Object

I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661, policy number DM44: and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502, policy number DM3: Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference number 755, policy number DM32. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites eg the site off the Purley Way. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards.

Mr P Cornish
Object

The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr & Mrs Rasbrook & Pickford
Object

The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4350/01/003/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr W Pook</td>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4352/01/003/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mrs I Pegrum</td>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4355/01/003/DM32.2/O | Mrs J Dobbs | DM32.2 755               | I am writing to object to the use of Pear Tree Farm off Featherbed Lane, Site 755 as a gypsy and traveller site.
Development on sites 661,502 and 755 would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a & SP2.7b | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use. |
<p>| 4356/01/002/DM32.2/O | Mrs A Coyle | DM32.2 755               | I am writing to object to the use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage as a location for a gypsy/traveller site (Ref 755) | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use. |
| 4362/01/004/DM32.2/C | Mrs G Syred | DM32.2 755               | Object to the use of Pear Tree Farm as a Travellers site | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM32.2 755</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I object to the use of Pear Tree Farm off Featherbed Lane Site 775 as a Gypsy and Traveller site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change**

The site is in private ownership and the landowners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
We object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Such development is in breach of Policy Eat Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that ‘Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites now, and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough. If the number of Gypsy/Traveller sites really needs to be increased by this amount then a more appropriate location would be around the existing site at Purley Way. The positioning of a Gypsy/Traveller site adjacent to the car park for Coombe Woods, between the Chateau Restaurant and the Hotel/restaurant, would probably deter me from using any of these attractions.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I have restricted my objections to those plans that primarily affect the area of Shirley I which I live, but the same objections apply to other proposals in other parts of the borough.

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Such development is in breach of Policy Eat Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that ‘Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites now, and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough. If the number of Gypsy/Traveller sites really needs to be increased by this amount then a more appropriate location would be around the existing site at Purley Way. The positioning of a Gypsy/Traveller site adjacent to the car park for Coombe Woods, between the Chateau Restaurant and the Hotel/restaurant, would probably deter me from using any of these attractions.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I have restricted my objections to those plans that primarily affect the area of Shirley I which I live, but the same objections apply to other proposals in other parts of the borough.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4373/01/003/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mrs J.M Martin</td>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the Gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755) Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4381/01/003/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Ms Sagar &amp; Allen</td>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the Gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755) Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4382/01/003/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Kate Adams</td>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the Gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755) Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4384/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Ms N Nesterovich</td>
<td>DM32.2 755</td>
<td>I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661, policy number DM44: and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502, policy number DM43 Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference number 755, policy number DM32. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites eg the site off the Purley Way. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards. Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Document Number</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>5988/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Dagger Skips</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>5989/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Cardiff Skips</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>5990/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Croydon Coaches</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>5991/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>London Scaffolding</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>5992/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Paragon White Lining</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5993/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>South Norwood Scaffolding</td>
<td>It would result in the business closing and loss of employment. The business does not want to vacate the site and would object to any Compulsory Purchase Notice. The site is in the wrong location for a Gypsy and Traveller site. Sites should not be proposed for allocation when the users/owners of the site have no desire to vacate.</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5994/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Woodside Containers</td>
<td>It would result in the business closing and loss of employment. The business does not want to vacate the site and would object to any Compulsory Purchase Notice. The site is in the wrong location for a Gypsy and Traveller site. Sites should not be proposed for allocation when the users/owners of the site have no desire to vacate.</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5995/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Ace Skips</td>
<td>It would result in the business closing and loss of employment. The business does not want to vacate the site and would object to any Compulsory Purchase Notice. The site is in the wrong location for a Gypsy and Traveller site. Sites should not be proposed for allocation when the users/owners of the site have no desire to vacate.</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5996/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>CCT Pipe Freezing</td>
<td>It would result in the business closing and loss of employment. The business does not want to vacate the site and would object to any Compulsory Purchase Notice. The site is in the wrong location for a Gypsy and Traveller site. Sites should not be proposed for allocation when the users/owners of the site have no desire to vacate.</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5997/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Dance Road Marking</td>
<td>It would result in the business closing and loss of employment. The business does not want to vacate the site and would object to any Compulsory Purchase Notice. The site is in the wrong location for a Gypsy and Traveller site. Sites should not be proposed for allocation when the users/owners of the site have no desire to vacate.</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object | DM32.2 | It would result in the business closing and loss of employment. The business does not want to vacate the site and would object to any Compulsory Purchase Notice. The site is in the wrong location for a Gypsy and Traveller site. Sites should not be proposed for allocation when the users/owners of the site have no desire to vacate.

Change | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object | DM32.2 | It would result in the business closing and loss of employment. The business does not want to vacate the site and would object to any Compulsory Purchase Notice. The site is in the wrong location for a Gypsy and Traveller site. Sites should not be proposed for allocation when the users/owners of the site have no desire to vacate.

Change | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object | DM32.2 | It would result in the business closing and loss of employment. The business does not want to vacate the site and would object to any Compulsory Purchase Notice. The site is in the wrong location for a Gypsy and Traveller site. Sites should not be proposed for allocation when the users/owners of the site have no desire to vacate.

Change | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object | DM32.2 | It would result in the business closing and loss of employment. The business does not want to vacate the site and would object to any Compulsory Purchase Notice. The site is in the wrong location for a Gypsy and Traveller site. Sites should not be proposed for allocation when the users/owners of the site have no desire to vacate.

Change | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object | DM32.2 | It would result in the business closing and loss of employment. The business does not want to vacate the site and would object to any Compulsory Purchase Notice. The site is in the wrong location for a Gypsy and Traveller site. Sites should not be proposed for allocation when the users/owners of the site have no desire to vacate.

Change | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colin Holiday (Scaffold)</td>
<td>It would result in the business closing and loss of employment. The business does not want to vacate the site and would object to any Compulsory Purchase Notice. The site is in the wrong location for a Gypsy and Traveller site. Sites should not be proposed for allocation when the users/owners of the site have no desire to vacate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morland Coaches</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG Tippers</td>
<td>It would result in the business closing and loss of employment. The business does not want to vacate the site and would object to any Compulsory Purchase Notice. The site is in the wrong location for a Gypsy and Traveller site. Sites should not be proposed for allocation when the users/owners of the site have no desire to vacate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes Scaffolding</td>
<td>It would result in the business closing and loss of employment. The business does not want to vacate the site and would object to any Compulsory Purchase Notice. The site is in the wrong location for a Gypsy and Traveller site. Sites should not be proposed for allocation when the users/owners of the site have no desire to vacate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Code</td>
<td>Business Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6009/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>OCM Scaffolding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6010/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Lee Holiday Scaffolding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6011/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Skip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6012/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Shirley Scaffolding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6013/01/001/DM32.2/O</td>
<td>Wilson Skip &amp; Grab Hire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Object: It would result in the business closing and loss of employment. The business does not want to vacate the site and would object to any Compulsory Purchase Notice. The site is in the wrong location for a Gypsy and Traveller site. Sites should not be proposed for allocation when the users/owners of the site have no desire to vacate.

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM32.2 755</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T Morris</td>
<td>The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for the gypsy/Traveller site (site reference 755)</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Mathers</td>
<td>We have seen information suggesting that 3 Traveller sites maybe placed around the Forestdale and Shirley Areas, and also plans to Intensify the Housing of Forestdale! We believe the plans for Traveller sites are wholly unfair and building on land which is Green Belt is inappropriate development. Policy E of Planning for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August indeed states this also. The building of such sites would also be hugely detrimental to house values, and totally unacceptable. We completely object to this so these plans need to be scrapped NOW!</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The suggested policy for building height and external presentation could maintain the village atmosphere of central Addiscombe. However, this does also discourage any large outlets and therefore requires residents to travel (often by car) to Purley Way. There appear to be several traders who are likely to close down, so there is a risk that Strategic Objectives are met but the type of traders no longer provides a suitable service to the local community. The lack of a Traders’ Association is evidence that conditions are below optimum. There is anger that Charity Shops gain preferential treatment for business rates.

The concern remains that the planning system allowed the demolition of the Black Horse Pub and the erection of an out of character structure. Agree strongly that ground floor frontages should remain active and un-obscured. Additionally, however, while the rhythm of the separate individual buildings is attractive and beneficial, it should not preclude separate ground floor units from being joined where this may make a business more viable or where an already successful business may hope to expand. Some of the smaller business units may be too small to practically allow even a small business to successfully operate, with the result that the unit may remain empty, indefinitely, and thereby breaking the rhythm. The safe-guard in retaining the rhythm would be maintained by further guidelines being established in relation to the joining of separate units sympathetically.

Although part of Bingham Road has been shown as a Local Heritage Area (Policy SP4), the damage to several of these properties has already been allowed through multiple occupancy and parking in front gardens. We originally asked for a much wider Heritage Area for Northampton Road, Cheyne Walk, Annandale Road, Carlyle Road, Fryston Avenue, Ashburton Avenue, Whiston Gardens, Beech Tree Way, Ashurst Walk. These were all developed under strict covenants from the Ashburton Estate.

The major problem that has precluded development of any large retail outlets is the lack of parking space. This also mitigates against...
any SME who relies on clients arriving by car. While Addiscombe Tram stop and bus stops provide good transport links, they are not really suitable for the large weekly shop, or collection of larger items of furniture or white goods. Delivery of stock to retail outlets often causes parking issues e.g. double parking or parking on zig-zag lines. The mix of retail outlets has become less attractive, although the multiple Charity shops provide a wide selection of second hand goods. There is no specialist clothing shop for ladies, children’s or gents, no haberdashery, no kitchen ware, no furniture, no antiques no artists or bookshop. Some of these specialist shops do not exist in central Croydon either. The local traders association has folded so there is minimal coordinated representation to the council.

The suggested building heights could maintain the village atmosphere of Central Addiscombe but also discourage any large outlets and therefore require residents to travel by car to Purley Way etc. There appears to be several traders who could be closing down and there is anger that charity shops get preferential business rates.

The place specific policy for the Addiscombe local centre is intended to accommodate growth and to complement local character. Large retail with corporate design would substantially narrow this character and therefore would not be appropriate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM33.1</th>
<th>Clause e) from the previous Detailed Policy should be reinstated.</th>
<th>Clause e) from the previous Detailed Policy should be reinstated.</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addiscombe Residents Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed change has been made and policy 33.1 reads:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Within the Addiscombe District Centre, to ensure that the District Centre characteristics are respected and enhanced proposals should: a) Complement existing predominant building heights of 2 storeys up to 4 storeys and a maximum of 5 storeys around the Lower Addiscombe Road and Blackhorse Lane Junction; b) Retain the rhythm, size and the continuity of ground floor active frontages; c) Allow flexibility at first floor and above for mixed use; d) Retain, enhance and positively reference corner features such as the articulation of corner buildings and architectural features such as domed projecting bays with finials and the projecting double gable ends running at 90 degree angles interrupting the running cornices; e) Incorporate or retain traditional shop front elements such as stall riser’s fascias and pilasters; and f) Incorporate multi-stock brick as the predominant facing materials of the whole building.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clause e) from the previous Detailed Policy should be reinstated.

Change

The proposed change has been made and policy 33.1 reads:

"Within the Addiscombe District Centre, to ensure that the District Centre characteristics are respected and enhanced proposals should:

a) Complement existing predominant building heights of 2 storeys up to 4 storeys and a maximum of 5 storeys around the Lower Addiscombe Road and Blackhorse Lane Junction;

b) Retain the rhythm, size and the continuity of ground floor active frontages;

c) Allow flexibility at first floor and above for mixed use;

d) Retain, enhance and positively reference corner features such as the articulation of corner buildings and architectural features such as domed projecting bays with finials and the projecting double gable ends running at 90 degree angles interrupting the running cornices;

e) Incorporate or retain traditional shop front elements such as stall riser’s fascias and pilasters; and

f) Incorporate multi-stock brick as the predominant facing materials of the whole building.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2605/01/019/DM33.2/O</td>
<td>Ian Broyd</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM33.2</td>
<td>Revitalising the retail areas and resolving the transport and traffic issues are of greatest importance for this area. To make this policy meaningful further details are needed, the policy is too weak as it stands. A meaningful consultation with the residents of this area is well overdue and we would ask you to organise it and then come up with a plan and with the action points and funding.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The policy needs to be more detailed in order to revitalise the retail areas and resolve the transport and traffic issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2846/01/003/DM33.2/S</td>
<td>Alison and Kemal Hairettin</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>DM33.2</td>
<td>We support the proposals</td>
<td>Welcome support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769/01/001/DM33.3/O</td>
<td>Agne Odhaimbo</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM33.3</td>
<td>I am sad to find these intentions of new housing heavily and one-sidedly impacting Shirley and Addington, but I must especially emphasise that with every new housing public transport has to be increased to adequate. I would propose to consider extending tramlink to Shirley as the area in between is poorly covered, before it is built up even more. Perhaps a new tram line ending via Ashburton fields, or from Elmers end to Addington. I am near Edenham school and the only bus 367 is a joke. Please develop the tramlink as London is expanding south then people would be more happy.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I would propose to consider extending tramlink to Shirley as the area in between is poorly covered, before it is built up even more. Perhaps a new tram line ending via Ashburton fields, or from Elmers end to Addington.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please develop the tramlink as London is expanding south then people would be more happy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The place specific policies are designed to manage local character. The issues of land use and transportation are covered by other sections of the plan and apply to the whole borough unless stated otherwise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object The Hyde Group

The Hyde Group’s initial development proposals would bring forward a number of benefits including:
- The provision of over 1.2 ha of publicly assessable open space which will visually and physically improve the link between South Norwood Country Park and Long Lane Wood, thus better contributing towards the local Green Grid;
- The provision of new public footpaths throughout the proposed new open space which will provide better links to / from the Arena Tramlink Stop and the surrounding area;
- The provision of new play space within the proposed open space;
- The provision of trees and shrubs to increase the potential for biodiversity and to provide habitats for specific target species;
- The provision of approximately 136 affordable units (100% of the total provision) which will help to address the recent undersupply of affordable housing in the borough (as identified within the Council’s SHMA);
- The provision of a range of accommodation (including flats and houses, and one, two and three bedroom units) which will help to create a mixed and balanced community; and
- The provision of a new community facility which has the potential to accommodate a variety of community uses.

The benefits of such a scheme coming forward in this location would help the Council meet their Strategic Objectives, notably:
- Strategic Objective 3 – Provide a choice of housing for people at all stages of life;
- Strategic Objective 6 – Provide well designed community facilities;
- Strategic Objective 8 – Improve accessibility, connectivity, sustainability and ease of movement to, from and with the borough; and
- Strategic Objective 10 – Improve the quality and accessibility of green space and nature, whilst protecting and enhancing biodiversity.

Given our representation on Policy SPT (as set out earlier), we consider that the World of Golf site should be included in Table 11.6 for residential development (including a significant area of publicly assessable open space and a new community facility).

No change All Green Belt and MOL sites were reviewed, including World of Golf. The site is correctly designated as MOL in that regard.

Object Addiscombe Residents Association

This site is not appropriate for a secondary school due to heavy traffic and no open space for a playing field. The site should be used for residential.

No change The site has been identified as being large enough to provide a secondary school to meet the need for school places in the borough.

Object Mrs Mira Armour

Rees House and Mortand Lodge – not appropriate for a secondary school – heavy traffic, no open space for a playing field designate for residential use

No change The site has been identified as being large enough to provide a secondary school to meet the need for school places in the borough.
116  0391/01/001/DM33.3/O Mrs Mira Armour
  HOME Residents Association

Object DM33.3
Rees House and Morland Lodge - not
appropriate for a secondary school -
heavy traffic, no open space for a
playing field
Designate for residential use No change
The site has been identified
as being large enough to
provide a secondary school
to meet the need for school
places in the borough.

116  2151/01/005/DM33.3/O Mr Rod Davies
  East Croydon Community Organis

Object DM33.3
ECCO object to the site being
developed as as secondary school.
The arguments for this site to be
turned over to a secondary school
have not been made by the Council.
ECCO has previously understood
that the site was to become much needed
social housing as part of CCURV,
which is in keeping with the adjacent
areas. The site is too small to provide
the facilities required by a secondary
school, such as playing fields. It is
not obvious to ECCO where the
school would access playing fields
and open space. It would located by
a very busy junction with significant
numbers of fast foot outlets etc.
which does not provide a good
environment for young people.
Affordable housing is desperately
needed in Croydon, and as Rees
House is a medium rise building
constructing flats there would not
cause a material change to the
environment. Although the CLP
asserts that secondary school places
are more urgently needed
homes, it provides no further detail
where this demand exists. If the
demand is largely within the north of
the borough then every step should
be taken to create facilities close to
where the future pupils live. It is not
obvious within the ECCO area that
there is significant demand that
cannot be met by existing
provision. There are already 3
secondary state secondary schools
and 1 private secondary in the area.
It is not desirable to concentrate
more secondary provision into such a
small area.
The Council should explore other
sites in Croydon, preferably away
from the town centre but well served
by public transport that could provide
a far better environment for learning.
(Conduit Lane site which is close to
playing fields, Lloyd Park and
provides a leafy pleasant
environment might be one such
location.)The Council has
consistently failed to effectively
engage with local communities to
seek solutions and obtain community
support.
The site should not be allocated as a
school. No change
The site has been identified
as being large enough to
provide a secondary school
to meet the need for school
places in the borough.

116  2605/01/010/DM33.3/O Ian Broyd

Object DM33.3
This site is not appropriate for a
secondary school due to heavy traffic
and no open space for a playing field.
The site should be used for residential. No change
The site has been identified
as being large enough to
provide a secondary school
to meet the need for school
places in the borough.
The Education Funding Agency has approved 3 new Free Schools currently looking for sites within Croydon. This site has been identified as being potentially suitable options for the permanent location of the Ark Croydon Secondary Academy. We would welcome the opportunity to work with Croydon Council and the respective trust to make these sites available options for these schools.
Ark Support

Ark has had two free school applications approved by the Department for Education (DfE) to develop a two-form entry primary school and a three-form entry secondary school to meet the pupil place demand in Croydon which has been identified by Croydon Council. Ark is an education charity and one of the country’s top-performing academy operators. Our network comprises of both new-start and transition schools that have become Ark academies. We currently operate 34 schools in London, Birmingham, Hastings and Portsmouth. No two of our schools are the same but we all share the same mission. Our aim is to create outstanding schools that give every Ark pupil, no matter their background or prior attainment, the opportunity to go to university or pursue the career of their choice. Ark has a proven track record in providing high standards of education across its school network and was recently rated by the DfE as the highest performing large multi-academy trust for value added. We’re proud that our schools have achieved some of the best results in the country. We’re also proud of the Ark staff who have built environments where pupils can succeed. Ark schools are twice as likely to be outstanding and all Ark schools have now come out of special measures and all bar one is now ‘Good’ or ‘Outstanding’. We have held talks with Croydon Council and the EFA over the development of a three-form entry secondary school on the site. One of the buildings already located on the site is owned by the NHS and the use of this site for a school development depends on whether an alternative site can be confirmed to which the NHS services could relocate. We understand that due diligence has begun on an alternative NHS site and the proposal will be tabled at their board meeting in December. - The site is a suitable shape and size for the development of a three-form entry secondary school - The site is in an area that will require additional secondary pupil places in the coming years - The site is in an area which meets the demographic criteria for Ark schools - The site is located near Ark Oval Primary Academy and would therefore create an opportunity to establish a link between the two schools.
2666/01/007/DM33.3/O  C Morley-Smith
Object
DM33.3 116
Please make proper provision for drop off/pick up, traffic control at rush hours and school times. Morland Road is already very busy at these times, with traffic backing up right down towards Woodside, and having vehicles stop at or near where the current entrance to the site would be a disaster
No change
Drop off/pick up would be dealt with during any planning permission on this site.

2818/01/001/DM33.3/S  Keisha John
Support
DM33.3 116
Residential development if the site is not required for a school by 2021. I am currently applying through Croydon for a free school, the proposed name for the school is MADE academy. MADE academy will like to express interest in the site mentioned in section 1. We aim to provide a creative and robust curriculum. My question is: Will the borough need another school before the dates suggested on the sites? Will there be negotiations on the intake size, such as five form entry instead of an eight form entry for the suggested school?
No change
Applications for free schools will be considered on their merits. This site has been allocated for a school but in order not to preclude its development for another use, a time limit has been put on when the need should be reassessed. Currently there is a need for a school in this area and this site has been identified as being suitable. Enquiries about opening a new Free School should be made to the Council's education service.

0120/02/011/DM33.3/O  Addiscombe Residents Association
Object
DM33.3 474
The allocation is speculative and would maybe undermine the present pub.
The site should not be allocated for residential.
No change
The site is considered appropriate for development. Any development of the site will be required to incorporate high quality design in line with local, regional and national policy. The site does not encroach on the existing public house.

0391/01/002/DM33.3/O  Mrs Mira Armour
HOME Residents Association
Object
DM33.3 474
Rear of Cricketers – Object as speculative – no interest and would maybe undermine the present pub
No change
The site is considered appropriate for development. Any development of the site will be required to incorporate high quality design in line with local, regional and national policy.

0391/02/002/DM33.3/O  Mrs Mira Armour
HOME Residents Association
Object
DM33.3 474
Rear of Cricketers – Object as speculative – no interest and would maybe undermine the present pub
No change
The site is considered appropriate for development. Any development of the site will be required to incorporate high quality design in line with local, regional and national policy. The site does not encroach on the existing public house.

2605/01/011/DM33.3/O  Ian Broyd
Object
DM33.3 474
The allocation is speculative and would maybe undermine the present pub.
The site should not be allocated for residential.
No change
The site is considered appropriate for development. Any development of the site will be required to incorporate high quality design in line with local, regional and national policy. The site does not encroach on the existing public house.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object Soundness - Effective</th>
<th>DM33.3 474</th>
<th>DM33.3 68</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2657/01/001/DM33.3/O Rebecca Pullinger CPRE London | A large number of the sites allocated for development through Detailed Policies and Proposals may result in the loss of green space. This appears to run counter to the Borough’s Strategic Objective 10 (The need to utilise brownfield areas first) and could be replaced with a goal to promote good quality high density developments that protect Croydon’s green spaces. Even undesignated green spaces provide important ecosystem services to Croydon’s growing population. We are also concerned about impacts on access to the adjacent Mol site. | The Council should provide additional text in these policies to encourage developers to propose good quality, high density developments which promote the protection and enhancement of green space. | No change The site is considered appropriate for development. Any development of the site will be required to incorporate high quality design in line with local, regional and national policy. |}
| 3080/01/017/DM33.3/O Mr John Mills | Furthermore, I also object to the proposals to build flats to the rear of the Cricketers Public House in Shirley Road. This road is extremely busy and proposed development will lead to increased volume of traffic and will exacerbate existing traffic congestion at peak times (e.g. rush hour, school times). I am also concerned that this will lead to the loss of the local shops and businesses next door to the development. | No change The site is considered appropriate for development. Any development of the site will be required to incorporate high quality design in line with local, regional and national policy. The site does not encroach on the existing public house. |}
| 0407/01/003/DM33.3/O A Douthwaite | I was at the consultation on 28 November at Bernard Weatherall House and noted that it was proposed that the area behind 130 Oval Road, currently containing a warehouse and vacant space should be redeveloped for 10-57 houses. The latter figure is ludicrous: it could only be obtained by building blocks of flats which would be out of character with the housing in the area and would mean many properties would be overlooked. Sandwiching housing between Oval Road and Cedar Road would need very careful, minimal, development. Would it also encroach on garden areas of the surrounding properties? | No change Any planning application submitted for the redevelopment of the site would be required to adhere to the standards and would be considered against matters such as privacy, overlooking and outlook. Furthermore, the density on the site will be agreed through a planning application. The range identified in the allocation indicates what could be achieved on the site taking into consideration the current character of the area, and what could be provided on the site if the over all character of the area was to change. |}
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Councillor Luke Clancy

Object
Soundness - Justified
DM34.3

DM34.3 should not allow for 6 storey development around the Lombard Roundabout as intensification of this area is already having an impact on local amenities and infrastructure.

No change
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. There are already two schemes containing 6 storey elements approved in the Lombard Roundabout, one of which is currently in construction. The policy puts a cap on scale of any future re-development in the area.

Councillor Dudley Mead
London Borough of Croydon

Comment
DM34.3

DM34.3 should not allow for 6 storey development around the Lombard Roundabout as intensification of this area is already having an impact on local amenities and infrastructure.

No change
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. There are already two schemes containing 6 storey elements approved in the Lombard Roundabout, one of which is currently in construction. The policy puts a cap on scale of any future re-development in the area.

Councillor Jason Perry
London Borough of Croydon

Object
Soundness - Justified
DM34.3

DM34.3 should not allow for 6 storey development around the Lombard Roundabout as intensification of this area is already having an impact on local amenities and infrastructure.

No change
Croydon’s suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. There are already two schemes containing 6 storey elements approved in the Lombard Roundabout, one of which is currently in construction. The policy puts a cap on scale of any future re-development in the area.
DM34.3 should not allow for 6 storey
development around the Lombard
Roundabout as intensification of this
area is already having an impact on
local amenities and infrastructure.

6 storey development should not be
permitted.

DM34.3 should not allow for 6 storey
development around the Lombard
Roundabout as intensification of this
area is already having an impact on
local amenities and infrastructure.

DM34.3 should not allow for 6 storey
development around the Lombard
Roundabout as intensification of this
area is already having an impact on
local amenities and infrastructure.

Croydon's suburbs will have
sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. There are already two schemes containing 6 storey elements approved in the Lombard Roundabout, one of which is currently in construction. The policy puts a cap on scale of any future re-development in the area.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. There are already two schemes containing 6 storey elements approved in the Lombard Roundabout, one of which is currently in construction. The policy puts a cap on scale of any future re-development in the area.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. There are already two schemes containing 6 storey elements approved in the Lombard Roundabout, one of which is currently in construction. The policy puts a cap on scale of any future re-development in the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2635/01/018/DM34.3/O</td>
<td>Paul Sandford</td>
<td>DM34.3</td>
<td>DM34.3 should not allow for 6 storey development around the Lombard Roundabout as intensification of this area is already having an impact on local amenities and infrastructure</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2775/01/029/DM34.3/O</td>
<td>Cllr Tim Pollard</td>
<td>DM34.3</td>
<td>DM34.3 should not allow for 6 storey development around the Lombard Roundabout as intensification of this area is already having an impact on local amenities and infrastructure</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2776/01/029/DM34.3/O</td>
<td>Cllr Helen Pollard</td>
<td>DM34.3</td>
<td>DM34.3 should not allow for 6 storey development around the Lombard Roundabout as intensification of this area is already having an impact on local amenities and infrastructure</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Cllr</td>
<td>Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/12/01/29/DM34.3/O</td>
<td>Cllr Jan Buttinger</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/29/01/29/DM34.3/O</td>
<td>Cllr Margaret Mead</td>
<td>Croydon Council</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/41/01/29/DM34.3/O</td>
<td>Cllr Vidhi Mohan</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM34.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. There are already two schemes containing 6 storey elements approved in the Lombard Roundabout, one of which is currently in construction. The policy puts a cap on scale of any future re-development in the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Cllr</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2841/01/018/DM34.3/O</td>
<td>Vidhi Mohan</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Object DM34.3 should not allow for 6 storey development around the Lombard Roundabout as intensification of this area is already having an impact on local amenities and infrastructure</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2842/01/029/DM34.3/O</td>
<td>Richard Chatterjee</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Object DM34.3 should not allow for 6 storey development around the Lombard Roundabout as intensification of this area is already having an impact on local amenities and infrastructure</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3430/01/028/DM34.3/O</td>
<td>Donald Speakman</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Object DM34.3 should not allow for 6 storey development around the Lombard Roundabout as intensification of this area is already having an impact on local amenities and infrastructure</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. There are already two schemes containing 6 storey elements approved in the Lombard Roundabout, one of which is currently in construction. The policy puts a cap on scale of any future re-development in the area.
DM34.3 should not allow for 6 storey development around the Lombard Roundabout as intensification of this area is already having an impact on local amenities and infrastructure.

Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. There are already two schemes containing 6 storey elements approved in the Lombard Roundabout; one of which is currently in construction. The policy puts a cap on scale of any future re-development in the area.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. There are already two schemes containing 6 storey elements approved in the Lombard Roundabout; one of which is currently in construction. The policy puts a cap on scale of any future re-development in the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4117/01/026/DM34.3/O</td>
<td>Cllr S Brew</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM34.3 should not allow for 6 storey development around the Lombard Roundabout as intensification of this area is already having an impact on local amenities and infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4125/01/029/DM34.3/O</td>
<td>Councillor M Fisher</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM34.3 should not allow for 6 storey development around the Lombard Roundabout as intensification of this area is already having an impact on local amenities and infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. There are already two schemes containing 6 storey elements approved in the Lombard Roundabout, one of which is currently in construction. The policy puts a cap on scale of any future re-development in the area.

Croydon's suburbs will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. There are already two schemes containing 6 storey elements approved in the Lombard Roundabout, one of which is currently in construction. The policy puts a cap on scale of any future re-development in the area.
We are seeking support to open an 11-18 free school to serve the needs of the local population of the area in partnership with an education provider who has significant successful track record in opening and running secondary provision and who has a stake in this local community.

We have already met with key local partners, particularly those represented in our Trust and have their agreement for this project, in particular The BRIT School and Crystal Palace FC Foundation. The governors have set up a steering group to take forward this project and are working with representatives from both organisations.

Timescale will be agreed in discussion with Croydon Council and the EFA and DFE, but we would look to open our Year 7 in September 2018, which would be when our oldest cohort come of age. Presently Croydon Council disagree with this and have suggested that the year of greatest need may be later than this, possibly 2020, so we are mounting a case to show that there are particular pressures on school places in the Selhurst and Thornton Heath area where there are high levels of deprivation and large numbers of children who would have to travel unacceptably large distances to the south of the borough to attend secondary school. On this basis, we are seeking to make a formal application to the DFE during this academic year, hopefully to meet the March deadline. We are now looking to build support for this proposal, on the basis of our track record, local partnerships and educational expertise.

The Whitehorse Community Centre and The Aztec Centre in Boulogne Road and adjoining grass space provide a suitable footprint for a new secondary school, when seen in conjunction with the existing Crescent site that has the potential to be re-organised. We are seeking to engage Croydon Council, who own these premises. Given the outward facing, community-based vision of our proposals and our unique sponsors, we would embrace the opportunity to support any local community provision through youth and adult provision.

We are therefore requesting that Croydon Council make these premises available for free school development.

Whilst the Council is supportive of new secondary schools in the north of the borough the development of one on this site would result in the unacceptable loss of proposed Local Green Space unless there was an element of a land swap with the site of the existing Crescent Primary School and BRIT School. This could only be achieved if the proposal was delivered by the Crescent Primary School itself. It is not advisable to allocate a site that could only be delivered by one organisation (in effect a personal allocation). Therefore, it will not be allocated in the Local Plan.

However this does not mean that the Council would not consider this proposal if it came forward as a package by the Crescent Primary School and Brit School that did not result overall in the loss of Local Green Space and its functionality in the local area.
| 0790/01/140/DM34.6/O | Mr Mathew Frith  
London Wildlife Trust | Object | Soundness - Justified | DM34.6 119 | This site continues to meet the criteria for Metropolitan Open Land designation and inappropriate to allocate the site for a school. | No change | Although the site is in MOL there are no other sites available in the northwest of the borough that could accommodate this proposed use of the site |
| 2657/01/024/DM34.6/O | Rebecca Pullinger  
CPRE London | Object | Soundness - Effective | DM34.6 119 | The more specific site allocations represent a large reduction in the amount of designated and non-designated open space. While we acknowledge the need to build new homes and associated infrastructure such as schools, Croydon's growing population also needs quality open spaces for all the human amenity and ecosystem services which they provide.  

Our understanding is that this site continues to meet the criteria for Metropolitan Open Land designation and so it is wholly inappropriate to allocate the site for a school. Additionally, the site in relatively inaccessible which would almost certainly lead to increased traffic even with improved public transport. Further efforts should be made to look into other sites. General pressures relating to increasing population should not be cited exceptional circumstance required by National and London Policy to justify building on MOL. | No change | Although the site is in MOL there are no other sites available in the northwest of the borough that could accommodate this proposed use of the site |
| 3526/01/006/DM34.6/O | Linda Stevens | Object | Soundness - Justified | DM34.6 119 | I wish to voice my concerns regarding the following:  
I totally object to any reduction of green space in the borough of Croydon in favour of development. | No change | This site is needed for a primary school as there are no other suitable sites in the north west of the borough. The loss of open space will be minimised through the planning process so that most of the site will remain open. |
| 2634/01/011/DM34.6/C | Charlie Fagan  
ARK | Comment |  
DM34.6 157 | The site is too small | No change | Comment is noted. |
| 2658/01/001/DM34.6/O | B and Q | Object |  
DM34.6 314 | My client supports the designation of the existing retail floorspace within the area as a Local Centre alongside the objective to improve accessibility by public transport. While we are generally supportive of the development of residential uses in the area, we believe that greater consideration should be given to the suitability of the area for residential purposes given it lies within Flood Zone 2. In addition, my client would not support any proposals that sought the redevelopment of their site or would affect the operation of their store which is of particular concern given the wording included in Table 11.7.  

The Council should consider the suitability of residential development given that the site is in Flood Zone 2. The site should also not be allocated for redevelopment which may affect the operation of the store. | No change | The proposed use would be for a mixture of residential, retail, healthcare possibly, and community and leisure use. It is considered that any proposed use of this site should not be limited to solely residential or retail use. |
AAM are the freeholders of Valley Park Leisure Complex and Valley Retail Park. In addition, they acquired the former Stewart Plastics site, to the south of the existing IKEA store, in 2015. The extent of AAM’s ownership is shown on the enclosed plan. Clearly, AAM is a significant stakeholder in the Valley Park area, and a key delivery partner. This is the first time that the majority area at Valley Park has been within a single ownership. In addition, AAM are in discussions with other stakeholders in the area, including B&Q PLC and IKEA. The former Stewart Plastics site has been vacant for a number of years, is in poor condition and presents a negative appearance to Purley Way and the wider area. The existing accommodation does not meet modern requirements and the site is subject to multiple physical constraints that influence its future potential. Valley Park and the former Stewart Plastics site has been identified by AAM for additional investment and regeneration potentially as part of a comprehensive approach. Our client is broadly supportive of the Council’s longer term aspirations for the potential new Local Centre at Valley Park, including the objective to improve accessibility by a range of transport modes. The redevelopment of the Stewart Plastics site provides, inter alia, an opportunity to deliver a comprehensive transport solution. In any event, AAM are keen to ensure that improvements to the Leisure Complex and Retail Park in the short to medium term, including potentially upgrading the appearance of the units and public realm, can be pursued where this is not incompatible with the longer term objectives. In any event, AAM is keen to engage with the Council at the earliest opportunity to explore the potential of Valley Park including Stewart Plastics.

Support AAM are the freeholders of Valley Park Leisure Complex and Valley Retail Park. In addition, they acquired the former Stewart Plastics site, to the south of the existing IKEA store, in 2015. The extent of AAM’s ownership is shown on the enclosed plan. Clearly, AAM is a significant stakeholder in the Valley Park area, and a key delivery partner. This is the first time that the majority area at Valley Park has been within a single ownership. In addition, AAM are in discussions with other stakeholders in the area, including B&Q PLC and IKEA. The former Stewart Plastics site has been vacant for a number of years, is in poor condition and presents a negative appearance to Purley Way and the wider area. The existing accommodation does not meet modern requirements and the site is subject to multiple physical constraints that influence its future potential. Valley Park and the former Stewart Plastics site has been identified by AAM for additional investment and regeneration potentially as part of a comprehensive approach. Our client is broadly supportive of the Council’s longer term aspirations for the potential new Local Centre at Valley Park, including the objective to improve accessibility by a range of transport modes. The redevelopment of the Stewart Plastics site provides, inter alia, an opportunity to deliver a comprehensive transport solution. In any event, AAM are keen to ensure that improvements to the Leisure Complex and Retail Park in the short to medium term, including potentially upgrading the appearance of the units and public realm, can be pursued where this is not incompatible with the longer term objectives. In any event, AAM is keen to engage with the Council at the earliest opportunity to explore the potential of Valley Park including Stewart Plastics.

No change Although now in the same ownership Stewarts Plastic is an industrial site which it is considered should be considered separately from Site 334

Support Ulswater Crescent: We are strongly in favour of this being designated as industrial and were very pleased when Waitrose selected this site for their Dot Com Fulfilment Centre employing over 600 people when fully operational. However, we do feel that where there is a case for local community use, that provides employment and provides services to the local community a change of use should be permitted on a case by case basis.

No change Comment is noted

Comment is noted

No change Comment is noted

Not Duly Made Community uses are not permitted in this location as set out the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment Assigned To</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0203/03/025/DM35/C</td>
<td>02/03/2016</td>
<td>Mr. Charles King, East Coulsdon Residents’ Association</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0203/01/019/DM35/C</td>
<td>01/01/2019</td>
<td>Mr. Charles King, East Coulsdon Residents’ Association</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0203/03/023/DM35/C</td>
<td>03/03/2023</td>
<td>Mr. Charles King, East Coulsdon Residents’ Association</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0203/03/019/DM35/C</td>
<td>03/03/2019</td>
<td>Mr. Charles King, East Coulsdon Residents’ Association</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0203/01/041/DM35/O</td>
<td>01/04/2020</td>
<td>Mr. Charles King, East Coulsdon Residents’ Association</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0203/01/050/DM35/C</td>
<td>01/05/2020</td>
<td>Mr. Charles King, East Coulsdon Residents’ Association</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Charles King  
*East Coulsdon Residents' Associat*

**Comment On street parking in Coulsdon Town centre should be consistent and provide sufficient time to enable people to shop and use the business in the town centre such as the chiropodist, dentists, hairdressers, libraries and physiotherapists. This should be 2 hours with 1 hour free with the second hour charged at a reasonable cost.**

On street car parking in Coulsdon should be improved.  
No change  
This is outside of the scope of the Croydon Local Plan.

Mr Charles King  
*East Coulsdon Residents' Associat*

**Comment The Council should work with Aldi to remark the car park to increase the number of spaces, but it should remain with an hour and half free parking for the town centre.**

Aldi should increase the number of car parking spaces.  
No change  
This is outside of the scope of the Croydon Local Plan.

Mr Charles King  
*East Coulsdon Residents' Associat*

**Comment Coulsdon Library: It is essential that the town centre has a library which provides an essential service to the community both for books and for the use of computers for learning and internet connections for those who are unable to have access to modern technology at home.**

The library should be retained.  
No change  
The library is currently protected as a community facility.

Mr Charles King  
*East Coulsdon Residents' Associat*

**Comment We are appreciative of the opening of the Calat centre car park to the public. But with it its narrow entrance and difficult turn from Chipstead Valley it is far from a replacement for Lion Green Road. Planning permission is urgently needed for a new entrance from Woodcote Grove Road. On completion this should become a permanent public car park separate from the Calat Centre.**

The CALAT centre should provide a new public car parking and a new entrance should be provided.  
No change  
The provision of a new entrance to the CALAT centre is not a matter for the Local Plan.

Mr Charles King  
*East Coulsdon Residents' Associat*

**Comment Although the bypass has provided a great relief to the town centre by removing through traffic, the general increase in traffic, the closure of Lion Green car park and other local developments have increased traffic in the town centre and in surrounding roads such as Chipstead Valley Road, Lion Green Road, Portnalls Road, Maryle Lane and the Brighton Road which are at capacity during the morning and evening peaks and even on Sundays. We are concerned that when the Lion Green development is complete and Cane Hill starts to come on stream these roads will become deadlocked which will not only cause a traffic problem, but will add to the pollution levels in the town centre. It would also increase the danger to pedestrians and other road users.**

The impact of the proposed developments and the closure of the Lion Green car park on the local road network should be assessed.  
No change  
The impact of developments already granted planning permission is outside the scope of the Local Plan.
Comment Safer Neighbourhoods Police Teams: They should also be located in the Town Centre so as to integrate better into the local community. No change The proposed use is too small to allocate in the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and

Comment Health: It is important that there adequate health facilities across the borough including the south of the borough. In addition to the Main hospital and A&E services there should be adequate GP provision across the borough with a number of strategically placed Urgent Care centres across the borough to relieve the pressure on Croydon University Hospital A&E, which should include the recently refurbished "Urgent Care Centre" at Purley. We believe that there should be a local health centre for the use of local GPs in the Coulsdon town centre. No change Site 945 has been allocated for healthcare facilities and the Council continues to work with NHS partners to identify future healthcare floorspace requirements.

Comment Calat Centre: If this is closed the southern car park should be separated from the site and continue to be used as a public car park. The site could be used for other community uses, retail, commercial or housing. No change The site has not been allocated in the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals as it is an operational community facility and there is a presumption against non-community uses.

Comment We support the use of the remaining space on Leaden Hill for town centre housing, but this must have adequate parking to reflect the number of dwellings as it is in a town centre location in a controlled parking zone. Any development on Leaden Hill should have adequate parking spaces. No change This site is not included in the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals.

Comment We are strongly in favour of Ulswater Crescent being designated as industrial and were very pleased when Waitrose selected this site for their Dot Com Fulfilment Centre employing over 600 people when fully operational. However, we do feel that where there is a case for local community use, that will provide employment on larger scale than the existing uses while providing services to the local community a change of use should be permitted on a case by case basis. Community uses should be considered for this area in some instances. Not Duly Made Community uses are not permitted in this location.

Comment The remaining industrial sites at Leaden Hill near the town centre are due to be vacated early in 2016. We are of the view that this area should provide a mixture of housing and commercial as this is better suited to the area being next to Coulsdon Town station this is likely to generate a larger employment opportunity than the existing light industrial units and that is in the interest of both the town and Croydon as a whole. Leaden Hill should be included as a site providing housing and commercial. No change Leaden Hill is a protected employment site.
A Vibrant Town Centre: For a Town Centre to be successful in the 21st century it needs to be a place that is attractive for people to come and just be there, whether they are working, on business, shopping, leisure activities or just meeting other people. To achieve this people need to believe that the centre is safe, secure, friendly, an attractive place to work, visit and live in for the whole age range of the population. The Town Centre has been in steady decline and a state of flux since the closure of Cane Hill Hospital 20 years ago and does not offer the local population what they need from a modern local Town Centre. This started to improve with the coming of Aldi to the town centre and the permission for Cane Hill and a number of residential developments in and near the town centre. As a result a number of small and new businesses started to move into and open up in Coulsdon. Unfortunately this has come to an abrupt halt since the closure of Lion Green car park in July 2015, with the loss of over 150 long term and 40 short term parking places. This has had a major effect on trade in the town with trade falling by anything up to 50% and a number of small outlets closing along with other businesses looking to relocate outside the town.

Calat Centre: We are appreciative of the opening of the Calat centre car park to the public. But with it its narrow entrance and difficult turn from Chipstead Valley it is far from a replacement for Lion Green Road. Planning permission is urgently needed for a new entrance from Woodcote Grove Road. On completion this should become a permanent public car public car park separate from the Calat Centre.

Town Centre Garden: There is need for a small Town Centre garden where people can sit and talk or eat their lunch during the day. This could be behind the library or near the Cane Hill site. It should be constructed in an open style that is attractive, but in a manner so as not to attract undesirable characters.

If the Calat Centre is closed the southern car park should be separated from the site and continue to be used as a public car park. The site could be used for other community uses, retail, commercial or housing. The site should provide a public car park and should also provide community uses, retail, commercial or housing.

A new entrance to the Calat Centre is not a matter for the Local Plan.
Public Parks: Coulsdon has three excellent parks at Coulsdon Memorial Ground Marlpi Lane, Grange Park Old Coulsdon and Rickman Hill Park. Between them they offer a good range of equipment for all ages except the 9-16 year olds. A skate park should be provided at one of the parks for the uses of 9-16 year olds and the best place for this would be Rickman Hill Park. The facilities need to be kept up to date. At Grange Park the children’s play area needs to be refreshed and brought up to date.

The safer Neighbourhoods Police Teams should be located in the Town Centre so as to integrate better into the local community. A site should be identified for this use.

The CALAT centre in Malcolm Road does not feature in the documents as a site of potential reuse, though its likely closure has been announced by the Council. This site, formerly the original Smitham Primary School, is of heritage significance and the buildings should be adapted to other educational or creative innovation use. The adjacent flint faced building, the original infants school built on land donated by Edmund Byron and with a Bourne Society plaque to that effect (now a day nursery) should be preserved for its present use.

I am very concerned that if the Coulsdon Calat Centre on the former Smitham School site were to close, the prime town centre site should be used for housing and retail. It is too good a site not to use to increase the density of population and bring new employment opportunities to the south of the borough. Does its current categorisation in the local plan permit such a change of use? I believe such a change as I suggest must be enabled.
Table 11.8 sets out the proposals for uses of land at specific sites in Coulsdon which are Ref 60, Ref 372, Ref 764, Ref 945 and Ref A329. It would have been helpful to have these proposals identified on a map so that one could see exactly which areas are being proposed.

The site maps should be published.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/03/01/04/DM35/O</td>
<td>Mr Charles King</td>
<td>East Coulsdon Residents' Associat</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>It is clear from the experience of the closure of Lion Green car park that a district centre like Coulsdon cannot compete with other local district centres without a public car park. The loss of Lion Green is severely undermining the town centre.</td>
<td>The car parking should not be lost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/01/04/DM35/O</td>
<td>Mr Charles King</td>
<td>East Coulsdon Residents' Associat</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>This site should be used as a car park and recycling centre.</td>
<td>The site will be allocated for &quot;mixed use development comprising leisure, community facilities and retention of car parking spaces. Retail so long as the current planning permission is extant&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/01/08/DM35/C</td>
<td>Mr Charles King</td>
<td>East Coulsdon Residents' Associat</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>On completion of the Waitrose Supermarket in Lion Green the car park should provide at least 50 long term parking places.</td>
<td>The site will be allocated for &quot;mixed use development comprising leisure, community facilities and retention of car parking spaces. Retail so long as the current planning permission is extant&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/03/020/DM35/C</td>
<td>Mr Charles King</td>
<td>East Coulsdon Residents' Associat</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Lion Green Road: If the Waitrose development does not go ahead the site should be returned as a car park and a recycling centre.</td>
<td>The site will be allocated for &quot;mixed use development comprising leisure, community facilities and retention of car parking spaces. Retail so long as the current planning permission is extant&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/03/017/DM35/C</td>
<td>Mr Charles King</td>
<td>East Coulsdon Residents' Associat</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Lion Green Waitrose car park: On completion of the Waitrose Supermarket in Lion Green the car park should provide at least 50 long term parking places.</td>
<td>The site will be allocated for &quot;mixed use development comprising leisure, community facilities and retention of car parking spaces. Retail so long as the current planning permission is extant&quot;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object: A Vibrant Town Centre: For a Town Centre to be successful in the 21st century it needs to be a place that is attractive for people to come and just be there, whether they are working, on business, shopping, leisure activities or just meeting other people. To achieve this people need to believe that the centre is safe, secure, friendly, an attractive place to work, visit and live in for the whole age range of the population. The Town Centre has been in steady decline and a state of flux since the closure of Cane Hill Hospital 20 years ago and does not offer the local population what they need from a modern local Town Centre. This started to improve with the coming of Aldi to the town centre and the permission for Cane Hill and a number of residential developments in and near the town centre. As a result a number of small and new businesses started to move into and open up in Coulsdon. Unfortunately this has come to an abrupt halt since the closure of Lion Green car park in July 2015, with the loss of over 150 long term and 40 short term parking places. This has had a major effect on trade in the town with trade falling by anything up to 50% and a number of small outlets closing along with other businesses looking to relocate outside the town. 

Change: 

Lion Green: It is clear from the experience of the closure of Lion Green car park that a district centre like Coulsdon cannot compete with other local district centres without a public car park. The loss of Lion Green is severely undermining the town centre.

Object: Objects to the uses identified for the site - this site should be specified for retail and public car parking. 

Change: The site will be allocated for "mixed use development comprising leisure, community facilities and retention of car parking spaces. Retail so long as the current planning permission is extant". 

Object: Soundness - Effective 

Change: The site will be allocated for "mixed use development comprising leisure, community facilities and retention of car parking spaces. Retail so long as the current planning permission is extant".
I live in Coulsdon and wish to strongly object about the constant developments taking place without adequate parking being provided. Coulsdon where I have lived for 60 yrs is a shambles parking wise and is rapidly becoming a total dump. As a result many people including myself are unable to use Coulsdon as much as we want to as there simply is nowhere to park as all the street parking is always occupied and Aldi is only for 90 mins which is far too little and that park is already always full anyway with queues into the road a lot of the time blocking any through traffic. Coulsdon is basically full even before we have the absurd Cane Hill development which noone wants. After that opens parking will be even worse as people will still want to use their cars to go to the bigger shops in Coulsdon. The development of the Lion Green Road car park area is ok in theory but without at least as many places to park as there is now it will make things even worse. I can never eat out in Coulsdon now as even in the evenings there is nowhere to park now so I go elsewhere. Do you really want the legacy of this labour council to be that you effectively destroyed the small businesses in Coulsdon and drove the shoppers to other areas because thats what it will be unless we have more parking and now. The cost of parking in Coulsdon and Croydon is a joke. Are you aware that its possible to park in Lewes in Sussex for 1.50 for 8 hrs and surprise surprise the shops are thriving and very few empty ones unlike Coulsdon. What is it about providing car parks that is so difficult to solve? Without them Coulsdon will die as a shopping center but maybe that's what you want so all the shops can be turned into dwellings.

Reigate and Banstead Borough Co

With particular reference to the above items Ref 60, 372 and 764 above, it has already been noted that there is traffic congestion in the area. The above proposals are most likely to make this considerably worse, but I have not been able to find any reference to how this will be resolved. The Plan should make clear how traffic congestion as a result of these sites will be resolved.

Planning permission for this site has already been granted which would have included an assessment of the transport impacts. If another application is submitted for this site then it will be assessed against the relevant policies in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Soundness - Effective</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM35 372</td>
<td>2853/01/002/DM35/C Gill Hickson Coulsdon Liberal Democrats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr John Stephenson Reigate and Banstead Borough Co</td>
<td>DM35 372</td>
<td>The site will be allocated for &quot;mixed use development comprising leisure, community facilities and retention of car parking spaces. Retail so long as the current planning permission is extant&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM35 372</td>
<td>The Lion Green Road car park has already closed, causing considerable inconvenience to long term users of Coulsdon Town Centre and commuters. It seems that Croydon has taken a parochial view by closing this car park with inadequate alternatives. It may be desirable to encourage cycling and public transport. But the reality is that, in this area, cars are the predominant form of transport. Closure of the car park has made the use of Coulsdon South station more difficult and diverted commuters to other stations such as Chipstead and Purley, which also have inadequate facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM35 372</td>
<td>You apparently have a consultation going on with businesses and residents and if its anything like the previous Tory Councils consultancy regarding Cane Hill and Lion Green Car Park, we will all be wasting our breath. As chair of Coulsdon Lib Dems, a committee member of East Coulsdon Residents Assoc, and as a resident, I have already objected to the size, lack of infrastructure, lack of southern exit, overuse of green belt, etc, regarding Cane Hill and the lack of parking and bad road management regarding Lion Green car park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object DM35

Mrs Sally Justice 372

Thanks to Tesco we can park there for up to 3 hours, but of course seem people can’t walk very far as parking nearer to the shops is impossible, we don’t need more residential properties in Purley which would bring more car park problems plus many other overloads of local resources.

A new superstore Coulson Waitrose is frankly absurd, they already have a nice store where you can walk around easily and not far as with superstores, again think of the elderly and disabled. One Waitrose, Aldi and Tesco Metro all compliment each other. The huge pavement outside Aldi is causing huge traffic jams now so I would hope you sort this out before any further building works take place, just wait until Cane Hill is sorted this will cause even more problems for you, surely best to sort this all out now? A left hand turn into Aldi would help once the pavement is reduced which I am sure many people have already suggested to you.

I go running in Lloyd Park and Coombe Woods where many families go after school and at the weekend. It is a lovely quiet friendly area, plenty don’t let the gypsies in, they already have made huge problems for residents in those areas before.

Finally I do like to go to Sanderstead where you can find smaller shops and easy parking. This would all be lost if another superstore was built, there is Aldi is Selsdon and Coulson surely this is enough?

Object DM35

Mr Joe Toner 372

I would like to voice my object to the following plan DM35.

Object DM35

Mr & Mrs Belsey 372

The new Waitrose site in Coulson MUST have ample parking, due to the terrible problems that are there at the moment.

Comment DM35

Mr Charles King 60

At present, footpath 744 across the site is open to the public, and as work is completed on the site previous and new footpaths should be opened to the public to enable them to enjoy Green Belt and wild life on the site. New footpaths should be opened up within the development to allow the public to enjoy the Green Belt.

Object DM35

East Coulsdon Residents’ Association

The provision of public footpaths on the site is not a matter for the Local Plan.
0203/01/035/DM35/C Mr Charles King
East Coulsdon Residents' Associat

Comment

DM35 60

We are of the view that the best
solution to this will be to provide
Cane Hill with an exit direct onto the
A23 Coulsdon bypass. This clearly
would reduce future traffic congestion
in the town centre and on local roads
as the transport study into Cane Hill
clearly showed that 60% of traffic
from Cane Hill will want access to the
A23, north and southbound and this
would take this traffic out of the town
centre and local roads. The Council
should work with Barratt Homes and
TfL to provide a direct access from
Cane Hill to the A23 Coulsdon
bypass.

The Council should work with the
developer and TfL to provide a direct
access from Cane Hill to the A23
Coulsdon bypass.

No change

The provision of a direct
access from Cane Hill is not a
matter for the Local Plan.

0203/01/022/DM35/O Mr Charles King
East Coulsdon Residents' Associat

Object

DM35 60

We welcome the development on
Cane Hill and the way it will be linked
into the town. However, we have
concerns over the volume of larger
houses compared to those of smaller
two and one bedroom units and this
should be re-examined as part of
detailed planning for phases 3 and 4.
We are concerned that without an
adequate mix of housing that the
existing population will not be able to
afford to live here and will have to
move away.

The development should provide a greater
number of one and two bedroom homes.

No change

The mix of homes by size
would be assessed against
SP2.5 and DM1 due to the
need for larger homes in the
borough.

0203/01/007/DM35/C Mr Charles King
East Coulsdon Residents' Associat

Comment

DM35 60

We are of the view a temporary car
park should be created on Cane Hill
until the Lion Green Road site has
been completed.

Cane Hill should include a temporary car
park.

No change

The provision of a temporary
car park on the site is not a
matter for the Local Plan.

0203/03/032/DM35/S Mr Charles King
East Coulsdon Residents' Associat

Support

DM35 60

Access: We still strongly support a
direct exit from Cane Hill on to the
Coulsdon Bypass to allow access to
the site and any school without the
need to drive through the town
centre. The Cane Hill transport report
clearly shows that 60% of the traffic
from Cane Hill would wish to access
the A23 north and southbound and
this would be best undertaken by a
direct access on to the bypass in
order not to add traffic to the already
crowded town centre and local roads.

No change

The provision of a direct
access from Cane Hill is not a
matter for the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/03/046/DM35/C</td>
<td>Mr Charles King</td>
<td>East Coulsdon Residents' Association</td>
<td>We are concerned that when the Lion Green development is complete and Cane Hill starts to come on stream these roads will become deadlocked which will not only cause a traffic problem, but will add to the pollution levels in the town centre. It would also increase the danger to pedestrians and other road users. Access to the A23 Bypass: We are of the view that the best solution to this will be to provide Cane Hill with an exit direct onto the A23 Coulsdon bypass. This clearly would reduce future traffic congestion in the town centre and on local roads as the transport Study into Cane Hill clearly showed that 60% of traffic from Cane Hill will want access to the A23, north and southbound and this would take this traffic out of the town centre and local roads. The Council should work with Barratt Homes and TfL to provide a direct access from Cane Hill to the A23 Coulsdon bypass.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/031/DM35/C</td>
<td>Mr Charles King</td>
<td>East Coulsdon Residents' Association</td>
<td>Cane Hill: We welcome the development on Cane Hill and the way it will be linked into the town. However, we have concerns of the volume of larger houses compared to those of smaller two and one bedroom units and this should be re-examined as part of detailed planning for phases 3 and 4. We are concerned that an adequate mix of housing that the existing population will not be able to afford to live here and will have to move away. While the new properties will be filled with new comers to the area and this leads to an unstable population.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/043/DM35/C</td>
<td>Mr Charles King</td>
<td>East Coulsdon Residents' Association</td>
<td>Public transport Bus and Coach: Coulsdon has a National Express coach route, 4 trunk bus routes linking Coulsdon to Croydon, Banstead and Redhill, a night bus to Croydon and London and 3 local bus routes to Purley, Kenley, Wallington and Whyteleafe. A bus service is planned for the new Cane Hill development. However, from July National Express reduced the National Express route from 15 buses per day to one. Although there is good bus coverage on the main roads there are still a number of places un-served. This includes the Toller's Lane estate, which is classified as a deprived area and has a large number of older people flats and housing and is the only part of Coulsdon that does not have a bus service and is over half a mile to the nearest stop and three quarters of mile from a stop for a bus to Coulsdon.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness</td>
<td>DM35</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mr Charles King  
East Coulsdon Residents' Associat | | | 60 | 60 |
| We still strongly support a direct exit from Cane Hill on to the Coulsdon Bypass to allow access to the site and any school without the need to drive through the town centre. The Cane Hill transport report clearly shows that 60% of the traffic from Cane Hill would wish to access the A23 north and southbound and this would be best undertaken by a direct access on to the bypass in order not to add traffic to the already crowded town centre and local roads. | | | | |
| There should be a direct exit from Cane Hill onto the Coulsdon Bypass. | No change | The provision of a direct access from Cane Hill is not a matter for the Local Plan. |
| Mr Mathew Frith  
London Wildlife Trust | Object | Soundness - Justified | DM35 | 60 |
| We recognise this site has nature conservation interests and still meets Green Belt criteria, despite permission granted to build housing. Potential further encroachment on adjacent greenspace should be strongly resisted. | | | | |
| No change | | The development of this site is limited to what has been granted permission. |
| Rebecca Pullinger  
CPRE London | Object | Soundness - Effective | DM35 | 60 |
| The more specific site allocations represent a large reduction in the amount of designated and non-designated open space. While we acknowledge the need to build new homes and associated infrastructure such as schools, Croydon’s growing population also needs quality open spaces for all the human amenity and ecosystem services which they provide. The application for the development of 600 homes was initially approved in 2013 despite the site continuing to meet Green Belt criteria. As Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes look to consult on future phases of the development the Council should ensure that the development represents an example of high quality, high density housing can work with good quality open spaces. Provisions must also be made to ensure that any associated infrastructure does not further encroach on Croydon’s Open spaces. | | | | |
| No change | | As a previously developed site in the Green Belt development will continue to be limited to the area which currently benefits from planning permission. |
Object Soundness - Effective

I note Option 1b of Policy DM27 and agree that developments should not have a detrimental impact on highway safety for pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users and private vehicles. I note also Option 1c of Policy DM27 and agree that developments should not have a severe impact on the transport networks local to the site. The proposed developments in Coulsdon (Ref 60, 372 and 764) will have a detrimental impact on highway safety and a severe impact on the local transport network and therefore do not comply with proposed Policy DM27. I note (page 238) that "there are a number of issues that need to be overcome before the site can be developed." I assume that one of these is the issue of access and, in this regard, I would point out that the elected representatives for Chipstead and Coulsdon have all called for direct access to be provided between the development and the A23.

No change

Policy DM35: Coulsdon Option 1 is misleading and should be amended. The Option fails to refer to planning permission 13-02527-P which is a live planning permission, which has been implemented and is under construction. It is incorrect to state that "there are a number of issues that need to be overcome before the site can be developed". This text should be removed. Planning permission 13-02527-P demonstrates exceptional circumstances why development in the Green Belt is acceptable and these circumstances should be referenced within the allocation. The planning permission does not include the need for a "new community, health and education facilities". Indeed as part of the planning application local needs were assessed and these facilities were not required. It is unclear why they are now proposed.

Change

Transport for London have advised that as a whole the road network of the borough can cope with the planned levels of development subject to the improvements they have already planned. Any site specific mitigation will have to be funded by developers as part of the development of their site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Soundness - Effective</th>
<th>DM35</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You apparently have a consultation going on with businesses and residents and if its anything like the previous Tory Councils consultancy regarding Cane Hill and Lion Green Car Park, we will all be wasting our breadth. As chair of Coulsdon Lib Dems, a committee member of East Coulsdon Residents Assoc. and as a resident, I have already objected to the size, lack of infrastructure, lack of southern exit, overuse of green belt, etc., regarding Cane Hill and the lack of parking and bad road management regarding Lion Green car park.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The provision of public footpaths on the site is not a matter for the Local Plan. This site is a key site in Croydon that is a previously developed site in the Green Belt that helps to meet the need for new homes in Croydon, a need that cannot be fully met by previously developed land outside of Green Belt. It is under construction but not all the site has full planning consent (only the parts that are under construction) so it will remain allocated in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The irony of this email is that the previous Conservative Council voted to build far too many houses on 207 acres of green belt land on the Cane Hill site; there was no need for it as there are plenty of brownfield sites across Croydon that could have been used. Something that you mention in your email, but of course not in connection with the Cane Hill development which you have supported. And now you complain politically against Labour for whatever they are doing, albeit that I gather it has been suggested that there were broken manifesto promises (doesn’t everyone?). For the record, I consider the current council at fault also in that they have not reversed the decision on Cane Hill when they had the chance; please note that this is not a political comment as I am not someone who supports anyone politically.

With due respect, I feel you need to act on stopping the Cane Hill development as it stands. In addition, pressure on the road issue, and to insist with them that they work with the local community group (which I am part of) who want to do something with the chapel. We had meetings with Barratt many months ago, but they appear to have done what we expected, and looked towards a more financially rewarding return for them, rather than enable a community group to be part of the development.

It just shows what we all knew, which was that they never had any intention of working with the community, as is always claimed to try and instil the feel good factor to the development. I recall your predecessor warning off a colleague of mine by telling him to “stay out because big bucks were involved” – which says everything I think! This development has all been pushed on us as a community in a way that shows that money was always going to override what was right, and that anyone benefitting was going to show little regard for what it is going to do to the town of Coulsdon.

I would like to think that you can right at least some of the wrongs done to our town re Cane Hill and prove that you really are serious about what you write in this email.

No change

This site is a key site in Croydon that is a previously developed site in the Green Belt that helps to meet the need for new homes in Croydon, a need that cannot be fully met by previously developed land outside of Green Belt. It is under construction but not all the site has full planning consent (only the parts that are under construction) so it will remain allocated in the Local Plan.
Object New School: The Cane Hill site plans propose a new senior school in Portnalls Road Coulsdon. We believe this would be the wrong location as the Cane Hill development already has permission to build houses on this part of the site. However, we do believe that there is room at the southern end of the Cane Hill site for a smaller two form entry primary school with entry from the Cane Hill site rather than Portnalls Road. This would provide relief for the existing local schools and reduce the need for extra class rooms. This would have a number of advantages. Not only would it provide a local school for Cane Hill and other local children. It would have less effect on traffic in Portnalls Road. The Cane Hill development will have public transport and this would provide reverse peak flow from Coulsdon Town centre and locations north of the town. It would be in a much more desirable location for the children from a health and environmental situation than the other proposed location in the plan. Access: A direct exit from Cane Hill on to the A23 Coulsdon Bypass would allow access to the site and school without the need to drive through the town centre.

No change The site has been identified to meet the need for secondary school places in the borough.

Object The Cane Hill site plans propose a new senior school in Portnalls Road Coulsdon. We believe this would be the wrong location as the Cane Hill development already has permission to build houses on this part of the site. However, we do believe that there is room at the southern end of the Cane Hill site for a smaller two form entry primary school with entry from the Cane Hill site rather than Portnalls Road. This would provide relief for the existing local schools and reduce the need for extra class rooms. This would have a number of advantages. Not only would it provide a local school for Cane Hill and other local children. It would have less effect on traffic in Portnalls Road. The Cane Hill development will have public transport and this would provide reverse peak flow from Coulsdon Town centre and locations north of the town. It would be in a much more desirable location for the children from a health and environmental situation than the other proposed location in the plan. Access: A direct exit from Cane Hill on to the A23 Coulsdon Bypass would allow access to the site and school without the need to drive through the town centre.

This site is not suitable for a secondary school. A new 2FE primary school should be provided at the southern end of Cane Hill instead. No change The site has been identified to meet the need for secondary school places in the borough.
Object Soundness - Justified
Policy SP7 does not reflect the fact that part of the site here is proposed for de-designation from the Green Belt: none of the sites in SP7 are linked to Portnalls Road. Given the adjacent Cane Hill housing development we urge the Council to protect this open space and enhance it for the use by new residents, through designating it as MOL.

No change
There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to existing bus routes and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough, in particular the south. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Object DM35
I refer to the proposed secondary school to be built on green belt land adjacent to Portnalls road Coulsdon. Firstly there are already two schools situated at the bottom of Portnalls road one of which is about to be increased in size. Already we have appalling traffic problems twice a day about to be exacerbated by the secondary exit from the Cane Hill development on to Portnalls road. Secondly the construction problems associated with a school of this size with no obvious access to playing fields on a hill side would be immense. Thirdly surely there is no sense in a Grammar school which we imagine is intended to benefit the whole borough on the Surrey border Are you intending to bus children from Norbury and Thornton heath to Coulsdon every day. Fourthly it would be a shame to take away the little bit of green space surrounding the existing two schools which at various public enquires we were assured would not be built on.

No change
There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to existing bus routes and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough, in particular the south. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
The WCGS Academy Trust would like to register an interest in the following site in response to Croydon’s Local Plan. (Site number 764)

The preferred option stated in the Local Plan is for a ‘secondary school’. We feel that this is the most appropriate use to enable Croydon to meet its strategic objectives. We would like to register an interest in the ‘preferred option’ which is for a secondary school. Our reasons for this are that Croydon seeks to provide a diverse educational offer for families across the borough. There is a basic need for more school places. By allowing a school to be built on this site Croydon will be able to meet local demand and offer the correct number of school places. In contrast to the Free School that WCGS Academy Trust hopes to develop on site number 662 the Trust would like to express an interest in developing an Annex or Satellite School for its existing Selective School which is based in Sutton. This is permitted under the right for every school to expand.

With the support of the Educational Funding Agency (EFA), the Department for Education (DfE) and Croydon Council a new ‘selective’ annex for Wallington County Grammar School can be delivered by 2020. We believe the phasing of development should be to open the school in 2020 rather than the phased development of post 2026 as suggested in the Local Plan. Our strategic objectives include bringing an aspirational educational offer to Croydon. This will provide families with a diverse educational offer which includes selective education. We aim to provide opportunities for all young people to reach their personal best.

The site does not meet Ark’s demographic criteria.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to existing bus routes and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough, in particular the south. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
The more specific site allocations represent a large reduction in the amount of designated and non-designated open space. While we acknowledge the need to build new homes and associated infrastructure such as schools, Croydon's growing population also needs quality open spaces for all the human amenity and ecosystem services which they provide. Note: Policy SP7 does not reflect the fact that part of the site here is proposed for de-designation from the Green Belt: none of the sites in SP7 are linked to Portnalls Road. The Council needs to make the proposed de-designation clear to ensure that the consultation is transparent. Given the adjacent Cane Hill housing development we would urge the Council to protect this open space and enhance it for the use by new residents, through designating it as MOL.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to existing bus routes and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough, in particular the south. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Effective</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/01/004/DM35/O</td>
<td>Peter Jarvis - Chipstead Residents' Association</td>
<td>I note Option 1b of Policy DM27 and agree that developments should not have a detrimental impact on highway safety for pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users and private vehicles. I note also Option 1c of Policy DM27 and agree that developments should not have a severe impact on the transport networks local to the site. The proposed developments in Coulsdon (Ref 60, 372 and 764) will have a detrimental impact on highway safety and a severe impact on the local transport network and therefore do not comply with proposed Policy DM27. I note (page 242) that the development of a secondary school at this location is envisaged for the period after 2026. It is probable that, by then, traffic on the surrounding road network will have become even more of an issue. In any event, a detailed Transport Assessment, prepared by an independent expert will be required to show that it will not conflict with Policy DM 27 (1b and 1c).</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/01/006/DM35/O</td>
<td>Barratt Homes</td>
<td>The red line around the site (Site 60) now includes a swathe of land adjacent to Smitham Primary School. This also lies in with the Strategic Policy Allocation for a &quot;secondary school allocated at land west of Cane Hill&quot;. It was determined under application 13-02527-P that this land would remain free from development owing to visual impacts across the Green Belt. Its inclusion now should be explained in further detail and with suitable justification, certainly in light of the newly proposed Local Designated Views, Croydon Panoramas and Local Designated Landmarks - LDV/14 Local; Designated View From Woodcote Grove Road.</td>
<td>The inclusion of this site allocation needs to be justified. No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/01/008/DM35/O</td>
<td>Cllr John Stephenson - Reigate and Banstead Borough Co</td>
<td>Subject to demographic data the need for a new secondary school is understandable, but there are already two junior schools on or adjacent to this site. If this is considered to be the best alternative it must have a detailed traffic assessment.</td>
<td>The site requires a detailed traffic assessment if the allocation is to be taken forward. No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2787/01/009/DM35/O  
Cllr John Stephenson  
Reigate and Banstead Borough Co  
Object  
DM35  
764  
Items Ref 60, 372, and 945 refer to community, health and leisure facilities. I presume that this is to provide options and trust that they will not be duplicated or removed entirely. No such facilities are included with the school proposal, but may I suggest that this be considered with some school facilities doubling for community use. The allocation should include community facilities so that the school facilities can provide a community use.  
No change  
The comment is noted and a planning permission for a new secondary school could be granted with a community use agreement which would provide community access to the school’s facilities, however this would be subject to the details of the individual planning application and the organisation proposing a school development.

2787/01/005/DM35/O  
Cllr John Stephenson  
Reigate and Banstead Borough Co  
Object  
DM35  
764  
With particular reference to the above items Ref 60, 372 and 764 above, it has already been noted that there is traffic congestion in the area. The above proposals are most likely to make this considerably worse, but I have not been able to find any reference to how this will be resolved. The Plan should make clear how traffic congestion as a result of these sites will be resolved.  
No change  
The site has met the criteria for the de-designation of Green Belt and has been identified to meet the need for school places across the borough. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. A transport assessment would be required with any planning application.

2981/01/002/DM35/O  
Mr & Mrs Jean & Peter Vile  
Object  
Soundness - Consistent with National DM35  
764  
We both agree that we do not want to lose any of our green belt. And the parking in the area is truly so bad especially in Coulsdon.  
No change  
There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to existing bus routes and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough, in particular the south. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>3070/01/003/DM35/O</td>
<td>Christine Denney</td>
<td>Soundness - Consistent with National DM35 764</td>
<td>I should like to protest against the site chosen for gypsy camps and a new secondary school being built on green belt. There must be better sites for them as we must protect our green belt sites.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>3074/01/004/DM35/O</td>
<td>Christine Younger</td>
<td>Object DM35 764</td>
<td>I strongly object to this council building or using Green Belt sites for this and any other purpose. Also high rise flats will upset the balance of the areas. I do accept that we need more housing but these should be build on existing empty or land filled sites.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM35</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/10/19/DM35/O</td>
<td>Mr Joe Toner</td>
<td>DM35</td>
<td>I would like to voice my objection to the following plan DM35. There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to existing bus routes and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough, in particular the south. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/001/DM35/O</td>
<td>Mr Steve Simms</td>
<td>DM35</td>
<td>I strongly object to any of these new proposals to build on any green belt land. There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to existing bus routes and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough, in particular the south. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

02 September 2016
Object

3222/01/001/DM35/0

Ruth Woodward

I would like to comment on how something as important as building a Secondary School on green farm land is just posted on a lamp post that if by chance the residents happen to see while passing can become aware of this happening. I feel and object strongly to this happening due to two schools already in the road causing build up of traffic and a times very chaotic. The green land which is disappearing very quickly now due to the large amount of houses already being built will be gone forever spoiling the wildlife and trees.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to existing bus routes and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough, in particular the south. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

3416/01/003/DM35/0

C Mortreuil

Croydon is currently running out of space and actually letting more people in through building more flats is putting pressure on our services: we do not have enough schools in the area to cater for all new arrivals. However taking green belt land is a step too far. Similarly a site for travellers with amenities which would prevent them from invading current green spaces is a good idea, but where to put it needs to be sensibly planned and the current proposal in my view is not adequate.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to existing bus routes and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough, in particular the south. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Ms E Potman

Object  
DM35  
764

As a mother I know how important it is in this day and age to have open green spaces to go in the city, that are natural, unspoiled, spacious and adventurous. In this fast paced and pressurised computer era, children and families and everyone else, need spaces to go to unwind, to re-energise, to connect to the real, living world and to have clean air to breath. With down grading green belt land and woods, we jeopardise the physical and mental health of our children and fellow citizens. We disrespect the need for green spaces for wild life and trees to bring healthy air and a healthy eco-system. If we do not teach our children and everyone else the importance of green in a city, we set a bad precedent for the next generation. If we let money be our main aim, choices like this will become easier and easier made and we would be left with no green at all. The strongest thing that Croydon has going for itself are the green spaces and woods. The green belt had been established for a reason. It is not meant to be touched! It is meant to be preserved for the good of all!

Please re-consider your plans and leave the green spaces protected in the green belt. Don't let it be eroded in the name of 'progress'.

No change

Ms F Wood

Object  
DM35  
764

Please do not build on greenbelt areas. There is plenty of space in the empty building in central Croydon and in West Croydon. Spend money on empty land and leave the last green parts of Croydon alone. When those green belt areas are gone so will nature. We are not inner city. We have a history of enjoying our green spaces in Croydon.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to existing bus routes and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough, in particular the south. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
I wish to voice my concerns regarding the following: I totally object to any reduction of green space in the borough of Croydon in favour of development.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to existing bus routes and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough, in particular the south. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

I am emailing you to express my concerns about Croydon Council’s Plans to build houses on some of our precious green spaces, back gardens. I understand that there is a great need for housing in the Croydon area and that the number of homeless people in Croydon is high. However, I need assurance that in providing this need we do not destroy our few remaining green spaces as these are vital to the well-being of our environment and people’s health. When I received the information about these proposals from my MP and local residents' association I had been away from home and so have not studied these plans in depth. However, with the information I have I cannot visualize how these proposals would work without destroying the character of the Shirley area and the destruction of our few remaining green areas. In the hope for me to agree to these proposals I would not only require the assurance that these environmental issues were taken into account but the homes that are planned for were affordable to those who are in need of a home, and that they were of good quality, energy efficient homes. Finally, having lived in Shirley for many years I have seen the increase in traffic which has brought about an increase in air pollution which is detrimental to our health. This is another important factor that has to be borne in mind when increasing the density of the population of the area.
3754/01/002/DM35/O Myra Rand

Object DM35 764

I fully oppose the proposals to build on green land.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to existing bus routes and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough, in particular the south. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

3857/02/001/DM35/O Mr Neil Morrison

Object DM35 764

We as a nation have maintained the principles of "the Green Belt" since its first inception in 1935 when it was part of a plan devised by the Greater London Regional Planning Committee eventually becoming law by virtue of the Town and Country Planning Act 1947. Recently the Government formally set out its policies and principles towards green belts in England and Wales in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: Green Belts, but this planning guidance was superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in March 2012. Planning Authorities are strongly urged to follow the NPPF's detailed advice when considering whether to permit additional development in the green belt. In the green belt there is a general presumption against inappropriate development, unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated to show that the benefits of the development will outweigh the harm caused to the green belt. The NPPF sets out what would constitute appropriate development in the green belt. I can not find any justifiable cause for allowing building on any "Green Belt" having viewed Gavin Barwell's email on the matter. This series of developments cannot seriously be described as "Appropriate Development" under any circumstances. Please do not build on land which we, as a nation, have preserved for future generations.
Mr Neil Morrison

Please do not build on "Green Belt" There is no necessity for it and our parents had the foresight to develop the legislation please don't soil there good intentions.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to existing bus routes and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough, in particular the south. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr & Mrs Shutter

The de-designation of Green belt land and Metropolitan Open land for building is quite frankly the sort of policy which is incredibly short-sighted: the green belt was put in place to provide open space for local residents, not to provide cheap building land for development

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to existing bus routes and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough, in particular the south. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Page/Case</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4006/00/001/DM35/C</td>
<td>Mr R Douglas</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>Please can you provide further details regarding the proposed secondary school development in Portnalls Road Coulsdon Ref 764. No change There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to existing bus routes and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough, in particular the south. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4022/01/004/DM35/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Ewin</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>Objection to Croydon Council's proposal to provide sites for travellers &amp; the building of houses, etc on green land in Shirley &amp; other areas. No change There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to existing bus routes and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough, in particular the south. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vivienne Murray

Object

DM35 764

We need more housing further out from Croydon and surrounding we are already becoming overcrowded - don’t spoil our landscapes by building on Green Belt land.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to existing bus routes and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough, in particular the south. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr Charles King

Comment

DM35 945

Existing Waitrose car park Malcolm Road: When Waitrose vacate the existing site in Brighton Road the Council should take over the existing car park in Malcolm Road and use it as a public car park providing off-street parking for the north of the town.

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

Mr Charles King

Comment

DM35 945

The existing Waitrose Building: If it becomes vacant this should be used for retail, education, medical centre and a public car park.

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

Mr Charles King

Comment

DM35 945

When Waitrose vacate the existing site in Brighton Road the Council should take over the existing car park in Malcolm Road and use it as a public car park providing off-street parking for the north of the town. The Waitrose car park should provide free car parking.

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0203/01/013/DM35/O</td>
<td>Mr Charles King</td>
<td>DM35</td>
<td>945</td>
<td></td>
<td>If it becomes vacant this should be used for retail, education, medical centre and a public car park. This site should be used for retail, education, medical centre and a public car park.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0535/01/018/DM35/O</td>
<td>Mr Peter Morgan</td>
<td>DM35</td>
<td>945</td>
<td></td>
<td>This site should have preferred uses as retail / commercial / industrial and as public car parking. There should be an accompanying statement asserting that Coulsdon is blighted by lack of car parking, and very much needs more public car parking, and this would be an obvious locations to help redress this serious deficit. It should also state that more employment and services is a better use than retail.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0538/01/002/DM35/O</td>
<td>Mr Adrian Britton</td>
<td>Soundness</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>DM35</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>The Waitrose site should show the preferred use as public car parking and, if required by the NHS, health care facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1788/01/012/DM35/O</td>
<td>Alice Desira</td>
<td>Soundness</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>DM35</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>Policy DM35, Table 11.3, Site 945 (p146) is the current Waitrose on Brighton Road, which will close when the new one on Lion Green road opens. The plan contemplates residential and healthcare uses, but I believe that ground floor retail should be allowed as well as potentially healthcare, and require as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site. The parking is especially important given the current parking problems in Coulsdon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.
1797/01/010/DM35/O Andrea Telman

Object DM35 945

I totally disagree to the following planning applications which would spoil the character of our local environment and threaten our green belt. I choose to live in an area that is peaceful and quiet and resent the changes that are being forced upon me. In the spirit of true democracy I wish to make clear my objection to the following developments - Policy DM2 (p18); Policy DM40.1 (p165); Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168); Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168); Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, Site 30 (p171); Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, Site 661 (p179); Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, Site 662 (p179); Policy DM28 (p115-116); Policy DM35, Table 11.8, Site 945 (p146); and Policy DM31.4 (p126)

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

1800/01/006/DM35/O Carly Litchfield

Object DM35 945

Ground floor retail should be allowed as well as potentially healthcare, and require as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site. The parking is especially important given the current parking problems in Coulsdon.

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

1826/01/011/DM35/O Christine Cafferkey

Object Soundness - Effective DM35 945

Policy DM35, Table 11.3, Site 945 (p146) is the current Waitrose on Brighton Road, which will close when the new one on Lion Green road opens. The plan contemplates residential and healthcare uses. I believe that ground floor retail should be allowed as well as potentially healthcare, and require as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site. The parking is especially important given the current parking problems in Coulsdon.

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

1843/01/010/DM35/O Mrs A L Winkley

Object DM35 945

I object DM35 table 118 site 945

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.
The plan contemplates residential and healthcare uses. Ground floor retail should be allowed as well as potentially healthcare, and any development should require as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site. The parking is especially important given the current parking problems in Coulsdon.

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

Following the parking problems caused in Coulsdon by the council’s mismanagement of development and developers, the soon-to-be-old Waitrose site is critical. There must be at least as many public parking spaces available in its new life as are currently available.

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

I have strong objections and would like my objection to be considered before any decisions are made: Policy DM35, Table 11.8, Site 945 refers to the old Waitrose site which will become vacant once the new site is completed in Lion green road. The proposed use is to change it to residential and healthcare. The objection that I have to this is that currently it is the only car park available at the north end of Coulsdon and there is already a dire car parking problem in Coulsdon which prevents people from just parking for an hour to visit the local shops. This is in turn holding back the development of the town centre and will only get worse with the large residential development on Cane Hill as all these residents will want to park in the town for a short period. This area or at least half of it must be reserved for short term parking for the town centre.

This area or at least half of it must be reserved for short term parking for the town centre.

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

Policy DM35, Table 11.8, Site 945 refers to the current Waitrose on Brighton Road, which will close when the new one on Lion Green road opens. The plan contemplates residential and healthcare uses, but I believe that ground floor retail should be allowed as well as potentially healthcare, and require as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site. The parking is especially important given the current parking problems in Coulsdon.

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.
The objection is noted but as there is no further information substantiating it no amendments the policy can be made as the basis for the objection is not known.

We would make the following objections to the proposed Draft Local Plan which is a poorly disguised attack on the southern part of the Borough.

Policy DM 35, table 11.8, Site 945

No change The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

We believe that ground floor retail should be allowed with a requirement to maintain as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site. The parking is especially important given the current parking problems in Coulsdon.

The plan contemplates residential and healthcare uses, but ground floor retail should be allowed as well as potentially healthcare, and require as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site. The parking is especially important given the current parking problems in Coulsdon.

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Councillor Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Ground Floor Retail</th>
<th>Parking Spaces</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1926/01/030/DM35/O</td>
<td>Councillor Luke Clancy</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM35 945</td>
<td>Site 945, Waitrose, 110-112 Brighton Road. Details residential and healthcare uses.</td>
<td>Ground floor retail should be allowed with a requirement to maintain as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951/01/005/DM35/O</td>
<td>Councillor Steve Hollands</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM35 945</td>
<td>Policy DM35, Table 11.8, Site 945 (p146) It is essential to the future success of Coulsdon town centre that the current level of parking for the public at the present Waitrose site on Brighton Road remains similar to the current number given the parking problems in Coulsdon.</td>
<td>It is essential to the future success of Coulsdon town centre that the current level of parking for the public at the present Waitrose site on Brighton Road remains similar to the current number given the parking problems in Coulsdon.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2056/01/015/DM35/C</td>
<td>Councillor Dudley Maad</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM35 945</td>
<td>Site 945, Waitrose, 110-112 Brighton Road. Details residential and healthcare uses. Ground floor retail should be allowed with a requirement to maintain as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site;</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2062/01/030/DM35/O</td>
<td>Councillor Jason Perry</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM35 945</td>
<td>Site 945, Waitrose, 110-112 Brighton Road. Details residential and healthcare uses.</td>
<td>Ground floor retail should be allowed with a requirement to maintain as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2071/01/030/DM35/O</td>
<td>Councillor Mario Creatura</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM35 945</td>
<td>Site 945, Waitrose, 110-112 Brighton Road. Details residential and healthcare uses.</td>
<td>Ground floor retail should be allowed with a requirement to maintain as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/09/01</td>
<td>Loraine Pond</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM35 945 Policy DM35, table 11.8, site 945 I feel the plan should include a ground floor retail shop in addition to residential and healthcare uses. There should also be a decent number of public car parking spaces to alleviate the parking problems in Coulsdon. No change The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2128/02/22</td>
<td>Cllr Steve O'Connell</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM35 945 The current site of Waitrose on Brighton Road is earmarked for residential and healthcare users but ground floor retail is desirable, as would be healthcare provision; car parking of as many park spaces as there are currently is essential. The site should be allocated for retail and healthcare alongside the current number of car parking spaces. No change The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Network Rail notes that there are a number of sites adjacent to the Railway and attach a standard response which sets out the issues that need to be considered. In particular with large new developments there is a concern about the risk of trespass and all new developments should have proper and suitable boundary fencing. The risk of greater flooding and drainage that new developments could potentially have on the Network Rail infrastructure and we would not want any increase of flooding or the increase in run off onto Railway Infrastructure.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not: encroach onto Network Rail land affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company’s railway and its infrastructure undermine its support zone damage the company’s infrastructure place additional load on cuttings adversely affect any railway land or structure over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future

The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail’s adjoining land.

Future maintenance
The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant’s land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail’s adjacent land and air-space, and therefore all any building should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail’s boundary. The reason for the 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant. Any
less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works. The applicant / resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer, the applicant / resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. all possession costs, all site safety costs, all asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard-against Network Rail’s boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction / maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary with Network Rail will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams’ ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.

Drainage
Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail’s property or into Network Rail’s culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail’s property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail’s property; full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail’s existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near/within 10 – 20 metres of Network Rail’s boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property. After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants’ expense.

Plant & Materials
All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail’s property, must at all times be carried out in a "fail safe" manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are
capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.

Scaffolding
Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant’s contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail’s existing fencing / wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail’s boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling.
arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer’s approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration
The potential for any noise/vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which holds relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night time train running and heavy freight trains.

Vehicle Incursion
Where a proposal calls for hard standing area/parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionSussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.asp.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Effective</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Ground floor retail should be allowed with a requirement to maintain as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site.</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2448/01/030/DM35/O</td>
<td>Andy Stranack (Croydon Council)</td>
<td>Site 945, Waitrose, 110-112 Brighton Road. Details residential and healthcare uses.</td>
<td>The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2635/01/019/DM35/O</td>
<td>Paul Sandford (Bourne Society)</td>
<td>Coulson Site 945, Waitrose, 110-112 Brighton Road. Details residential and healthcare uses. Ground floor retail should be allowed with a requirement to maintain as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site.</td>
<td>The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further to previous comments the New Waitrose should provide more, or at the very least an equivalent number of car parking spaces to the current site. The lack of any commitment here is again testament to the lack of commitment to providing public parking spaces, needed by many local residents who are perhaps elderly, or simply like anyone else, needs the car parked close by for the weekly shop.

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.
2785/01/008/DM35/O Ian Cutts Object Soundness - Effective DM35 945 The retail use should be continued together with adequate parking. The inadequate parking at the Aldi site results in the customers using the current Waitrose site which confirms there is a lack of parking in Coulsdon and the south of the borough generally. No change The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

2808/01/001/DM35/C Ian Cryer Comment Soundness - Effective DM35 945 The new Waitrose store being built in the current Lions Green carpark will result in a massive loss of parking in Coulsdon, with consequent loss of trade to the large number of independent shops. An elegant solution would be to use the site of the current Waitrose store (your ref 945) to build a central multi-storey carpark. No change The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

2812/01/030/DM35/O Cllr Jan Buttinger Object Soundness - Effective DM35 945 Site 945, Waitrose, 110-112 Brighton Road. Details residential and healthcare uses. Ground floor retail should be allowed with a requirement to maintain as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site. No change The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

2817/02/001/DM35/O Tina Steele Object Soundness - Effective DM35 945 I object to the removal of any current parking facilities on or around this Waitrose site. I also object to this development not having retail space on the ground floor. No change The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

2829/01/030/DM35/O Cllr Margaret Mead Object Soundness - Effective DM35 945 Site 945, Waitrose, 110-112 Brighton Road. Details residential and healthcare uses. Ground floor retail should be allowed with a requirement to maintain as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site. No change The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.
Object  
Jeff and Susanne Webb  
We feel that the reduction in public parking with affect the local traders. Parking is already very difficult in Coulsdon and this will aggravate the problem.  

No change

Object  
Kathleen Tomlin  
Of course, the Coulsdon fiasco continues apace - you now want to concrete over the Waitrose car park. Have you tried parking in Coulsdon to access doctor/dental services in recent months: almost impossible, thanks to the closure of the car park on Green Lion Rd. Thanks a million. If you continue in this vein, my husband & I will move out of the area, to somewhere up North, where they plan things differently!! Your loss, our gain - pity, as this should be a really nice place to live, but you are definitely spoiling it.

No change

Object  
Cllr Richard Chatterjee  
London Borough of Croydon  
Ground floor retail should be allowed with a requirement to maintain as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site.

No change

Support  
Elizabeth Killick  
The development sounds good but there must be car parking spaces provided.

No change

Object  
Mr James Marland  
The site should remain suitable for retail as long as the car park is also kept in any plans. Healthcare provision could be included above ground level if required.

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.
Mr John Harris

Object DM35 945

I am writing to object to Redevelopment of the current Waitrose site for possible residential and healthcare uses as detailed in Policy DM35, Table 11.8. Site 945 (p146).

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

Mr John Pewtress

Object DM35 945

Loss of local parking must be considered.

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

Mrs Julie Goacher

Object DM35 945

I believe the old Waitrose site in Coulsdon should maintain its precious parking, as it is such a problem at the moment in Coulsdon and will be to the detriment of local businesses in the long run without adequate parking.

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

Mrs Julie Goacher

Object DM35 945

I believe the old Waitrose site in Coulsdon should maintain its precious parking, as it is such a problem at the moment in Coulsdon and will be to the detriment of local businesses in the long run without adequate parking.

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

Joanne Darville

Object Soundness - Effective DM35 945

I object to the following policies: Dm35 table 11.8 site 945, any development should include as many parking spaces as are currently there, as you know the parking situation in coulsdon is dire and affects businesses.

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.
3039/01/006/DM35/O Samantha Freeman

Object: Soundness - Effective

DM35

In particular I object to:

6. (DM35 Table 11.8 Site 945) Waitrose site in Coulsdon should not be given up to residential development. The retail site and car park is valued and I would object to the site changing use. I understand that Waitrose is moving to a larger site but we do not need to increase residential pressure in the centre of town with the new developments both opposite and at Cane Hill so close by.

No change

3046/01/010/DM35/O Stephanie Lawson

Object: DM35

DM35

945

I believe that the current number of public car parking spaces available on this site definitely needs to be maintained, so as not to exasperate existing parking problems in the area. I believe ground floor retail should also be allowed for this site development (in addition to residential and healthcare uses) as this is in the best interests of those living locally.

No change

3075/01/006/DM35/O Mr Christopher Andrews

Object: DM35

DM35

945

As and when the current Waitrose site is redeveloped it must provide for parking spaces commensurate with usage of the site. It should be noted that the current Waitrose car park is one of the most useful car parks in the town.

No change

3162/01/020/DM35/O Mr Joe Toner

Object: DM35

DM35

945

I would like to voice my objection to the following plan DM35.

No change
Mr Stephen Woodward: We have lived in Sanderstead for over 40 years, and have thoroughly enjoyed the areas to the south of Croydon being unsullied. In our view these ill conceived proposals will change this area beyond recognition and take away that for which it is well known and valued. Please rethink, and do not continue with the proposed policies set out below and which can be found in your Local Plan: Policy DM35, Table 11.8, Site 945 (p146) The parking is especially important given the current parking problems in Coulsdon.

Saundra Dudman: 9) Policy DM35 Table 11.8 site 945 p146 the current Waitrose site in Coulsdon will close when the new Waitrose store is opened in Lion Green Road. I believe the vacant site should then be used for a retail property on the ground floor and the parking spaces there currently should be kept. This would help the chronic shortage of parking in Coulsdon.

Mr Richard Brandwood: Policy DM35, Table 11.8, Site 945 (p146) - Redevelopment of this site MUST allow similar provision for public car parking as at present. Provision in Coulsdon is inadequate at present!

Mr David Dudman: 9) Policy DM35 Table 11.8 site 945 p146 the current Waitrose site in Coulsdon will close when the new Waitrose store is opened in Lion Green Road. I believe the vacant site should then be used for a retail property on the ground floor and the parking spaces there currently should be kept. This would help the chronic shortage of parking in Coulsdon.

Ms C Sorozyński: Please note my objections to planning objections to Policy DM35, Table 11.8, Site 945
Mr Donald Speakman
Object: Soundness - Effective
DM35 946
Site 945, Waitrose, 110-112 Brighton Road. Details residential and healthcare uses. Ground floor retail should be allowed with a requirement to maintain as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site. No change
The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

Mr Gregory Taylor
Object: DM35
DM35 945
Policy DM35, Table 11.8, Site 945 (p146), the current Waitrose on Brighton Road. The site redevelopment will be very important to that end of the high street. Currently the parking is used for visitors not only to Waitrose but other shops in the area, therefore substantial parking should be maintained on this site. The building on this site must be in keeping with the surrounding, and any multistorey building on the site must not exceed heights already seen in the town centre. No change
The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

Mr Mike Rice
Object: DM35
DM35 945
Dear Sirs,
With reference to the recently published 'Croydon Local Plan', as a resident of the past 25 years I give my views as follows:
Policy DM35, Table 11.8, Site 945 (p146) Agreed but requires as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site. No change
The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

Linda Hione
Object: DM35
DM35 945
Coulsdon Town centre – Current Waitrose Site
Policy DM35, Table 11.8, Site 945 (p146) is the current Waitrose on Brighton Road, which will close when the new one on Lion Green road opens. The plan contemplates residential and healthcare uses, but I believe that ground floor retail should be allowed as well as potentially healthcare, and require as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site. The parking is especially important given the current parking problems in Coulsdon. No change
The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.
Mr & Mrs Hewitt
Object: DM35 945
Policy DM35, Table 11.8, Site 945 (p.146)
This is the site of the current Waitrose on Brighton Road, which will close when the new one on Lion Green road opens. The plan contemplates residential and healthcare uses, but we believe that ground floor retail should be allowed as well as potentially healthcare, and require as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site. The parking is especially important given the current parking problems in Coulsdon.
No change
The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

Mrs Margaret Lawless
Object: DM35 945
I list below the relevant policy References to which I object. DM35 Table 11.8 Site 945 (p.146)
No change
No changes can be made as the result of this comment as it not detailed enough to determine what is being objected to.

Cllr J Cummings
Object: Soundness - Effective DM35 945
Site 945, Waitrose, 110-112 Brighton Road. Details residential and healthcare uses.
Ground floor retail should be allowed with a requirement to maintain as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site.
No change
The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

Mrs J McDonald
Object: DM35 945
Policy DM35, Table 11.8, Site 945 (p.146) is the current Waitrose on Brighton Road, which will close when the new one on Lion Green road opens. The plan contemplates residential and healthcare uses, but I believe that ground floor retail should be allowed as well as potentially healthcare, and require as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site. The parking is especially important given the current parking problems in Coulsdon.
No change
The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

Mr Nick Peiris
Object: DM35 945
We need to maintain (if not improve) the infrastructure the benefit Traders, shoppers as well as residents. Certainly easier access and MORE underground parking spaces with any suitable new developments. Coulsdon Waitrose site - need road infrastructure and more parking.
No change
The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.
Mr & Mrs Mott

I object to this site allocation. No change

Mrs Anne Turner

I would like to put in writing my objections to the following local plans:
I am listing the relevant Policy Numbers:
- DM35, Table 11.8, Site 945

Mr Malcom Mackenzie

Because Coulsdon already has considerable parking problems, we would have hoped that any plan for the development of the current Waitrose site, in Brighton Rd., Coulsdon, would have ensured that the level of public parking would be maintained. We do not believe that Policy DM 35 Table 11.8, Site 945 (p146) achieves this. Other proposed parking restrictions and a policy of requiring developers to provide fewer parking spaces in a number of areas, will not help the situation. No change

Mr Thomas Lawson

I believe that the current number of public car parking spaces available on this site definitely needs to be maintained, so as not to exacerbate existing parking problems in the area. I believe ground floor retail should also be allowed for this site development (in addition to residential and healthcare uses) as this is in the best interests of those living locally. No change

Mr Tony Sales

I am emailing to record my objection to the following policies within the ‘Local Plan’. No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.
3804/01/028/DM35/C  Cllr L Hale
London Borough of Croydon

**Comment**

DM35 945

Site 945, Waitrose, 110-112 Brighton Road. Details residential and healthcare uses. Ground floor retail should be allowed with a requirement to maintain as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site.

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

3807/01/003/DM35/O  Mr Geoff Bell

**Object**

DM35 945

The redevelopment should include retail on the ground floor. This is important if the town centre is to recover and thrive as a shopping area. Parking is tight and difficult already. There are significant numbers of elderly people in Purley and Coulsdon, while everyone doing significant amounts of shopping also needs transport. The loss of the Lion Green car park has caused serious parking issues in Coulsdon. These problems must be addressed for the town centres to remain viable - we need more parking spaces, not less.

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

3810/01/008/DM35/O  Joan Sabatini

**Object**

DM35 945

This refers to the current site on which is a Waitrose store which is due to close. The proposal is for residential and healthcare development. This is wholly support but some retail outlet should also be provided as well as suitable car parking for the residents, healthcare users and public parking.

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.

3813/01/013/DM35/O  Mr Brandon Hannan

**Object**

DM35 945

Policy DM35, Table 11.8, Site 945 (p146) is the current Waitrose on Brighton Road, which will close when the new one on Lion Green road opens. The plan contemplates residential and healthcare uses, but I believe that ground floor retail should be allowed as well as potentially healthcare, and require as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site. The parking is especially important given the current parking problems in Coulsdon.

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Comment/Object</th>
<th>DM35 945</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Location/Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3814/01/013/DM35/O</td>
<td>Mr Jon Adams</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Policy DM35, Table 11.8, Site 945 (p146) is the current Waitrose store on Brighton Road, which will close when the new store on Lion Green Road is opened. The plan contemplates the replacement of the existing building and land with residential and healthcare uses, but I believe that ground floor retail should be retained with the addition of healthcare facilities and the provision of as many public car parking spaces as there are currently.</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>No change The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.</td>
<td>Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3819/01/006/DM35/O</td>
<td>Mr Michael Drury</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I notice that in your Local Plan for development of the area there are several proposals which deserve reconsideration before they are promulgated. 5 Current Waitrose site, policy DM35 Table 11.8 There should be at least an equivalent number of public parking spaces when this site is redeveloped if all the residential properties envisaged are to have an allocated space and a health care centre will also be competing for spaces.</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>No change The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.</td>
<td>Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3829/01/011/DM35/C</td>
<td>Dr L Bowen-Long</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified Waitrose site in Coulsdon – the possibilities for replacement facilities on the current Waitrose site need fundamental consideration to meet local needs for public and commercial services. Local consultation is essential to ensure local residents obtain developments which meet their requirements.</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>No change The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.</td>
<td>Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3849/01/011/DM35/O</td>
<td>Maureen Messett</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I sincerely hope that my objections will be noted. I have lived in this borough for many many years and I hate seeing it gradually destroyed.</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>No change The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.</td>
<td>Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3896/01/018/DM35/O</td>
<td>Mr M Veldeman</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Parking is a requirement particularly if the proposal for this site includes a healthcare centre. If people are unwell the majority of them will want to travel by car. Without parking being included, the whole area is going to suffer.</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>No change The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.</td>
<td>Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Objector</td>
<td>Reason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3897/01/022/DM35/O</td>
<td>Cllr M Neal</td>
<td>Site 945, Waitrose, 110-112 Brighton Road. Details residential and healthcare uses. Ground floor retail should be allowed with a requirement to maintain as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3941/01/009/DM35/O</td>
<td>Mr Frances Sell</td>
<td>Car parking equal to that now existing should be included in any new developments, it is very badly needed. Purley and Coulsdon is very hilly with steep hills, the elderly and infirm require door to door access, only restricted public transport exists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4032/01/010/DM35/O</td>
<td>Ms S Lawson</td>
<td>I believe that the current number of public car parking spaces available on this site definitely needs to be maintained, so as not to exacerbate existing parking problems in the area. I believe ground floor retail should also be allowed for this site development (in addition to residential and healthcare uses) as this is in the best interests of those living locally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4085/01/010/DM35/O</td>
<td>Mrs Shelley Chatter-Singh</td>
<td>DM 35 , table 11.8 site 945. I am opposed to your proposals for the current waitrose site in Coulsdon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4108/01/012/DM35/O</td>
<td>The Chudasama Family</td>
<td>Policy DM35, Table 11.8, Site 945 (p146)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No change

The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>DM35 945</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Object Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>DM35 945</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Object Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>DM35 945</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4117/01/027/DM35/O</td>
<td>Cllr S Brew</td>
<td>Site 945, Waitrose, 110-112 Brighton Road. Details residential and healthcare uses. Ground floor retail should be allowed with a requirement to maintain as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site;</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4125/01/030/DM35/O</td>
<td>Councillor M Fisher</td>
<td>Site 945, Waitrose, 110-112 Brighton Road. Details residential and healthcare uses. Ground floor retail should be allowed with a requirement to maintain as many public car parking spaces as there are currently on the site.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4716/01/010/DM35/O</td>
<td>Rachel Marland</td>
<td>Policy DM35 - The site should remain suitable for retail as long as the car park is also kept in any plans. Healthcare provision could be included above ground level if required.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The site is in a good location to provide much needed homes and healthcare facilities for the borough rather than be used for providing car parking spaces. Site 372, Lion Green Road car park, will require the retention of car parking spaces which will address the need for some parking in Coulsdon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Network Rail notes that there are a number of sites adjacent to the Railway and attach a standard response which sets out the issues that need to be considered. In particular with large new developments there is a concern about the risk of trespass and all new developments should have proper and suitable boundary fencing. The risk of greater flooding and drainage that new developments could potentially have on the Network Rail infrastructure and we would not want any increase of flooding or the increase in run off onto Railway Infrastructure.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not:
- encroach onto Network Rail land
- affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company’s railway and its infrastructure
- undermine its support zone
- damage the company’s infrastructure
- place additional load on outlings
- adversely affect any railway land or structure
- over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land
- cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future.

The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail’s adjoining land.

**Future maintenance**

The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant’s land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail’s adjacent land and air-space, and therefore all building should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail’s boundary. The reason for the 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant. Any
less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail's land and air-space to facilitate works. The applicant/resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer, the applicant/resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. all possession costs, all site safety costs, all asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard-against Network Rail's boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction/maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary with Network Rail will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams' ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.

Drainage
Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail's property or into Network Rail's culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail's property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail's property; full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail's existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near/within 10 – 20 metres of Network Rail's boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail's property. After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants' expense.

Plant & Materials
All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail's property, must at all times be carried out in a "fail safe" manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are
capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.

Scaffolding
Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass-proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail’s existing fencing/wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail’s boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling
arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer’s approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration

The potential for any noise/vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which hold relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night time train running and heavy freight trains.

Vehicle Incursion

Where a proposal calls for hard standing area/parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionSussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.asp.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0407010004/DM36.1/C</th>
<th>A Douthwaite</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Soundness - Effective</th>
<th>DM36.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I should like to mention here the ongoing littered state of the former Royal Mail staff car park and the dog leg to Cherry Orchard Road of Billinton Hill. Addiscombe residents run the gauntlet of this as we are still unable to access East Croydon Station via the northern bridge which is firmly blocked off. When may we expect action of both these points?</td>
<td>Not Duly Made</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>204103001/DM36.1/D</th>
<th>McKay Securities</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM36.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy DM36.1 emphasises the competing, overlapping and un-coordinated planning approach to this Opportunity Area. To maximise the chance of achieving the strategic objectives for this area, a single unified planning document should be produced which makes sets out all the policies relevant to it in a single location, whose status in relation to the Development Plan is clear and unambiguous.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The issue is not a planning matter and therefore it is not a subject of this consultation. The bridge will be fully operational and open to general public once the development on the Eastern side is completed. Construction began in 2015.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name and Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2177/01/007/DM36.1/O</td>
<td>Miss Vanessa Garner, Network Rail Infrastructure Limited</td>
<td>Policy DM36 refers to the ‘London Road area’. It is not clear from the map provided whether West Croydon station is within this area. DM36.1 and DM36.2 set out the intention to develop masterplans for certain areas. Network Rail request to be kept informed on the preparation of relevant masterplans.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2041/05/001/DM36.4/O</td>
<td>McKay Securities</td>
<td>Object DM36.4 is not a planning policy and cannot be expected to guide development with any degree of certainty or predictability. The area to which it relates to, ‘the area along Sydenham and Lansdowne Road’, is uncertain and in addition, it is not clear either what this policy seeks to achieve, or how it will achieve it. This policy as drafted is not clear or certain and is unsound.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0203/03/003/DM36.5/C</td>
<td>Mr Charles King, East Coulsdon Residents’ Association</td>
<td>Comment DM36.5 Entertainment It is also important that Fairfield Halls remains a first class venue for concerts, plays and other entertainment for South London and the surrounding area. Other artistic and cultural venues such as the David Lean and the Clock Tower should also be supported.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0203/03/004/DM36.5/C</td>
<td>Mr Charles King, East Coulsdon Residents’ Association</td>
<td>Comment DM36.5 Croydon’s Retail and Commercial Offering Croydon’s retail and commercial offering are essential to employment and wellbeing of the town centre as a place to visit, work and do business. It needs to be improved to keep pace with out of town shopping centres such as Bluewater and the move towards internet shopping. To this end we welcome the proposed Westfield/Hamerson development. However, we are concerned about the detrimental affect the redevelopment would have on the town centre during the two or more years of construction.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document ID</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Soundness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926/01/032/DM36.5/O</td>
<td>02/01/2023</td>
<td>Luke Clancy</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926/01/031/DM36.5/O</td>
<td>02/01/2023</td>
<td>Luke Clancy</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2056/01/016/DM36.5/C</td>
<td>02/01/2023</td>
<td>Dudley Mead</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2062/01/031/DM36.5/O</td>
<td>02/01/2023</td>
<td>Jason Perry</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM36.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A comprehensive redevelopment of the vacant lots and untidy buildings in Park Street should be considered

No change

The redevelopment of Park Street and the surrounding area is subject to the Mid-Croydon Masterplan. It is anticipated that any development within this area refers to the parameters set out in the masterplan to ensure the redevelopment of the area is cohesive and compliant with Local Plan policy. It is considered that the masterplan addresses the potential for the area appropriately. Furthermore, the majority of the area has been put forward as an allocation (site no. 194) and has been identified for residential and retail uses, and a civic space.

A comprehensive redevelopment of the vacant lots and untidy buildings in Park Street should be considered

No change

The redevelopment of Park Street and the surrounding area is subject to the Mid-Croydon Masterplan. It is anticipated that any development within this area refers to the parameters set out in the masterplan to ensure the redevelopment of the area is cohesive and compliant with Local Plan policy. It is considered that the masterplan addresses the potential for the area appropriately. Furthermore, the majority of the area has been put forward as an allocation (site no. 194) and has been identified for residential and retail uses, and a civic space.

DM36.5 allows for a number of car parks and parking areas to be redeveloped. A cumulative impact assessment should be undertaken to ensure that enough parking remains to satisfy the retail and office core

No change

The Croydon Opportunity Area Planning Framework has already considered the need for car parks in the Opportunity Area, and its findings have been taken into account in proposing sites in the Croydon Local Plan.
DM36.5 allows for a number of car parks and parking areas to be redeveloped. A cumulative impact assessment should be undertaken to ensure that enough parking remains to satisfy the retail and office core. A comprehensive redevelopment of the vacant lots and untidy buildings in Park Street should be considered.

An impact assessment should be undertaken within the Croydon Opportunity Area to ensure enough parking remains to satisfy the retail and office core.

The Croydon Opportunity Area Planning Framework has already considered the need for car parks in the Opportunity Area, and its findings have been taken into account in proposing sites in the Croydon Local Plan. The redevelopment of Park Street and the surrounding area is subject to the Mid-Croydon Masterplan. It is anticipated that any development within this area refers to the parameters set out in the masterplan to ensure the redevelopment of the area is cohesive and compliant with Local Plan policy. It is considered that the masterplan addresses the potential for the area appropriately. Furthermore, the majority of the area has been put forward as an allocation (site no. 194) and has been identified for residential and retail uses, and a civic space.

---

The Forum is concerned that if the cinema proposal is provided in the new Whitgift Centre it will lead to the closure of the Vue Cinema in the former Grants building. It appears that nothing has really worked there since it opened. There was a Playtown (kids' soft play centre) on the upper level at one stage but despite being very popular it closed. Other possibilities might be a skating rink, a free gym and an internet cafe. Above all the building should be retained as a community arts space. Its cinema areas could be the base for increasing the range of performance venue spaces. This would strengthen the offer in the Cultural Quarter, and attract customers for the bars and restaurants at ground floor level.


The use of the land in this location is considered D2 - should the cinema vacate the site, the land use would still remain a D2 use. This is a commercial building and any future uses of the site would need to be commercially viable. It is not considered appropriate to allocate the land for a use that may not be commercially viable.

Fairfield Halls should remain open until funding is in place to replace it.

This is not a planning consideration and so cannot be taken into account. The Local Plan considers the land use of the site and this has remained unchanged.

The Croydon Opportunity Area Planning Framework has already considered the need for car parks in the Opportunity Area, and its findings have been taken into account in proposing sites in the Croydon Local Plan.
2448/01/032/DM36.5/O  Andy Stranack  Croydon Council  
Object Soundness - Effective  DM36.5  A comprehensive redevelopment of the vacant lots and untidy buildings in Park Street should be considered  No change  The redevelopment of Park Street and the surrounding area is subject to the Mid-Croydon Masterplan. It is anticipated that any development within this area refers to the parameters set out in the masterplan to ensure the redevelopment of the area is cohesive and compliant with Local Plan policy. It is considered that the masterplan addresses the potential for the area appropriately. Furthermore, the majority of the area has been put forward as an allocation (site no. 194) and has been identified for residential and retail uses, and a civic space.

2635/01/021/DM36.5/O  Paul Sandford  Bourne Society  
Object DM36.5  DM36.5 allows for a number of car parks and parking areas to be redeveloped. A cumulative impact assessment should be undertaken to ensure that enough parking remains to satisfy the retail and office core  No change  The Croydon Opportunity Area Planning Framework has already considered the need for car parks in the Opportunity Area, and its findings have been taken into account in proposing sites in the Croydon Local Plan.

2775/01/031/DM36.5/O  Cllr Tim Pollard  London Borough of Croydon  
Object Soundness - Justified  DM36.5  DM36.5 allows for a number of car parks and parking areas to be redeveloped. A cumulative impact assessment should be undertaken to ensure that enough parking remains to satisfy the retail and office core  No change  The Croydon Opportunity Area Planning Framework has already considered the need for car parks in the Opportunity Area, and its findings have been taken into account in proposing sites in the Croydon Local Plan.

2775/01/032/DM36.5/O  Cllr Tim Pollard  London Borough of Croydon  
Object Soundness - Effective  DM36.5  A comprehensive redevelopment of the vacant lots and untidy buildings in Park Street should be considered  No change  The redevelopment of Park Street and the surrounding area is subject to the Mid-Croydon Masterplan. It is anticipated that any development within this area refers to the parameters set out in the masterplan to ensure the redevelopment of the area is cohesive and compliant with Local Plan policy. It is considered that the masterplan addresses the potential for the area appropriately. Furthermore, the majority of the area has been put forward as an allocation (site no. 194) and has been identified for residential and retail uses, and a civic space.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2776/01/031/DM36.5/O</td>
<td>Cllr Helen Pollard</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2776/01/032/DM36.5/O</td>
<td>Cllr Helen Pollard</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2807/01/001/DM36.5/S</td>
<td>Mr Kennedy Wilson</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>DM36.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The respondent puts forward a site on behalf of the landowner. This representation fully supports DM36: Croydon Opportunity Area and the aspirations of the site could also complement the proposed Office Retention Area.

The site put forward is currently known as Norfolk House and has been identified as suitable for mixed use high density redevelopment which could include retail, office, hotel and residential uses. It would complement SP3of CLP1.1. Phasing of development could be 2018 - 2025 and could yield approximately 250 - 400 homes. The proposed allocation is submitted by the site owner and would therefore not have site ownership issues.

The site will be included as an allocation in the next stage of the Local Plan and will be allocated for uses which could include retail, office, hotel and residential units (up to 7000sqm of commercial floorspace and 125-255 residential units).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2807/02/001/DM36.5/S</td>
<td>Mr Kennedy Wilson</td>
<td>Support DM36.5</td>
<td>The respondent puts forward a site on behalf of the landowner. This representation fully supports DM36: Croydon Opportunity Area and the aspirations of the site could also complement the proposed Office Retention Area. The site put forward is currently known as Norfolk House and has been identified as suitable for mixed use high density redevelopment which could include retail, office, hotel and residential uses. It would complement SP3of CLP1.1. Phasing of development could be 2018 - 2025 and could yield approximately 250 - 400 homes. The proposed allocation is submitted by the site owner and would therefore not have site ownership issues.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>The site will be included as an allocation in the next stage of the Local Plan and will be allocated for uses which could include retail, office, hotel and residential units (up to 7000sqm of commercial floorspace and 125-255 residential units).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2812/01/032/DM36.5/O</td>
<td>Cllr Jan Buttinger</td>
<td>Object DM36.5</td>
<td>A comprehensive redevelopment of the vacant lots and untidy buildings in Park Street should be considered</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The redevelopment of Park Street and the surrounding area is subject to the Mid-Croydon Masterplan. It is anticipated that any development within this area refers to the parameters set out in the masterplan to ensure the redevelopment of the area is cohesive and compliant with Local Plan policy. It is considered that the masterplan addresses the potential for the area appropriately. Furthermore, the majority of the area has been put forward as an allocation (site no. 194) and has been identified for residential and retail uses, and a civic space.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2812/01/031/DM36.5/O</td>
<td>Cllr Jan Buttinger</td>
<td>Object DM36.5</td>
<td>A comprehensive redevelopment of the vacant lots and untidy buildings in Park Street should be considered</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The Croydon Opportunity Area Planning Framework has already considered the need for car parks in the Opportunity Area, and its findings have been taken into account in proposing sites in the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2812/01/032/DM36.5/O</td>
<td>Cllr Margaret Mead</td>
<td>Object DM36.5</td>
<td>DM36.5 allows for a number of car parks and parking areas to be redeveloped. A cumulative impact assessment should be undertaken to ensure that enough parking remains to satisfy the retail and office core</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The Croydon Opportunity Area Planning Framework has already considered the need for car parks in the Opportunity Area, and its findings have been taken into account in proposing sites in the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2829/01/032/DM36.5/O</td>
<td>Cllr Margaret Mead</td>
<td>Object DM36.5</td>
<td>A comprehensive redevelopment of the vacant lots and untidy buildings in Park Street should be considered</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The Croydon Opportunity Area Planning Framework has already considered the need for car parks in the Opportunity Area, and its findings have been taken into account in proposing sites in the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness</td>
<td>DM36.5</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Margaret Mead</td>
<td>Croydon Council</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Justified DM36.5 allows for a number of car parks and parking areas to be redeveloped. A cumulative impact assessment should be undertaken to ensure that enough parking remains to satisfy the retail and office core</td>
<td>The Croydon Opportunity Area Planning Framework has already considered the need for car parks in the Opportunity Area, and its findings have been taken into account in proposing sites in the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Vidhi Mohan</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM36.5 allows for a number of car parks and parking areas to be redeveloped. A cumulative impact assessment should be undertaken to ensure that enough parking remains to satisfy the retail and office core. A comprehensive redevelopment of the vacant lots and untidy buildings in Park Street should be considered.</td>
<td>The Croydon Opportunity Area Planning Framework has already considered the need for car parks in the Opportunity Area, and its findings have been taken into account in proposing sites in the Croydon Local Plan. The redevelopment of Park Street and the surrounding area is subject to the Mid-Croydon Masterplan. It is anticipated that any development within this area refers to the parameters set out in the masterplan to ensure the redevelopment of the area is cohesive and compliant with Local Plan policy. It is considered that the masterplan addresses the potential for the area appropriately. Furthermore, the majority of the area has been put forward as an allocation (site no. 194) and has been identified for residential and retail uses, and a civic space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Richard Chatterjee</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective DM36.5 A comprehensive redevelopment of the vacant lots and untidy buildings in Park Street should be considered</td>
<td>The redevelopment of Park Street and the surrounding area is subject to the Mid-Croydon Masterplan. It is anticipated that any development within this area refers to the parameters set out in the masterplan to ensure the redevelopment of the area is cohesive and compliant with Local Plan policy. It is considered that the masterplan addresses the potential for the area appropriately. Furthermore, the majority of the area has been put forward as an allocation (site no. 194) and has been identified for residential and retail uses, and a civic space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DM36.5 allows for a number of car parks and parking areas to be redeveloped. A cumulative impact assessment should be undertaken to ensure that enough parking remains to satisfy the retail and office core

No change

The Croydon Opportunity Area Planning Framework has already considered the need for car parks in the Opportunity Area, and its findings have been taken into account in proposing sites in the Croydon Local Plan.

3699/01/032/DM36.5/O Cllr J Cummings

Object Soundness - Effective DM36.5

A comprehensive redevelopment of the vacant lots and untidy buildings in Park Street should be considered

A comprehensive redevelopment of the vacant lots and untidy buildings in Park Street should be considered

No change

The Croydon Opportunity Area Planning Framework has already considered the need for car parks in the Opportunity Area, and its findings have been taken into account in proposing sites in the Croydon Local Plan.

3699/01/031/DM36.5/O Cllr J Cummings

Object Soundness - Justified DM36.5

DM36.5 allows for a number of car parks and parking areas to be redeveloped. A cumulative impact assessment should be undertaken to ensure that enough parking remains to satisfy the retail and office core

No change

The Croydon Opportunity Area Planning Framework has already considered the need for car parks in the Opportunity Area, and its findings have been taken into account in proposing sites in the Croydon Local Plan.

02 September 2016
Comment
DM36.5
DM36.5 allows for a number of car parks and parking areas to be redeveloped. A cumulative impact assessment should be undertaken to ensure that enough parking remains to satisfy the retail and office core; No change
The Croydon Opportunity Area Planning Framework has already considered the need for car parks in the Opportunity Area, and its findings have been taken into account in proposing sites in the Croydon Local Plan.

Object
DM36.5
DM36.5 allows for a number of car parks and parking areas to be redeveloped. A cumulative impact assessment should be undertaken to ensure that enough parking remains to satisfy the retail and office core; A comprehensive redevelopment of the vacant lots and untidy buildings in Park Street should be considered. No change
The Croydon Opportunity Area Planning Framework has already considered the need for car parks in the Opportunity Area, and its findings have been taken into account in proposing sites in the Croydon Local Plan.

Object
DM36.5
DM36.5 allows for a number of car parks and parking areas to be redeveloped. A cumulative impact assessment should be undertaken to ensure that enough parking remains to satisfy the retail and office core; There should be a comprehensive redevelopment of the vacant lots and untidy buildings in Park Street. No change
The redevelopment of Park Street and the surrounding area is subject to the Mid-Croydon Masterplan. It is anticipated that any development within this area refers to the parameters set out in the masterplan to ensure the redevelopment of the area is cohesive and compliant with Local Plan policy. It is considered that the masterplan addresses the potential for the area appropriately. Furthermore, the majority of the area has been put forward as an allocation (site no. 194) and has been identified for residential and retail uses, and a civic space.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>DM36.5 Details</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4125/01/032/DM36.5/O</td>
<td>M Fisher</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>A comprehensive redevelopment of the vacant lots and untidy buildings in Park Street should be considered</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The redevelopment of Park Street and the surrounding area is subject to the Mid-Croydon Masterplan. It is anticipated that any development within this area refers to the parameters set out in the masterplan to ensure the redevelopment of the area is cohesive and compliant with Local Plan policy. It is considered that the masterplan addresses the potential for the area appropriately. Furthermore, the majority of the area has been put forward as an allocation (site no. 194) and has been identified for residential and retail uses, and a civic space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4125/01/031/DM36.5/O</td>
<td>M Fisher</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>DM36.5 allows for a number of car parks and parking areas to be redeveloped. A cumulative impact assessment should be undertaken to ensure that enough parking remains to satisfy the retail and office core</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The Croydon Opportunity Area Planning Framework has already considered the need for car parks in the Opportunity Area, and its findings have been taken into account in proposing sites in the Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2634/01/005/DM36.5/C</td>
<td>Charlie Fagan</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM36.5</td>
<td>The site is assigned to another school provider.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Comment is noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Network Rail notes that there are a number of sites adjacent to the Railway and attach a standard response which sets out the issues that need to be considered. In particular with large new developments there is a concern about the risk of trespass and all new developments should have proper and suitable boundary fencing. The risk of greater flooding and drainage that new developments could potentially have on the Network Rail infrastructure and we would not want any increase of flooding or the increase in run off onto Railway Infrastructure.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not:
- encroach onto Network Rail land
- affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company’s railway and its infrastructure
- undermine its support zone
- damage the company’s infrastructure
- place additional load on outcrops
- adversely affect any railway land or structure
- over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land
- cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future.

The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail's adjoining land.

Future maintenance
The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant's land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail’s adjacent land and air-space, and therefore all any building should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail’s boundary. The reason for the 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant.

Any development proposals for the site would be subject to consultation and Network Rail would be consulted as required.
less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works. The applicant / resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer, the applicant / resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. all possession costs, all site safety costs, all asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard-against Network Rail’s boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction / maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary with Network Rail will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams’ ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.

Drainage
Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail’s property or into Network Rail’s culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail’s property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail’s property; full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail’s existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near/within 10 – 20 metres of Network Rail’s boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property. After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants’ expense.

Plant & Materials
All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail’s property, must at all times be carried out in a “fail safe” manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are
capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.

Scaffolding
Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant’s contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail’s existing fencing/wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail’s boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers’ vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling
arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer’s approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

**Noise and Vibration**

The potential for any noise/vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which hold relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night time train running and heavy freight trains.

**Vehicle Incursion**

Where a proposal calls for hard standing area/parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionSussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.asp.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0391/01/10</td>
<td>DM36.5/0</td>
<td>MENTA Tower – should it not be built and new buildings should be limited to 25 stories.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0391/02/10</td>
<td>DM36.5/0</td>
<td>MENTA Tower – should it not be built and new buildings should be limited to 25 stories.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Network Rail notes that there are a number of sites adjacent to the Railway and attach a standard response which sets out the issues that need to be considered. In particular with large new developments there is a concern about the risk of trespass and all new developments should have proper and suitable boundary fencing. The risk of greater flooding and drainage that new developments could potentially have on the Network Rail infrastructure and we would not want any increase of flooding or the increase in run off onto Railway Infrastructure.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not: encroach onto Network Rail land affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company’s railway and its infrastructure undermine its support zone damage the company’s infrastructure place additional load on outfalls adversely affect any railway land or structure over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future.

The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail’s adjoining land.

Future maintenance
The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant’s land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail’s adjacent land and air-space, and therefore all any building should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail’s boundary. The reason for the 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant. Any
less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works. The applicant / resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer, the applicant / resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. all possession costs, all site safety costs, all asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard-against Network Rail’s boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction / maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary with Network Rail will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams’ ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.

Drainage
Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail’s property or into Network Rail’s culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail’s property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail’s property; full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail’s existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near within 10 – 20 metres of Network Rail’s boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property. After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants’ expense.

Plant & Materials
All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail’s property, must at all times be carried out in a “fail safe” manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are
capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.

Scaffolding
Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant’s contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail’s existing fencing/wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail’s boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling
arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer’s approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration
The potential for any noise/vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which hold relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, right time train running and heavy freight trains.

Vehicle Incursion
Where a proposal calls for hard standing area/parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionSussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.asp.
Object We have seen the site location plan included within the background 'Place Specific Policies' document. The plan appears to be incorrect. The land west of Cherry Orchard Road within the Red Line is land currently being developed on the Galaxy House site. The Red Line should therefore be drawn to the south of this area and include land up to the area including Bilton Hill and the Porter and Sorter public house south of Bilton Hill. In addition, the Cherry Orchard Gardens part of the site (to the east of Cherry Orchard Road) does not reflect the consented scheme where the site boundary extended to the junction of Cherry Orchard Road and Oval Road. The following comments are made on this basis that the site plans be amended accordingly:
The proposed use reflects the consented development for the site. The development has not yet been delivered, and in order to provide some flexibility for future market conditions it is recommended that the policy provides some flexibility on the basis that the development can comprise some or all of these uses. It is also expected that the commercial uses are not envisaged on the Cherry Orchard Gardens site and this should perhaps be made clear. The background 'Place Specific Policies' document refers to the local character of the area as "industrial estates" or "mixed type flats". This is incorrect.

Change The site location should be amended to reflect the consented scheme. The proposed uses should also allow for some flexibility for other uses.

2824/01/001/DM36.5/C Mark Slater I am writing to raise my objection to the construction of high-rise apartment blocks in the East Croydon and Addiscombe areas, such as the development on Cherry Orchard Gardens. As a resident in the area for many years, I feel that these developments are detrimental to the area for environmental reasons. In particular, they will block natural light to many of the adjacent two storey properties. They will also lead to extra traffic and put pressure on existing parking spaces and other amenities.

No change Any application put forward for the redevelopment of the site will be considered on its merits. The uses of the site are considered appropriate and the site will continue to be allocated for same.

3417/01/001/DM36.5/O Mr & Mrs Colin Read Object Soundness - Justified There is a plan for a massive 65-storey block in Cherry Orchard Road. This is vastly out of proportion to the rest of the buildings in Croydon and its planned height - if the building is needed at all - should be reduced.

No change This site has planning permission and it would be unrealistic to expect a lessor form of development on it now. The former Essex House site also has planning permission and the Council is waiting for development to commence.

02 September 2016
Mr Ian Leonard

My main concern about the proposals for Addiscombe and East Croydon is that the Council is not amending its tall buildings policy. When the Menta planning application for a 50+ storey tower on Cherry Orchard Road was approved by the previous Conservative Council, both Labour councillors and our local MP for Central Croydon agreed that very tall buildings were not appropriate on this site. However, now that they are running the Council those same councillors have not changed the previous Council’s policy. Why? Apparently, the MP for Central Croydon will be calling on the Council to amend its tall buildings policy so that the tallest buildings have to be in the centre of town, not right on the edge of the tall buildings zone next to two-storey residential housing.

No change

Mr & Mrs Shutter

We are writing to voice my our objections to the council’s planning policy. Specifically we object to: The continued approval of the 50-storey Menta Tower which when in opposition, your party agreed that very tall buildings were not appropriate to the site. Having voted for your party on the basis of your objection to the tower I am very disappointed that you have taken no steps to prevent its construction.

No change

Guildhouse Rosepride LLP

The allocation should include Voyager House to reflect longstanding Council aspirations and allow for development that optimises the site’s potential, including for over 900 homes. Some element of retail should be included within the allocation as the site is in an accessible location close to the primary shopping frontage. This would create greater flexibility in terms of the deliverability of any commercial element of the site. Including Voyager House within site 142 would enable optimal development at this location, securing sustainable regeneration across a wider area and creating a catalyst for the realisation of other schemes in the local context. The inclusion of Voyager House would also help deliver important place-making benefits for the Wellesley Road frontage.

The allocation should include Voyager House.

Change

Any application put forward for the redevelopment of the site will be considered on its merits. The uses of the site are considered appropriate and the site will continue to be allocated for same.

The scheme has been consented to and the permission has technically been implemented. In light of this, the permission will not expire.

The allocation will be amended to include Voyager House. It is not considered appropriate to allocate the site to include retail uses as the site is located beyond the Primary Shopping Area. A density will be applied of 419 - 441 to indicate the number of units that may be deliverable on the site. The number of units provided will be determined through any future planning application.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minerva</td>
<td>DM36.5 162</td>
<td>The allocation will be amended to include other town centre uses, however any redevelopment of the site will be expected to meet the required standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Object**

The planning permission for this site includes a minimum of 7,285sqm up to a maximum of 10,900sqm of Class A floor space (including Class A1 retail).

The consented development on the site includes the surface car park to the north of Lansdowne Road. The overall number of homes set out in the proposed allocation for Site 172 is taken from the planning permission which includes site 243 (the surface car park) and this needs to be reflected in the proposed allocation.

Retail should be included in the preferred option to reflect the extant planning permission for the site. The surface car park north of Lansdowne Road (site 243) should be included as part of Site 172.

| Croydon Gateway Limited Partners | DM36.5 172 | The allocation will be changed to reflect the extant planning permission on the site which provides 550 - 625 residential units, office space, retail, 400 sqm community uses, a replacement theatre of 200 seats and energy centre. Site 243 will also be made part of the allocation to reflect the extant planning permission. |

**Object**

The proposed use identified reflects the current planning permission for the site. The site could be appropriate for other uses in this town centre location which, in the interest of flexibility, the policy should not discount. Within the background 'Place Specific Policies' document, it is stated that any conversion needs to adhere to London Plan and Local Plan standards to "improve the sustainability of the development". As noted elsewhere in the document, the site has planning permission for conversion. In any event, the standard should be treated with flexibility in conversion schemes.

The site should consider other uses appropriate to the town centre location in addition to the current planning permission.
Network Rail notes that there are a number of sites adjacent to the Railway and attach a standard response which sets out the issues that need to be considered. In particular with large new developments there is a concern about the risk of trespass and all new developments should have proper and suitable boundary fencing. The risk of greater flooding and drainage that new developments could potentially have on the Network Rail infrastructure and we would not want any increase of flooding or the increase in run off onto Railway Infrastructure.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not: encroach onto Network Rail land affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company’s railway and its infrastructure undermine its support zone damage the company’s infrastructure place additional load on outfalls adversely affect any railway land or structure over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future

The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail’s adjoining land.

Future maintenance
The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant’s land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail’s adjacent land and air-space, and therefore all/any building should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail’s boundary. The reason for the 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant. Any
less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works. The applicant / resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer, the applicant / resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. all possession costs, all site safety costs, all asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard-against Network Rail’s boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction / maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary with Network Rail will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams’ ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.

Drainage
Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail’s property or into Network Rail’s culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail’s property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail’s property; full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail’s existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near within 10 – 20 metres of Network Rail’s boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property. After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants’ expense.

Plant & Materials
All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail’s property, must at all times be carried out in a “fail safe” manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are
capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.

Scaffolding
Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant’s contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass-proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail’s existing fencing/wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail’s boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling
arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail's Asset Protection Engineer's approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration
The potential for any noise/vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which hold relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night time train running and heavy freight trains.

Vehicle Incursion
Where a proposal calls for hard standing area/parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionsussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.asp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2177/01/002/DM36.5/O</td>
<td>Miss Vanessa Garner</td>
<td>DM36.5 172 Any development on this site needs to consider existing station layout and services (ATM’s and cycle facilities). No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2683/01/005/DM36.5/S</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Iles</td>
<td>Support DM36.5 174 There are many, many empty sites in Croydon that are not mentioned. For example a large site near the Three Penny Bit by East Croydon station has been empty for as long as we can remember. Welcome support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am expressing my extreme disquiet over the cavalier 'development' plans proposed by the current Croydon Council, especially in my own area, Shrublands and Shirley. I can well imagine there is council property that is lying empty. In my area, it has taken more than 15 years to bring two council properties back into use long after they became vacant and fell into extreme disrepair, namely the school keeper’s house by Forest Academy (formerly Spring Park School) and the former Children’s Home in Oak Avenue.

In Croydon town centre there are office blocks that have been empty for decades. There is a large, vacant, building ready plot, in Addiscombe Road, between Park Hill Road and Addiscombe Grove, neglected for more than 15 years. The shops and near derelict dwellings above them on Station Road, West Croydon, are a disgrace to the Borough and badly need redevelopment.

Until all such places have been developed, residential areas should not be considered and then only with great sensitivity to existing and future residents, who will want to find the green spaces the Shrublands and Shirley area is famous for.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>DM36.5</th>
<th>Welcome support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia Dibbs</td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM36.5</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Rod Davies</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>The site should not be allocated as a school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>DM36.5</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Fagan</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>The site has been identified to meet the need for school places in the Opportunity Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support

The preferred approach is appropriate provided that a primary school can be reasonably accommodated on the Stephenson House site alongside commercial and/or residential which would both enhance the local area and make any potential development commercially viable.

DM36.5

Welcome support

Object

The allocation in the Plan is for offices with residential and/or hotel with health care facility. This site has been in office use and still is in office use at present on the lower floors. Since 2013, it has had several prior approvals for conversion to flats and now holds consents for 134 units from the basement to the seventh floors. Work has commenced on the building. Under the terms of the GPDQ 2015, the prior approvals can be commenced within 3 years from approval and the scheme comprising the 134 units was approved in July 2015 so the building has to be converted by July 2018. To include in a Plan running until 2036 a policy which states that the building can remain as offices then converted around 2026 to include a hotel or health club or other such town centre use compliant with policy SP3 as mentioned is unrealistic since there is no chance at all that this will happen. A more appropriate policy would need to take account of this is a building being in residential use by 2018. The building is already being worked on and is expected to be in use as flats by 2018. To state that the building will not change from its existing use as offices until 2026 is not realistic given the permissions that already exist for the site. The amount of housing units stated to be required is 26-62. This is not at all plausible especially given the size and number of floors. The building has consent for 134 units and this should be acknowledged for its contribution to the housing targets. The Council makes it clear that it has a shortfall of housing yet it is looking for windfall development of around 10000 units. It would be more realistic and more likely that the Plan overall will pass Examination if the Council acknowledges that some of the shortfall in housing units is already provided in this and other Prior Approval schemes. It would not be difficult to contact the landowners about which schemes are being implemented-they are already being consulted as part of the current process.

DM36.5

Change

As there is prior approval in place for a change of use to residential and this is currently under construction, the site will no longer be allocated within the Local Plan.
Comment Soundness - Effective

Network Rail notes that there are a number of sites adjacent to the Railway and attach a standard response which sets out the issues that need to be considered. In particular with large new developments there is a concern about the risk of trespass and all new developments should have proper and suitable boundary fencing. The risk of greater flooding and drainage that new developments could potentially have on the Network Rail infrastructure and we would not want any increase of flooding or the increase in run off onto Railway Infrastructure.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not:
- encroach onto Network Rail land
- affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company’s railway and its infrastructure
- undermine its support zone
- damage the company’s infrastructure
- place additional load on cuttings
- adversely affect any railway land or structure
- over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land
- cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future

The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail’s adjoining land.

Future maintenance
The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant’s land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail’s adjacent land and air-space, and therefore all/any building should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail’s boundary. The reason for the 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant. Any
less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong probability that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works. The applicant / resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer, the applicant / resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. all possession costs, all site safety costs, all asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard-against Network Rail’s boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction / maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary with Network Rail will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams’ ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.

Drainage
Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail’s property or into Network Rail’s culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail’s property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail’s property; full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail’s existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near within 10 – 20 metres of Network Rail’s boundary at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property. After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants’ expense.

Plant & Materials
All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail’s property, must at all times be carried out in a “fail safe” manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are
capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.

Scaffolding
Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant’s contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass-proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail’s existing fencing/wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail’s boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling...
arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer’s approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration
The potential for any noise/vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which holds relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night time train running and heavy freight trains.

Vehicle Incursion
Where a proposal calls for hard standing area/parking of vehicles near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionSussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.asp.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>DM36.5</th>
<th>Number of Homes: The actual capacity of the site would be tested and confirmed through a proper feasibility and planning process.</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>The number of homes is calculated to take into consideration the area of the site and the current and potential character of the surrounding area whilst also applying the measures as set out in the London Plan. Should a planning application be submitted, further consideration will be given to the number of units proposed, whether this is suitable, or if it is considered an over-development of the site.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telereal Trillium</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Evidence of Deliverability - The landowner has indicated that the site would be developed by themselves or by Joint Venture with another party.

DM36.5 186 Evidence of Deliverability - The landowner has indicated that the site would be developed by themselves or by Joint Venture with another party. Change The site will remain as an allocation in the Local Plan, however the evidence of deliverability will be amended to reflect that there is known interest in the site. The phasing of development will also be amended to fall within the period 2016 - 2021.

Comment Phasing of Development - The landowner has stated that it is their intention to bring the site forward for development prior to 2020.

DM36.5 186 Phasing of Development - The landowner has stated that it is their intention to bring the site forward for development prior to 2020. Change The site will remain as an allocation in the Local Plan, however the evidence of deliverability will be amended to reflect that there is known interest in the site. The phasing of development will also be amended to fall within the period 2016 - 2021.

Comment Justification for Option It is stated within the specific policies that "the site has been identified by the NHS as being in an area with a need for additional healthcare facilities. The inclusion of healthcare facilities should be explored with the NHS before development takes place". It is considered that should a deliverable scheme be brought forward on the site that helps to achieve the strategic objectives for the area without input from the NHS, this should be treated on its own merits and not be precluded by the mention of NHS within this policy. We are unclear as to why the NHS requirements are included for this site and would suggest reference is removed.

DM36.5 186 Justification for Option It is stated within the specific policies that "the site has been identified by the NHS as being in an area with a need for additional healthcare facilities. The inclusion of healthcare facilities should be explored with the NHS before development takes place". It is considered that should a deliverable scheme be brought forward on the site that helps to achieve the strategic objectives for the area without input from the NHS, this should be treated on its own merits and not be precluded by the mention of NHS within this policy. We are unclear as to why the NHS requirements are included for this site and would suggest reference is removed. No change Reference to the NHS will remain as part of this allocation as there is an identified need for such services in the area. There is no expectation that the NHS would pay less than the market value for the site and so this should not jeopardise the site coming forward for development.

Support Yes, redevelopment for the proposed uses outlined, offices, residential, hotel, class A2 (finance), would all be appropriate in this location along with any other town centre use.

DM36.5 186 Yes, redevelopment for the proposed uses outlined, offices, residential, hotel, class A2 (finance), would all be appropriate in this location along with any other town centre use. Welcome support

Support Metropolitan Properties' Site, Suffolk House, has been put forward as a proposed site specific allocation. This site is allocated for mixed use development with offices or residential dwellings above retail units at ground level. Metropolitan Properties is supportive of this allocation as it will assist in the development aims of both the Croydon Opportunity Area and the Fairfield Masterplan. Metropolitan Properties area also supportive of the flexibility of uses proposed. Metropolitan Properties would like to work with the London Borough of Croydon to develop the preferred development option further.

DM36.5 192 Metropolitan Properties' Site, Suffolk House, has been put forward as a proposed site specific allocation. This site is allocated for mixed use development with offices or residential dwellings above retail units at ground level. Metropolitan Properties is supportive of this allocation as it will assist in the development aims of both the Croydon Opportunity Area and the Fairfield Masterplan. Metropolitan Properties area also supportive of the flexibility of uses proposed. Metropolitan Properties would like to work with the London Borough of Croydon to develop the preferred development option further. Welcome support
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2637/01/004/DM36.5/S</td>
<td>Metropolitan Properties (Provincial)</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>DM36.5 192</td>
<td>In line with the redevelopment aims of the Croydon Opportunity Area and the Fairfield Masterplan area, Metropolitan Properties would like to bring the site forward for mixed use redevelopment</td>
<td>Welcome support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2637/01/003/DM36.5/C</td>
<td>Metropolitan Properties (Provincial)</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM36.5 193</td>
<td>Essex House lies to the east of Norwich Union House. The site is allocated for mixed use development with offices or residential dwellings above retail units at ground floor level. Metropolitan Properties is supportive of mixed use development in the locality of George Street however, notes that it is imperative that any forthcoming design proposals for this plot would not prejudice future development of both 96 George Street and other neighbouring site (for example, in terms of daylight / sunlight).</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>All planning applications are determined against policies of the Local Plan. This includes matters such as overlooking, outlook, daylight and sunlight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2635/01/022/DM36.5/O</td>
<td>Paul Sandford</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM36.5 194</td>
<td>A comprehensive redevelopment of the vacant lots and untidy buildings in Park Street should be considered</td>
<td>Welcome support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2749/01/002/DM36.5/C</td>
<td>Mr A Kennedy</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM36.5 194</td>
<td>The term “Civic Space” is inferior to the term “Town Hall Square” and if adopted, it would likely lead to an inferior space to that which was intended in the Masterplan reference MC1 and MC4 adopted by the Council in July 2012. A Town Hall Square opposite the Old Town Hall and the main Library entrance in Katharine Street capable of holding thousands of people. A Square such as we see in other major and minor European cities which can be used for all kinds of civil ceremonies and as a place that shows the best architecture that the city has to offer. A square that has multiple uses. Isolated from through traffic and with multiple purposes. An outside space for ceremonies, concerts, speeches, presentations as well as remembrance events. A hard surface, paved and partially cobbled. Not habitually used by vehicles. Possibly with a sculpture or memorional fountain in the middle demonstrating civic pride and giving inspiration to the population of Croydon. European cities often use them for market days too. Let’s up to you but first of all you have to create the space and divert traffic flow away from it.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The allocation as a civic space supports and complements the “Town Hall Square” as set out in the Mid-Croydon Masterplan. Any redevelopment of the site will accord with the Local Plan and Mid-Croydon masterplan. “Civic space” does not alter the aspirations of this particular component of the Masterplan or what it will be used for, and its name will be defined thought the planning application process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
your terminology is wrong and may lead to an inferior outcome if not addressed. Presently you describe the preferred use as having a civic space”. This is unsatisfactory because that could be either internal or external. The Mid-Croydon Masterplan calls for a “Town Hall Square” and that is what the wording should be on the Local Plan. Let unchecked you are in danger of compromising the Strategic Objectives of the Local Plan under the heading “A Place to Belong” and “A Place with a Sustainable Future” SO 7 in particular - "Conserve and create spaces and buildings that foster safe, healthy and cohesive communities” SO 8 - Improve accessibility, connectivity, sustainability and ease of movement to, from and within the borough. As presently written you are in danger of under-delivering a scheme to the people of Croydon which could be so much better. We need an exterior ceremonial space that can accommodate many hundreds if not thousands of people in the open air around the memorial statue opposite the Town Hall as other major European Cities usually have. You the Council should decide what space is required and not be cow towed by the developer in whose prima facie interest is to minimise public realm space and maximise the amount of private office and interior space.

The allocation as a civic space supports and complements the "Town Hall Square" as set out in the Mid-Croydon Masterplan. Any redevelopment of the site will accord with the Local Plan and Mid-Croydon masterplan. "Civic space" does not alter the aspirations of this particular component of the Masterplan or what it will be used for, and its name will be defined thought the planning application process.
Object DM36.5

Minerva

This is a large site which is currently subject to early pre-application discussions. The development will be of significant scale with associated timescales and the content and make up of any scheme will inevitably be reviewed throughout the development process. Whilst any scheme is almost certainly going to include the identified residential and retail uses, other uses on the site should not be precluded on the site by the policy and the policy should provide this flexibility. It would be logical for this site to be extended to include the adjacent Seagas House site (reference 231) as both sites are within the same ownership and will likely come forward under one planning application.

With reference to the background ‘Place Specific Policies’ document, it is considered that whilst the site is not situated in East Croydon, it could be suitable for office use. Part of the site is in a Conservation Area, but the majority is outside the Conservation Area. The number of homes suggested for the site is 88-504. It is unclear how these figures have been derived but the site clearly has significant capacity for residential development, and we think it would be inappropriate to put a range of units on the site at this stage.

The allocation should be flexible enough to allow for other uses and should include Seagas House. The number of homes should be removed.

No change

It is not considered appropriate to include Seagas House (site 231) within this allocation given its status as a listed building. Redevelopment of the site will therefore require particular sensitivity. The site lies within the Primary Shopping Area and can therefore accommodate other town centre uses in accordance with Local Plan policy. The range is calculated using density matrix within the Mayor of London’s Housing SPG (2016) and applying the character of the extant character within the area as set out in the Croydon’s Borough Typology. This gives an indicative range of what may be provided on the site. However, all planning applications are decided on their merits and the number of units that are considered appropriate on the site will be determined as part of a planning application.

Support DM36.5

Cllr L Hale
London Borough of Croydon

A comprehensive redevelopment of the vacant lots and untidy buildings in Park Street should be considered.

Welcome support
Network Rail notes that there are a number of sites adjacent to the Railway and attach a standard response which sets out the issues that need to be considered. In particular with large new developments there is a concern about the risk of trespass and all new developments should have proper and suitable boundary fencing. The risk of greater flooding and drainage that new developments could potentially have on the Network Rail infrastructure and we would not want any increase of flooding or the increase in run off onto Railway Infrastructure.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not encroach onto Network Rail land affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company’s railway and its infrastructure undermine its support zone damage the company’s infrastructure place additional load on outlings adversely affect any railway land or structure over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future

The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail’s adjoining land.

Future maintenance

The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant’s land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail’s adjacent land and air-space, and therefore allenary building should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail’s boundary. The reason for the 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant.

Any development proposals for the site would be subject to consultation and Network Rail would be consulted as required.
less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works. The applicant / resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer, the applicant / resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. all possession costs, all site safety costs, all asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard-against Network Rail’s boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction / maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary with Network Rail will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams’ ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.

Drainage

Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail’s property or into Network Rail’s culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail’s property. Full details to be submitted to Network Rail for approval. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail’s existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near/within 10 – 20 metres of Network Rail’s boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property.

After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants' expense.
capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.

Scaffolding
Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant’s contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail’s existing fencing/wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail’s boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling.
arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer’s approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration
The potential for any noise/ vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which hold relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night time train running and heavy freight trains.

Vehicle Incursion
Where a proposal calls for hard standing area / parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionSussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.asp.
Network Rail notes that there are a number of sites adjacent to the Railway and attach a standard response which sets out the issues that need to be considered. In particular with large new developments there is a concern about the risk of trespass and all new developments should have proper and suitable boundary fencing. The risk of greater flooding and drainage that new developments could potentially have on the Network Rail infrastructure and we would not want any increase of flooding or the increase in run off onto Railway Infrastructure.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not encroach onto Network Rail land affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company’s railway and its infrastructure undermine its support zone damage the company’s infrastructure place additional load on outlings adversely affect any railway land or structure over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future

The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail’s adjoining land.

Future maintenance
The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant’s land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail’s adjacent land and air-space, and therefore all any building should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail’s boundary. The reason for the 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant. Any
less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works. The applicant / resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer, the applicant / resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. all possession costs, all site safety costs, all asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard-against Network Rail's boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction / maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary with Network Rail will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams' ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.

**Drainage**

Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail's property or into Network Rail's culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail's property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail's property; full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail's existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near within 10 – 20 metres of Network Rail's boundary at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail's property. After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants' expense.

**Plant & Materials**

All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail's property, must at all times be carried out in a "fail safe" manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are
capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.

Scaffolding
Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant's contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail's Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass-proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail’s existing fencing/wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail’s boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers’ vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling
arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail's Asset Protection Engineer's approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration
The potential for any noise/vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which hold relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night time train running and heavy freight trains.

Vehicle Incursion
Where a proposal calls for hard standing area/parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionSussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.asp.

| 2634/01/013/DM36.5/C | Charlie Fagan | Comment | DM36.5 | The site is not suitable for Ark as it is too close to another academy. | No change | Comment is noted. | ARK | 201 |
Network Rail notes that there are a number of sites adjacent to the Railway and attach a standard response which sets out the issues that need to be considered. In particular with large new developments there is a concern about the risk of trespass and all new developments should have proper and suitable boundary fencing. The risk of greater flooding and drainage that new developments could potentially have on the Network Rail infrastructure and we would not want any increase of flooding or the increase in run off onto Railway Infrastructure.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not:
- encroach onto Network Rail land
- affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company’s railway and its infrastructure
- undermine its support zone
- damage the company’s infrastructure
- place additional load on cuttings
- adversely affect any railway land or structure
- over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land
- cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future

The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail’s adjoining land.

Future maintenance
The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant’s land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail’s adjacent land and air-space, and therefore all proposed buildings should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail’s boundary. The reason for the 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant. Any
less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works. The applicant / resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer, the applicant / resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. all possession costs, all site safety costs, all asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard-against Network Rail’s boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction / maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary with Network Rail will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams’ ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.

Drainage
Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail’s property or into Network Rail’s culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail’s property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail’s property; full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail’s existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near / within 10 – 20 metres of Network Rail’s boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property. After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants’ expense.

Plant & Materials
All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail’s property, must at all times be carried out in a “fail safe” manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are
capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.

Scaffolding
Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant's contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail's Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass-proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail's existing fencing/wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail's boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling
arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer’s approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration
The potential for any noise/vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which holds relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night time train running and heavy freight trains.

Vehicle Incursion
Where a proposal calls for hard standing area/parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionSussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.asp.x.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM36.5</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0120/02/12</td>
<td>Addiscombe Residents Association</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>The proposal should have a Parcel Collection office and a cycle hub for those who travel on trains. The allocation should include a parcel collection office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0391/01/003</td>
<td>Mrs Mira Armour</td>
<td>DM36.5</td>
<td>Royal Mail Sorting Office – we would SUPPORT the proposal to have here - the Parcel Collection office (easily accessible by residents ) - a cycle hub - for those that travel on by trains</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Addiscombe Residents Association**

Object: The proposal should have a Parcel Collection office and a cycle hub for those who travel on trains. The allocation should include a parcel collection office.

**Change:** The site has an extant planning permission for residential, hotel and/or office use as well as retail uses. It is considered appropriate for such uses, however it is considered a suitable site for a cycle hub and so will be included in the allocation. The provision of a parcel collection office is unlikely to come forward as the site is no longer owned by the Royal Mail and will not be commercially viable for a private developer to provide.

**Support:**

- DM36.5
- Mrs Mira Armour
- HOME Residents Association

SUPPORT the proposal to have here - the Parcel Collection office (easily accessible by residents ) - a cycle hub - for those that travel on by trains.

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>DM</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>Royal Mail Sorting Office – we would SUPPORT the proposal to have here - the Parcel Collection office (easily accessible by residents) - a cycle hub - for those that travel on by trains.</th>
<th>Welcome support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0391/02/003/DM36.5/S</td>
<td>Mrs Mira Armour</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>DM36.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Royal Mail Sorting Office – we would SUPPORT the proposal to have here - the Parcel Collection office (easily accessible by residents) - a cycle hub - for those that travel on by trains.</td>
<td>Welcome support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2177/01/003/DM36.5/O</td>
<td>Miss Vanessa Garner</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM36.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>The height of development on this site needs to bear in mind the future over-site development at the station.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2605/01/012/DM36.5/O</td>
<td>Ian Broyd</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM36.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>The proposal should have a Parcel Collection office and a cycle hub for those who travel on trains.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2691/01/007/DM36.5/C</td>
<td>Hyde Housing Association</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM36.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>We are supportive of the drive to enable development opportunities in the area. Table 11.9 site 21 refers to Hyde Housing Group’s Addiscombe Square site. The site is situated adjacent Croydon East Railway Station where the incorporation of some retail uses are considered wholly appropriate for this location. Suggested wording is as follows: Mixed use development incorporating residential and retail subject to satisfying the sequential test. Alternative uses could also be explored including a hotel and/or offices. There should be recognition that the redevelopment scheme could include the redevelopment of the Porter and Sorter Public House and improvements to Billington Hill.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**

Sites are allocated based on their suitability of uses - should a proposal come forward in this location for retail uses; it would not be supported in the first instance (and is therefore not allocated as such) and would require a sequential test. The only exception to this in this instance is where retail development comes forward as part of the extent planning permission on the site.
Last year there was debate about the future of SEGAS House and suggestions made that it should be turned into a community arts centre, museum and art gallery, local history centre, etc. The Council has designated it for housing use in the detailed site proposals for the Croydon Opportunity Area (Town Centre). The Arts Network is totally opposed to this proposed use. It considers that such a use would be inappropriate and difficult to achieve without compromising the exterior of the building. The Arts Network considers that a community use for the building will assist in linking the two sides of the proposed Cultural Quarter together on both sides of Wellesley Rd, and that it would provide an attraction for people to come into the Town Centre during the period of the closure of the Fairfield Halls.

Replace ‘Residential conversion’ by ‘Arts and heritage centre’ in the listing of SEGAS House in Detailed Policies & Proposals Table 11.9.

The site lies within the Primary Shopping Area and can therefore accommodate other town centre uses in accordance with Local Plan policy, however the potential for community uses should be fully explored prior to any proposals for residential and/or retail uses on the site being considered. The site will not be safeguarded for community uses whereby development of this type may not occur.

Option 1 is misleading as it fails to make reference to planning application reference 15/01419/P & 15/01422/LB which is due for imminent determination and which will provide context to redevelopment of this site. This application seeks to deliver 232 residential units (well in excess of the 50 to 141 suggested in the draft policy). The site is well suited for retail development, up to the provision of existing, given its main street frontages and accessibility.

The allocation should reflect the planning applications 15/01419/P and 15/01422/LB.

The allocation will be amended to reflect the extant planning permission on the site which will provide 232 residential units as part of an over all redevelopment of the site which includes re-provision of retail uses, car and cycle parking and a public square.
I am expressing my extreme disquiet over the cavalier ‘development’ plans proposed by the current Croydon Council, especially in my own area, Shrublands and Shirley. I can well imagine there is council property that is lying empty. In my area, it has taken more than 15 years to bring two council properties back into use long after they became vacant and fell into extreme disrepair, namely the school keeper’s house by Forest Academy (formerly Spring Park School) and the former Children’s Home in Oak Avenue. In Croydon town centre there are office blocks that have been empty for decades. There is a large, vacant, building ready plot, in Addiscombe Road, between Park Hill Road and Addiscombe Grove, neglected for more than 15 years. The shops and near derelict dwellings above them on Station Road, West Croydon, are a disgrace to the Borough and badly need redevelopment. Until all such places have been developed, residential areas should not be considered and then only with great sensitivity to existing and future residents, who will want to find the green spaces the Shrublands and Shirley area is famous for.

**Object**

| 2750/01/001/DM36.5/O | Home Office | DM36.5 | The Home Office has concerns about the suggestion of a mixture of uses at both Lunar House and Apollo House. Owing to the nature of its functions the Home Office has concerns about sharing the sites with other uses/users for security reasons. This is due to the nature of the current operations on both sites (UK Visas and Immigration). Lunar House and Apollo House were built to operate as offices (Use Class B1a) and the Home Office wishes to ensure that the buildings can remain in office use for so long as required. | Change | The allocation which currently promotes office and residential and/or hotel (with healthcare facility if required by the NHS) will be amended to include, if the site is no longer required by the Home Office. |

<p>| 6471/02/001/DM36.5/O | Egan Property Asset Management | DM36.5 | This site is within a location that the Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF) identifies as being within a “Tall Buildings Area” (Figure 4.6 within the OAPF). Thus, there is potential for a tall building on this site (at least 40 storeys) which could deliver c.400 dwellings. The development potential of this site is not correctly being optimised in this allocation. There is heritage and design evidential justification for 40+ storeys at this location. It is important to facilitate the development of this site promptly in order that its development does not detract from the use and layout of the Whitgift scheme once that is implemented. | No change | The use of residential has been established in principle however the number of homes can be considered through any forthcoming planning application. It is beyond the scope of the allocation to determine this definitively and the ranges applied to all sites are indicative and are subject to the surrounding character. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Soundness - Effective</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0120/02/06/DM36.5/O</td>
<td>Addiscombe Residents Association</td>
<td>Object DM36.5 222</td>
<td>Whilst there is lots of good work in the documents on consultation some parts of the document show fundamental misconceptions. We give one as an example - we were not able to go over all so there might be more. Ref no 222 Multi story car park, 1 Whitgift Street Buildings on Wellesley Rd, next to old Allders Car Park- this site is described as ideal for Residential development as it is &quot;poor location for offices as it is too far from East Croydon&quot;? The site is 5 min walk from East Croydon? Who has decided that 5 minutes on foot is far?</td>
<td>Sites 5 minutes from East Croydon should not be considered too far.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2605/01/06/DM36.5/O</td>
<td>Ian Broyd</td>
<td>Object DM36.5 222</td>
<td>Whilst there is lots of good work in the documents on consultation some parts of the document show fundamental misconceptions. We give one as an example - we were not able to go over all so there might be more. Ref no 222 Multi story car park, 1 Whitgift Street Buildings on Wellesley Rd, next to old Allders Car Park- this site is described as ideal for Residential development as it is &quot;poor location for offices as it is too far from East Croydon&quot;? The site is 5 min walk from East Croydon? Who has decided that 5 minutes on foot is far?</td>
<td>Sites 5 minutes from East Croydon should not be considered too far.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610/02/06/DM36.5/C</td>
<td>Mr Sean Creighton</td>
<td>Norbury Residents Association Jol</td>
<td>Comment SEGAS House 11.Given there have been proposals over the last two years for SEGAS House to be converted into a community facility such as a community centre, art gallery, new venue for the Council museum and local studies, why has it been designated for housing use? 12.Given the proposed closure of Fairfield Halls for two years as part of the Croydon College/Green redevelopment project why has SEGAS House not been seen as a potential temporary performance venue?</td>
<td>231 SEGAS House Change</td>
<td>The site lies within the Primary Shopping Area and can therefore accommodate other town centre uses in accordance with Local Plan policy, however the potential for community uses should be fully explored prior to any proposals for residential and/or retail uses on the site being considered. The site will not be safeguarded for community uses whereby development of this type may not occur.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 02 September 2016 | 2749/03/001/DM36.5/O Mr A Kennedy | SEGAS House is a Grade II statutory listed building which is NOT suitable for housing, the internal and external features of which would be seriously affected if it were to be converted for that purpose. The building is much more suited to community, commercial or public use, the use for which it was designed and intended. The principal features which would be downgraded by any other use would be the extra large windows, the division of which into smaller units would be detrimental to the appearance of the building, the plan fails to meet Statutory Objectives 502, 505, SOG and SO7. The best use for the building within the public, commercial, community realm would be as craft workshops, creative studios both in the artistic and digital industries, an industrial and craft centre shop, a gallery, museum and local information centre for visitors to Croydon and possibly and desirably with a performance space for 150 to 200 audience inside in an atrium or Shakespeare's Globe type theatre with banked seating. The resulting development could then meet some of Croydon's strategic objectives namely: -SO 2 Fostering an environment where both existing, and new, innovative, cultural and creative enterprises can prosper - So 4 Reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation ... by... reducing unemployment, improving skills education...community and environmental conditions. - SO 5 Ensure that high quality new development both integrates, respects and enhances the borough's natural environment and built heritage. - SO 7 Conserve and create spaces and buildings that foster safe, healthy and cohesive communities.
| DM36.5 231 | | Change |
| 2843/01/018/DM36.5/O Minerva | Other uses apart from residential conversion should be considered and should be extended to include site 194. | The proposed use is "residential conversion". The site does not lend itself to a residential conversion, and indeed, extension to provide additional floorspace. Equally, the site could suit other town centre uses. It is a listed building and the policy should not preclude any viable town centre use of the building in future. It would be logical for this site to be extended to include the adjacent St Georges Walk, Katherine House and Park House site (reference 194) as both sites are in the same ownership and will likely come forward under one planning application. Within the background 'Place Specific Policies' document, reference is made to the site having capacity for 40 homes, this has not been tested and the actual figure will be derived from more detailed work.
| DM36.5 231 | | Change |
| | | The site lies within the Primary Shopping Area and can therefore accommodate other town centre uses in accordance with Local Plan policy, however the potential for community uses should be fully explored prior to any proposals for residential and/or retail uses on the site being considered. The site will not be safeguarded for community uses whereby development of this type may not occur.
| | | The site lies within the Primary Shopping Area and can therefore accommodate other town centre uses in accordance with Local Plan policy, however the potential for community uses should be fully explored prior to any proposals for residential and/or retail uses on the site being considered. It is not considered appropriate to include site 194 as part of this allocation as this site is a listed building and will require particular sensitivity in its redevelopment.
This site is owned by LCR, we have been working with BDP and your colleagues in the Regeneration Team, within Development and Environment, for the past 12 months. A land owner’s workshop was carried out at the start of the year to discuss our proposals and further masterplanning work carried out for the urban block. Can I suggest you discuss the site and the work with your colleague James Collier who I have copied in to this email.

Proposals looked at both full redevelopment of the site and partial redevelopment and refurbishment. The leading schemes consulted on with the Council proposed mixed used development with between 310,000 - 550,000 sq.ft. of office and 290-340 residential units, along with the provision of new public squares and routes across the site, and around 7,000 sq.ft. of ancillary retail fronting public spaces.

As the owner and likely developers we would seek to consider development following the expiry of key leases in 2021, rather than 2026. Due to the new routes through the site, scale of development potential and location between East Croydon Station and Westfield we would expect there to be ancillary ground floor retail in order to create a successful and sustainable place.

We would therefore suggest the following amendments:
- Site area 0.84 ha
- Height 18 storeys
- The acceptance of ancillary retail at ground
- Phasing of development post 2021
- Incorporation of a summary of discussions with the landowner

In relation to accommodating any NHS demand, we would be happy to do this subject to market price/ rent being offered for premises.

DM36.5

The Home Office has concerns about the suggestion of a mixture of uses at both Lunar House and Apollo House. Owing to the nature of its functions the Home Office has concerns about sharing the sites with other uses / users for security reasons. This is due to the nature of the current operations on both sites (UK Visas and Immigration). Lunar House and Apollo House were built to operate as offices (Use Class B1a) and the Home Office wishes to ensure that the buildings can remain in office use for so long as required.

The allocation which currently promotes office and residential and/or hotel (with healthcare facility if required by the NHS) will be amended to include, if the site is no longer required by the Home Office.
This site forms part of the wider Ruskin Square development. As the landowner we would not make the site available for a primary school and as such the preferred option is not deliverable. As landowner we intend to build out the site (subject to Reserved Matters approval) for residential use in accord with the outline planning permission. The site does not have permission for any use other than residential so the alternative use on this site (listed as residential and/or hotel and/or office is also not deliverable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Remove proposed allocation for a primary school and include the site as part of site 172.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2629/01/001/DM36.5/S Jamie McFarland Support DM36.5 243 The Education Funding Agency has approved 3 new Free Schools currently looking for sites within Croydon. This site has been identified as being potentially suitable options for the permanent location of the Ark Bayes Primary Academy. We would welcome the opportunity to work with Croydon Council and the respective trust to make these sites available options for these schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Remove proposed allocation for a primary school and include the site as part of site 172.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2634/01/006/DM36.5/S Charlie Fagan Support DM36.5 243 We are aware that a planning application was submitted in 2011 including the site as part of a mixed development of offices and shopping units. The site itself is being proposed to be the parking for the development. However, if the proposed development were not to go ahead, we would certainly consider it as an option for the two-form entry primary school.
- The site is situated in an area identified as having a requirement for additional primary places in the coming years.
- The site is a good shape and size for a primary school.
- The site is located in an area which meets the demographic criteria of Ark schools.
- The site is located near Ark Oval Primary Academy and would therefore create an opportunity to establish a link between the two schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Remove proposed allocation for a primary school and include the site as part of site 172.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

28 August 2016 Croydon Gateway Limited Partners
Network Rail notes that there are a number of sites adjacent to the Railway and attach a standard response which sets out the issues that need to be considered. In particular with large new developments there is a concern about the risk of trespass and all new developments should have proper and suitable boundary fencing. The risk of greater flooding and drainage that new developments could potentially have on the Network Rail infrastructure and we would not want any increase of flooding or the increase in run off onto Railway Infrastructure.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not:
- encroach onto Network Rail land
- affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company’s railway and its infrastructure
- undermine its support zone
- damage the company’s infrastructure
- place additional load on outtings
- adversely affect any railway land or structure
- over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land
- cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future

The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail’s adjoining land.

Future maintenance

The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant’s land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail’s adjacent land and air-space, and therefore all new building should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail’s boundary. The reason for the 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant. Any
less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works. The applicant / resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer, the applicant / resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. all possession costs, all site safety costs, all asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard-against Network Rail’s boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction / maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary with Network Rail will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams’ ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.

Drainage
Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail’s property or into Network Rail’s culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail’s property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail’s property; full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail’s existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near within 10 – 20 metres of Network Rail’s boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property. After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants’ expense.

Plant & Materials
All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail’s property, must at all times be carried out in a “fail safe” manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are
capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.

Scaffolding
Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant’s contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail’s existing fencing/wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail’s boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling.
arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer’s approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration
The potential for any noise/vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which hold relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night time train running and heavy freight trains.

Vehicle Incursion
Where a proposal calls for hard standing area/parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionsSussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.asp.

2637/01/002/DM36.5/S
Support DM36.5
Metropolitan Properties (Provincial) 247
96 George Street to the East of Suffolk House, has been put forward as a site specific allocation (Reference number 247). The identified preferred option for this site is for offices with residential development (19 to 52 units) or hotel and/or retail. Metropolitan Properties is supportive of this allocation as it will assist in the development aims of both the Croydon Opportunity Area and the Fairfield Masterplan.

Note: rep. (2807) of the landlord also supports designation.
The allocation in the Plan is for offices with residential and/or hotel with health care facility. This site has been in office use and this ceased in November 2014. Since 2013, it has had several prior approvals for conversion to flats and now holds consents for 62 units from the basement to the tenth floors. Work has commenced on the building. Under the terms of the GPDO 2015, the prior approvals can be commenced within 3 years from approval and the scheme comprising 56 of the units was approved in August 2015 so the building has to be converted by August 2018. To include in a Plan running until 2036 a policy which states that the building can remain as offices then converted around 2026 to include a hotel or health club or other such town centre use compliant with policy SP3 as mentioned is unrealistic since there is no chance at all that this will happen. A more appropriate policy would need to take account this is a building being in residential use by 2018. For the reasons outlined above—the building is already being worked on and is expected to be in use as flats by 2018. To state that the building will not change from its existing use as offices until 2020 is not possible given the permissions that already exist for the site. The amount of housing units stated to be required is 13–36. This is not at all realistic especially given the size and number of floors. The building has consent for 62 units and this should be acknowledged for its contribution to the housing targets. The Council makes it clear that it has a shortfall in housing yet it is looking for windfall development of around 10000 units. It would be more realistic and more likely that the Plan overall will pass Examination if the Council acknowledges that some of the shortfall in housing units is already provided in this and other Prior Approval schemes. It would not be difficult to contact the landowners about which schemes are being implemented—they are already being consulted as part of the current process.

The site should be allocated for residential as it is currently being converted. The number of housing units should be increased to 62 units.
Object Site 375 is described as No.7 Cairo New Road. There is no such number. The Council appear to be defining 5 Cairo New Road as two distinct sites, when that is not the case. Both sites are known as 5 Cairo New Road, with the buildings originally constructed for use as a single factory, with a central access point between two factory buildings, a service yard at the rear, and an interconnecting pedestrian bridge between the two buildings. Whilst the two connected buildings are under different ownership and their uses are no longer for factory purposes they are nevertheless connected and visually coherent as a whole. Both owners are currently considering the potential for redevelopment. It is inappropriate for the Council to suggest that the site of 5 Cairo New Road can be split into two and developed as two separate entities. The splitting of the site into two does not encourage a comprehensive or high quality development that will satisfy the Council’s aims and objectives for this area, and it will hinder the feasibility of any project.

Sites 375 and 178 should be seen as one site.

Object The site allocations as written suggest that a B1 use needs to be retained at the southern end closest to the town centre (Site 178) and that a D1 use is acceptable at the northern end of the site, furthest away from the town centre (Site 375). This is illogical as the community uses should be positioned in that part of the site closest to the Town Centre where the building and active use can face towards the open spaces, town square and former chapel building at Reeves Corner. This arrangement will also offer the opportunity to improve the relationship of buildings and spaces, and provide appropriate and compatible uses to the adjoining Tramstop. We question whether it is appropriate to encourage ground floor residential units directly adjacent the busy and noisy Tramstop, below a flyover. A community or commercial use would be more compatible. As the site allocations are currently written, any D1 use is restricted to the northern part of the site, in a location that is remote from the Centre and where it would potentially conflict with adjoining uses.

The D1 one use should not be restricted to the northern part of the site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM36.5</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3468/01/003/DM36.5/O</td>
<td>Mr Chima Amiaka New Life Croydon</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM36.5</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3468/01/004/DM36.5/O</td>
<td>Mr Chima Amiaka New Life Croydon</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM36.5</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3468/01/005/DM36.5/O</td>
<td>Mr Chima Amiaka New Life Croydon</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM36.5</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3581/01/002/DM36.5/O</td>
<td>Mercy Sambol</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM36.5</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3468/01/003/DM36.5/O**
Mr Chima Amiaka
New Life Croydon

Object DM36.5

375

The dividing line between the two sites is down the centre of the current access road to the shared parking and servicing area. One half of the site cannot therefore be developed without the other unless separate accesses are to be provided. This further prejudices the successful development of both sites and does not make optimum use of urban land.

Sites 375 and 178 should be seen as one site. No change

The two site allocations reflect the current planning permission for the southern part of the site which could be implemented. The fact that there are two allocations would not preclude both sites being brought forward as one development.

**3468/01/004/DM36.5/O**
Mr Chima Amiaka
New Life Croydon

Object DM36.5

375

The red line boundary should also include the parcel of land fronting Ruskin Road as this will otherwise become redundant land.

Include the land fronting Ruskin Road in the allocation Change

The land on Ruskin Road will be included as part of the site allocation as it is part of the site.

**3468/01/005/DM36.5/O**
Mr Chima Amiaka
New Life Croydon

Object DM36.5

375

With regard to the phasing of the development and the evidence of deliverability, the owners of the site are currently undertaking pre-application discussions with the Council (Reference 15/4747/PRE) and there is therefore strong community and developer interest and significant potential for development sooner than 2026

Change the phasing of the site to before 2026. Change

The phasing has been amended in light of the comments and is now anticipated to be delivered between 2021 - 2026.

**3581/01/002/DM36.5/O**
Mercy Sambol

Object DM36.5

375

I am writing to oppose the planning permission application number 15/04748/P for 5 Cairo New Road, Croydon, CR0 1XP. This application must not be granted because of:

1. The tram
2. Traffic

For years the situation around the tram (Reeves Corner) has been so smooth, because the area has been less congested. If the planning permission is granted, there will be so much congestion and traffic will be something else.

5 New Cairo Road is not designed for residential purpose, considering the location and therefore, the planning permission application must be refused with no right of appeal.

I am a tram user and work in Croydon and I support friends, family and residents of Croydon. The tram is the most wonderful thing that has ever happened to Croydon to decrease traffic congestion.

No change

The site has been consented to, was considered on its merits and took into account the traffic impacts generated by the site.
### Object

**Croydon Partnership Ltd**

**Object**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM36.5</th>
<th>393</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**The Whitgift Centre is listed at ref. no. 393 of Table 11.9 with a proposed use identified as “Expansion of shopping centre, improved transport infrastructure, public realm and residential development”. We consider that the wording cited within Table 11.9 is not accurate as it stands and suggest that reference to “improved transport infrastructure” be removed. This is on the basis that while the Whitgift Centre development proposals will result in improved transport infrastructure for the Borough as a whole, as far as the allocation goes, the site will not specifically deliver transport infrastructure, only parking. We therefore consider that the text as currently drafted is misleading and would request that this reference be removed.

### Change

- **Reference to “improved transport infrastructure”** will be removed from the Proposed Use, as it is not considered necessary. Reference to a car park will be included however as this is part of what is proposed for the site and will fall within the site boundary.

---

### Soundness - Effective

**Kevin Smith**

**Croydon TUC**

**Object**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM36.5</th>
<th>393</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**The Council is staking a lot on the alleged benefits of the redevelopment of the Whitgift Centre by the developers Westfield and Hammerson’s Croydon Partnership. The working group is not convinced that these benefits will be for residents, but are mainly aimed to attract better-off customers from Surrey, Sussex and Kent.

10. The development of the Whitgift Centre redevelopment claim that 5,000 jobs mainly in retail and leisure and c 4,000 in construction are promised. But uncertainties are also leading to the loss of current jobs.

11. It is likely that many existing businesses will struggle to survive when they have to close or re-locate for the Whitgift Centre to be demolished. Those seeking to move into the new Centre will face higher rental costs of the new shop floor space and business rates compared with current levels. Existing businesses have no guarantee they will be able to move into the new Centre. Most jobs will be low wage retail and leisure jobs, many part-time.

### No change

- **There is no policy that would seek to provide affordable retail units and so in that respect cannot be considered a requirement. Furthermore, it is considered that there are affordable retail units already within the surrounding area that would meet a need should that arise.**
Policy DM36.5 refers to the allocated sites for development set out in Table 11.9. The reference to Corinthian House, 17 Lansdowne Road (ref number site 489), was considered in our response to the informal consultation exercise dated 10 June 2015, and we would like these comments to also be taken into account in respect of this current consultation exercise.

For the reasons set out in that letter, the Preferred Use should be amended to make clear it is a site suitable for redevelopment, and should state:

"Residential and/or any town centre use including hotel and offices. Retail use will be acceptable if the sequential and impact tests can be met."

The reasons for the preferred use also set out in our letter dated 10 June 2015 should also be taken into account in respect of this consultation.

No change

The proposed use of the site is "retention of offices with residential conversion, and/or hotel (with healthcare facility if required by the NHS)" and is therefore identified as a site for development/redevelopment. It is not considered appropriate to identify this site as suitable for other uses as set out in the representation as this would not achieve the objectives of the Office Retention Policy and would also create a tension with town centre policies which promote retail in suitable areas. Sites are allocated based on their suitability of uses - should a proposal come forward in this location for retail uses; it would not be supported in the first instance (and is therefore not allocated as such) and would require a sequential test.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM36.5 522</th>
<th>Objection - suggested alternative sites below: 522, Wandle Road surface car park, Wandle Road, Croydon Opportunity area</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

As part of the assessment and selection of sites for Gypsy and travellers, this site was considered. Since the proposed site is situated within the COA and is ideally located for a district energy centre, bus stand and residential development. The majority of the site is in flood zone 3a, and in accordance with the National Planning Practice Guidance, caravans (which are a "Highly Vulnerable" use) are not considered appropriate in such locations.
Network Rail notes that there are a number of sites adjacent to the Railway and attach a standard response which sets out the issues that need to be considered. In particular with large new developments there is a concern about the risk of trespass and all new developments should have proper and suitable boundary fencing. The risk of greater flooding and drainage that new developments could potentially have on the Network Rail infrastructure and we would not want any increase of flooding or the increase in run off onto Railway Infrastructure.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not:
- encroach onto Network Rail land
- affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company’s railway and its infrastructure
- undermine its support zone
- damage the company’s infrastructure
- place additional load on cuttings
- adversely affect any railway land or structure
- over-sail or encroach upon the airspace of any Network Rail land
- cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future.

The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail’s adjoining land.

Future maintenance
The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant’s land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail’s adjacent land and air-space, and therefore all any building should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail’s boundary. The reason for the 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant.
less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works. The applicant / resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer, the applicant / resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. all possession costs, all site safety costs, all asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard-against Network Rail’s boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction / maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams’ ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.

Drainage
Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail’s property or into Network Rail’s culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail’s property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail’s property; full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail’s existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near/within 10 – 20 metres of Network Rail’s boundary at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property. After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants’ expense.

Plant & Materials
All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail’s property, must at all times be carried out in a “fail safe” manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are
capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.

Scaffolding
Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant’s contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail’s existing fencing/wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail’s boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling
arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer’s approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration
The potential for any noise/vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which holds relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night time train running and heavy freight trains.

Vehicle Incursion
Where a proposal calls for hard standing area/parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionSussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.asp.

We support the alternative option for this site (use as residential development) given the plan period runs to 2036 and the strategic approach towards car parking in the Croydon Opportunity Area (car parking requires rationalisation to ensure car parks are where they are needed to be to serve businesses and the residential community).

Allocate the site for residential development.

The site can be allocated for residential development and for use as a public car park.
Network Rail notes that there are a number of sites adjacent to the Railway and attach a standard response which sets out the issues that need to be considered. In particular with large new developments there is a concern about the risk of trespass and all new developments should have proper and suitable boundary fencing. The risk of greater flooding and drainage that new developments could potentially have on the Network Rail infrastructure and we would not want any increase of flooding or the increase in run off onto Railway Infrastructure.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not:
- encroach onto Network Rail land
- affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company's railway and its infrastructure
- undermine its support zone
- damage the company’s infrastructure
- place additional load on outlings
- adversely affect any railway land or structure
- over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land
- cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future

The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Raft's adjoining land.

Future maintenance
The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant’s land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail’s adjacent land and air-space, and therefore all/any building should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail’s boundary. The reason for the 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to Railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant. Any
less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works. The applicant / resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer, the applicant / resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. all possession costs, all site safety costs, all asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard-against Network Rail’s boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction / maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary with Network Rail will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams’ ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.

Drainage
Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail’s property or into Network Rail’s culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail’s property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail’s property; full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail’s existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near/within 10 – 20 metres of Network Rail’s boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property. After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants’ expense.

Plant & Materials
All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail’s property, must at all times be carried out in a “fail safe” manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are
capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.

Scaffolding
Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant's contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass-proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail’s existing fencing/wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail’s boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling
arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail's Asset Protection Engineer's approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration
The potential for any noise/vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which hold relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night time train running and heavy freight trains.

Vehicle Incursion
Where a proposal calls for hard standing area/parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionSussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.asp.
Network Rail notes that there are a number of sites adjacent to the Railway and attach a standard response which sets out the issues that need to be considered. In particular with large new developments there is a concern about the risk of trespass and all new developments should have proper and suitable boundary fencing. The risk of greater flooding and drainage that new developments could potentially have on the Network Rail infrastructure and we would not want any increase of flooding or the increase in run off onto Railway Infrastructure.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not:
- encroach onto Network Rail land
- affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company’s railway and its infrastructure
- undermine its support zone
- damage the company’s infrastructure
- place additional load on outbuildings
- adversely affect any railway land or structure
- over-sail or encroach upon the airspace of any Network Rail land
- cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future

The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail’s adjoining land.

Future maintenance
The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant’s land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail’s adjacent land and air-space, and therefore all new buildings should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail’s boundary. The reason for the 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand-off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant. Any
less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works. The applicant / resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer, the applicant / resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. all possession costs, all site safety costs, all asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard-against Network Rail's boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction / maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary with Network Rail will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams' ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.

Drainage
Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail’s property or into Network Rail’s culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail’s property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail’s property; full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail's existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near/w ithin 10 – 20 metres of Network Rail’s boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property.

After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants’ expense.

Plant & Materials
All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail’s property, must at all times be carried out in a “fail safe” manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are
Scaffolding
Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant’s contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass-proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail’s existing fencing/wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail’s boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling...
arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer’s approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration
The potential for any noise/vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which hold relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night time train running and heavy freight trains.

Vehicle Incursion
Where a proposal calls for hard standing area/parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionSussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.asp

---

2077/03/002/DM36.5/O Mr David Page

Mid Croydon Conservation Area A

Object DM36.5 A27

The alternative is totally inappropriate for a site of such historical importance.

No change

The site was consulted upon as an alternative option. It will not be included in the Proposed Submission draft of the Local Plan as there was no support for the alternative option.

---

0086/02/001/DM37/S Mr Andy Quinn

Support DM37

Generally approve of plans for Crystal Palace. The area does need greater co-operation with adjoining boroughs and greater emphasis on public realm.

No change

The Councils welcome support for Policy DM37
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Soundness - Effective</th>
<th>Decided</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2128/03/010/DM37/C</td>
<td>Cllr Steve O'Connell AM</td>
<td>A policy to promote the burgeoning cultural and creative quarter that is developing in the triangle should be framed, in a similar vein to the proposed Restaurant Quarter policy, DM7.</td>
<td>DM37</td>
<td>A policy to promote the burgeoning cultural and creative quarter that is developing in the triangle should be framed, in a similar vein to the proposed Restaurant Quarter policy, DM7.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The Restaurant Quarter policy is specifically aimed at having a flexible approach towards A3 and A4 uses within the frontages. For cultural and community uses DM18.1 is more relevant as this policy aims to ensure the provision of a network of community uses that still serves the community. It should also be noted that changes to DM5 would allow B1 uses in Secondary Retail Frontages in some instances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3804/01/033/DM37/C</td>
<td>Cllr L Hale</td>
<td>A policy to promote the burgeoning cultural and creative quarter that is developing in the Upper Norwood triangle should be framed, in a similar vein to the proposed Restaurant Quarter policy, DM7;</td>
<td>DM37</td>
<td>A policy to promote the burgeoning cultural and creative quarter that is developing in the Upper Norwood triangle should be framed, in a similar vein to the proposed Restaurant Quarter policy, DM7;</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The Restaurant Quarter policy is specifically aimed at having a flexible approach towards A3 and A4 uses within the frontages. For cultural and community uses DM18.1 is more relevant as this policy aims to ensure the provision of a network of community uses that still serves the community. It should also be noted that changes to DM5 would allow B1 uses in Secondary Retail Frontages in some instances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1506/01/001/DM37/O</td>
<td>Antenna Ltd</td>
<td>The site allocation is welcomed but the allocation of site no.28 solely for a cultural and creative industries enterprise centre misses an opportunity to achieve an enhanced redevelopment of the site to include an expanded recording studio as well as a remodelled market, further commercial space and residential accommodation. A more comprehensive redevelopment would offer an enhanced sustainable commercial and residential site, retaining and improving the existing market and studio uses. This would contribute well to the Croydon Vision and Strategic Objectives.</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>As indicated in pre-application advice received from the Council, a revised scheme is required. A revised scheme will offer a more sustainable and viable mixed use redevelopment incorporating the expansion of the existing recording studio and market in addition to new commercial and residential space. Please refer to the attached documents submitted alongside this representation relating to a proposed redevelopment scheme that has been considered through the Council’s pre-application process.</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective 28</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>If the existing recording studio is seeking to expand it would be subject to a planning application and dealt with on its merits although there would be no objection in principle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2173/01/001/DM37/O  Anna-Katrina Hastie  Object  Soundness - Effective  DM37 28  We wish to make known that we would raise concern about any development across the road from us if it was not in keeping with the conservation area - ideally the facades and entry point and courtyard would be kept as they are. Our house relies on this layout as all of our natural daylight especially on the ground floor comes from this formation of buildings. Any change to this layout would result in a total lack of daylight due to the proximity of the original buildings. The gateway to the current market allows a significant amount of light to enter our ground floor.  No change  The comments are noted but any redevelopment of this site would be subject to the planning application process which would include the consideration of existing planning policies and the impact on the surrounding area.

2190/01/001/DM37/S  Mr Martin Jessup  Support  DM37 28  I believe that this site should continue to be a Cultural & Creative area of Interest ie. Artist studios. We are opposed to any change of use to residential or commercial.  Welcome support

2813/01/001/DM37/C  Lindsey Lawson  Comment  DM37 28  The respondent neighbours the site and requests the following - that the space between the new development and the borders of their property permit space for vehicle access as laid out in the property deeds. The respondent would like to view the architectural drawings of any prospective plans for the site. There are severe geological subsidence problems in the area; what steps will be taken to ensure the properties in Haynes Lane won’t be affected by the impacts of construction. What steps will be taken to install better street lighting to the bottom part of the street as the cultural centre might take the little light that we have? The respondent requests that the Organic Farmers Market will be retained on Saturdays.  No change  The proposals for the site do not circumvent the need for planning permission to be sought. All development would need to comply with Building Regulations, beyond the legislation which underpins the planning system but does ensure that construction is to a set standard. Should any planning application be submitted for the site, this would be made publically available on the Council’s website and comments are invited during a consultation period. An assessment of the groundworks would be required should the planning department consider this necessary before any excavation/construction at the site takes place. The installation of street lighting is not a matter which can be taken into consideration as part of this consultation process. It is not the intention of the Local Plan to remove the Organic Farmers Market.
Mrs Nikki Constantinides

Object

The area referred to (357) works well as it is. Building on this site would not be beneficial. Hundreds of people work in the shops there, any resulting job losses would have devastating effects. The area doesn’t need to be further developed there. Referring to ref no 357 Norwood Heights Shopping Centre, Westow Street. I think sainsburys supermarket and smaller retail units are fit for purpose, the Council may think it has potential for redevelopment but I think that area of the “triangle” is fine as it is. It has a thriving Sainsbury’s supermarket, parking for sainsburys and the surrounding independent shops and restaurants and a lovely garden centre that is there, and Westow Park, the community centre and salvation army. This area has a lot of resident locations already, and has become very popular for shopping, eating and visiting the parks. It doesn’t need to be disrupted. The one way system at present just copes with what’s going on there. Everyone I have discussed this with is not in favour of the proposed changes!

Sheila J Rogers

Object

The owners of the flats at Highland Lodge, who collectively form the Highland Lodge Management Company Ltd disapprove of the proposals for the redevelopment of the Norwood Heights site for up to 223 homes. Even the minimum number expressed (39 homes) would be a cause of further strain in an area that has seen additional housing development which has caused considerable stress on local amenities and transport.

The proposed number of homes could only be achieved by building a taller building on the site of the supermarket or by building on the garden centre and car park. Neither of these would be acceptable in the context of the Conservation Area status of the area. In fact they would destroy features such as the view from Westow Park.

We would also point out that there are other sites in the Westow Street area which have the potential for limited development without excessively damaging the Conservation Area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Councilor Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Planning Application</th>
<th>Redevelopment Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1926/01/03/DM37/C</td>
<td>Councillor Luke Clancy</td>
<td>Site 82, St John the Evangelist Vicarage, Sylvan Road. Any redevelopment must take care not to damage the setting of the vicarage but rather to enhance it</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Redevelopment of this site would help meet the need for new homes in the borough although any planning application for development would have to take account of SP5 which protects community uses including churches. This should also consider the setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2056/01/01/DM37/C</td>
<td>Councillor Dudley Mead</td>
<td>Site 82, St John the Evangelist Vicarage, Sylvan Road. Any redevelopment must take care not to damage the setting of the vicarage but rather to enhance it</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Redevelopment of this site would help meet the need for new homes in the borough although any planning application for development would have to take account of SP5 which protects community uses including churches. This should also include consideration given to the setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2062/01/03/DM37/C</td>
<td>Councillor Jason Perry</td>
<td>Site 82, St John the Evangelist Vicarage, Sylvan Road. Any redevelopment must take care not to damage the setting of the vicarage but rather to enhance it</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Redevelopment of this site would help meet the need for new homes in the borough although any planning application for development would have to take account of SP5 which protects community uses including churches. This should also include consideration given to the setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2071/01/03/DM37/C</td>
<td>Councillor Mario Creatura</td>
<td>Site 82, St John the Evangelist Vicarage, Sylvan Road. Any redevelopment must take care not to damage the setting of the vicarage but rather to enhance it</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Redevelopment of this site would help meet the need for new homes in the borough although any planning application for development would have to take account of SP5 which protects community uses including churches. This should also include consideration given to the setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2128/03/06/DM37/C</td>
<td>Cllr Steve O'Connell AM</td>
<td>Any redevelopment must take care not to damage the setting of the vicarage but rather to enhance it.</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The impact of any redevelopment on the vicarage will be assessed through the Development Management process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2448/01/033/DM37/C Andy Stranack  
Croydon Council  
Comment  
Soundness - Effective  
DM37  
82  
Site 82, St John the Evangelist Vicarage, Sylvan Road. Any redevelopment must take care not to damage the setting of the vicarage but rather to enhance it  
No change  
Redevelopment of this site would help meet the need for new homes in the borough although any planning application for development would have to take account of SP5 which protects community uses including churches. This should also include consideration given to the setting.

2635/01/023/DM37/O Paul Sandford  
Bourne Society  
Object  
DM37  
82  
Site 82, St John the Evangelist Vicarage, Sylvan Road. Any redevelopment must take care not to damage the setting of the vicarage but rather to enhance it  
No change  
Redevelopment of this site would help meet the need for new homes in the borough although any planning application for development would have to take account of SP5 which protects community uses including churches. Any redevelopment would seek to ensure that the setting of the vicarage would not be harmed through the submission of a planning application.

2657/01/002/DM37/O Rebecca Pullinger  
CPRE London  
Object  
Soundness - Effective  
DM37  
82  
A large number of the sites allocated for development through Detailed Policies and Proposals may result in the loss of green space. This appears to run counter to the Borough’s Strategic Objective 10 (The need to utilise brownfield areas first) and could be replaced with a goal to promote good quality high density developments that protect Croydon’s green spaces. Even undesignated green spaces provide important ecosystem services to Croydon’s growing population.  
No change  
Redevelopment of this site would help meet the need for new homes in the borough although any planning application for development would have to take account of SP5 which protects community uses including churches. Any redevelopment should also include consideration given to the setting including the garden land in the grounds of St John’s Church.

2775/01/033/DM37/C Cllr Tim Pollard  
London Borough of Croydon  
Comment  
Soundness - Effective  
DM37  
82  
Site 82, St John the Evangelist Vicarage, Sylvan Road. Any redevelopment must take care not to damage the setting of the vicarage but rather to enhance it  
No change  
Redevelopment of this site would help meet the need for new homes in the borough although any planning application for development would have to take account of SP5 which protects community uses including churches. Any redevelopment should also include consideration given to the setting of the vicarage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27/06/01/033/DM37/C</td>
<td>Cllr Helen Pollard</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Site 82, St John the Evangelist Vicarage, Sylvan Road.</td>
<td>redevelopment must take care not to damage the setting of the vicarage but rather to enhance it</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>DM37 82</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/12/01/033/DM37/C</td>
<td>Cllr Jan Buttinger</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Site 82, St John the Evangelist Vicarage, Sylvan Road.</td>
<td>redevelopment must take care not to damage the setting of the vicarage but rather to enhance it</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>DM37 82</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/29/01/033/DM37/C</td>
<td>Cllr Margaret Mead</td>
<td>Croydon Council</td>
<td>Site 82, St John the Evangelist Vicarage, Sylvan Road.</td>
<td>redevelopment must take care not to damage the setting of the vicarage but rather to enhance it</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>DM37 82</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/41/01/020/DM37/O</td>
<td>Cllr Vidhi Mohan</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Site 82, St John the Evangelist Vicarage, Sylvan Road.</td>
<td>redevelopment must take care not to damage the setting of the vicarage but rather to enhance it; A policy to promote the burgeoning cultural and creative quarter that is developing in the triangle should be framed, in a similar vein to the proposed Restaurant Quarter policy, DM7;</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>DM37 82</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Soundness</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Project Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2842/01/033/DM37/C</td>
<td>Cllr Richard Chatterjee</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM37 82</td>
<td>Site 82, St John the Evangelist Vicarage, Sylvan Road. Any redevelopment must take care not to damage the setting of the vicarage but rather to enhance it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3430/01/033/DM37/C</td>
<td>Mr Donald Speakman</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM37 82</td>
<td>Site 82, St John the Evangelist Vicarage, Sylvan Road. Any redevelopment must take care not to damage the setting of the vicarage but rather to enhance it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3699/01/033/DM37/C</td>
<td>Cllr J Cummings</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM37 82</td>
<td>Site 82, St John the Evangelist Vicarage, Sylvan Road. Any redevelopment must take care not to damage the setting of the vicarage but rather to enhance it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3804/01/031/DM37/C</td>
<td>Cllr L Hale</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM37 82</td>
<td>Site 82, St John the Evangelist Vicarage, Sylvan Road. Any redevelopment must take care not to damage the setting of the vicarage but rather to enhance it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Redvelopment of this site would help meet the need for new homes in the borough although any planning application for development would have to take account of SP5 which protects community uses including churches. Any redevelopment should also include consideration given to the setting of the vicarage and its gardens.
Cllr M Neal

Object

DM37 82

St John the Evangelist Vicarage, Sylvan Road. Any redevelopment must take care not to damage the setting of the vicarage but rather to enhance it. A policy to promote the burgeoning cultural and creative quarter that is developing in the triangle should be framed, in a similar vein to the proposed Restaurant Quarter policy, DM7.

No change

Any redevelopment of the site would be subject to all other policies of the Local Plan which includes Design and Character. All planning applications are based on their merits and all relevant policies of the Plan will be applied.

Councillor M Fisher

Comment Soundness - Effective

DM37 82

Site 82, St John the Evangelist Vicarage, Sylvan Road. Any redevelopment must take care not to damage the setting of the vicarage but rather to enhance it.

No change

Redevelopment of this site would help meet the need for new homes in the borough although any planning application for development would have to take account of SP5 which protects community uses including churches. This should also include consideration given to the setting.

Mr Charles King

East Coulsdon Residents' Association

Comment

DM38

These are important in maintaining and reflecting the history of local areas. Bradmore Green Conservation area along with its listed buildings and St John’s church is one of the nicest parts of Old Coulsdon and Croydon should remain a conservation area and treated as such.

No change

Bradmore Green remains a conservation area. The Bradmore Green Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan will be prepared by the Council in the near future.

Councillor Luke Clancy

Comment Soundness - Effective

DM38

A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along the main A23 and A22 corridors.

No change

The A23 and A22 are part of the Transport for London Road Network, therefore the entry points to the borough on these roads are not under Croydon’s control. However, other entry points on borough roads will be enhanced in line with other area wide public realm improvements throughout the borough as appropriate. This will not form part of the Local Plan.

Councillor Dudley Mead

London Borough of Croydon

Comment

DM38

A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along the main A23 and A22 corridors.

No change

The A23 and A22 are part of the Transport for London Road Network, therefore the entry points to the borough on these roads are not under Croydon’s control. However, other entry points on borough roads will be enhanced in line with other area wide public realm improvements throughout the borough as appropriate. This will not form part of the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>DM38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along the main A23 and A22 corridors</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The A23 and A22 are part of the Transport for London Road Network, therefore the entry points to the borough on these roads are not under Croydon’s control. However, other entry points on borough roads will be enhanced in line with other area wide public realm improvements throughout the borough as appropriate. This will not form part of the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

207/01/036/DM38/C Councillor Mario Creatura  
London Borough of Croydon  
Comment: Soundness  
DM38: Effective  
A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along the main A23 and A22 corridors  
No change: The A23 and A22 are part of the Transport for London Road Network, therefore the entry points to the borough on these roads are not under Croydon’s control. However, other entry points on borough roads will be enhanced in line with other area wide public realm improvements throughout the borough as appropriate. This will not form part of the Local Plan. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>DM38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along the main A23 and A22 corridors</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2448/01/035/DM38/C Andy Stranack  
Croydon Council  
Comment: Soundness  
DM38: Effective  
A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along the main A23 and A22 corridors  
No change: The A23 and A22 are part of the Transport for London Road Network, therefore the entry points to the borough on these roads are not under Croydon’s control. However, other entry points on borough roads will be enhanced in line with other area wide public realm improvements throughout the borough as appropriate. This will not form part of the Local Plan. |
Gayfere House at the junction of Tollers Lane and Coulsdon Road is located on the edge of Old Coulsdon, directly over the road from a number of shops and other facilities, on regular bus routes and close to schools. It is a sustainable location that is well related to the residential area that surrounds it on all sides.

Gayfere House and the paddock to the rear are located within the designated Green Belt, but effectively three sides are bound by the urban area outside the Green Belt, the other side bordering further residential development within the Green Belt.

Allocation of this site for housing would have a number of advantages to the Council, as follows:
1. It will assist the Council in providing much needed housing within the borough, helping to meet Council housing requirements;
2. It can provide a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes, in particular providing family houses (including some affordable houses) required by the Council;
3. It is a sustainable location, adjacent to services and facilities;
4. It would involve rounding off the Green Belt, utilising a site that is already in an appropriate urban use in a more sustainable manner; and
5. It will provide a more logical and defensible Green Belt boundary in this area.

This site is suitable, available and achievable for development.

The A23 and A22 are part of the Transport for London Road Network, therefore the entry points to the borough on these roads are not under Croydon’s control. However, other entry points on borough roads will be enhanced in line with other area wide public realm improvements throughout the borough as appropriate. This will not form part of the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Soundness - Effective</th>
<th>A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along the main A23 and A22 corridors</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cllr Helen Pollard  
London Borough of Croydon | DM38 | The A23 and A22 are part of the Transport for London Road Network, therefore the entry points to the borough on these roads are not under Croydon’s control. However, other entry points on borough roads will be enhanced in line with other area wide public realm improvements throughout the borough as appropriate. This will not form part of the Local Plan. | DM38 |
| Cllr Jan Buttinger  
London Borough of Croydon | | No change | DM38 |
| Cllr Margaret Mead  
Croydon Council | | No change | DM38 |
| Cllr Vidhi Mohan  
London Borough of Croydon | Object | The A23 and A22 are part of the Transport for London Road Network, therefore the entry points to the borough on these roads are not under Croydon’s control. However, other entry points on borough roads will be enhanced in line with other area wide public realm improvements throughout the borough as appropriate. This will not form part of the Local Plan. | DM38 |
A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along the main A23 and A22 corridors. The A23 and A22 are part of the Transport for London Road Network, therefore the entry points to the borough on these roads are not under Croydon’s control. However, other entry points on borough roads will be enhanced in line with other area wide public realm improvements throughout the borough as appropriate. This will not form part of the Local Plan.

No change

The A23 and A22 are part of the Transport for London Road Network, therefore the entry points to the borough on these roads are not under Croydon’s control. However, other entry points on borough roads will be enhanced in line with other area wide public realm improvements throughout the borough as appropriate. This will not form part of the Local Plan.

No change

The A23 and A22 are part of the Transport for London Road Network, therefore the entry points to the borough on these roads are not under Croydon’s control. However, other entry points on borough roads will be enhanced in line with other area wide public realm improvements throughout the borough as appropriate. This will not form part of the Local Plan.

No change

The A23 and A22 are part of the Transport for London Road Network, therefore the entry points to the borough on these roads are not under Croydon’s control. However, other entry points on borough roads will be enhanced in line with other area wide public realm improvements throughout the borough as appropriate. This will not form part of the Local Plan.
A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along the main A23 and A22 corridors.

No change

The A23 and A22 are part of the Transport for London Road Network, therefore the entry points to the borough on these roads are not under Croydon’s control. However, other entry points on borough roads will be enhanced in line with other area wide public realm improvements throughout the borough as appropriate. This will not form part of the Local Plan.

A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along the main A23 and A22 corridors.

No change

The A23 and A22 are part of the Transport for London Road Network, therefore the entry points to the borough on these roads are not under Croydon’s control. However, other entry points on borough roads will be enhanced in line with other area wide public realm improvements throughout the borough as appropriate. This will not form part of the Local Plan.

A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along the main A23 and A22 corridors.

No change

The A23 and A22 are part of the Transport for London Road Network, therefore the entry points to the borough on these roads are not under Croydon’s control. However, other entry points on borough roads will be enhanced in line with other area wide public realm improvements throughout the borough as appropriate. This will not form part of the Local Plan.

The preferred option is far too vague. “Community use” is such a generalisation that it could be anything. The respondent believes that this is another attempt to push through a planning applications that was refused in 2013 to provide accommodation for homeless people. This type of development would seriously impact on our lives if such social issues and needs present themselves on our door or grounds. However, the site is deliverable if the right development and use is applied.

No change

Community facilities are defined as - facilities providing for the health and wellbeing, (excluding care homes, residential homes and nursing homes), social, educational, spiritual, recreational, leisure and cultural needs of the community including public houses - as set out in the Croydon Local Plan; Strategic Policies (Partial Review).
The wording of this policy contradicts the 'limited growth' of ????. It also is in danger of compromising the heritage building line of parades of properties above and behind shops units. This needs to be addressed by amendment.

Proposed amendment
Policy DM39.1 'Within Norbury District Centre, to facilitate growth ensure that the vision of limited growth and to enhance the distinctive character, developments should:

a. Complement the existing predominant building heights of 2 storeys up to a maximum of 5 storeys, and not exceed historic height levels in a parade.

b. Ensure proposal for large buildings are visually consistent with the predominant urban grain by not exceeding the current height limits; and

c. Seek opportunity to provide direct access from the south of London Road to Norbury railway station.'

No change
Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Norbury District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth.

The JPC welcomes the proposed Strategic Policy para 7.51 policy that there will be lower residential growth (para 7.51) it considers that Detailed Policy DM39.1 contradicts para 7.51 by stating 'to facilitate growth'.

The JPC is concerned at the growing number of applications to provide new homes, including studio to 2 bedroom flats, including about shops, which is contrary to the existing Council policy of 60% of new homes should be 3 and 4 bedrooms to meet needs. It is also concerned about the attempts to squeeze small new homes onto small backland sites, e.g. Tylecroft Mews with its existing 6 new homes and two more proposed.

The JPC hopes that once the Local Plan comes into effect it will enable the Council to reject planning applications that infringe the concept of 'lower residential growth'; and ensure that any new developments meet the needs for the proposed revised 50% of 3+ bedrooms.

Replace Detailed Policy DM39.1 by 'Within Norbury District Centre, to facilitate growth and to enhance the distinctive character, developments should:

a. Complement Maintain the existing predominant building heights of the shopping and housing parades 2 storeys up to a maximum of 5 storeys; b. Ensure proposal for large buildings are visually consistent with the predominant urban grain; and b. Retain the design features of the upper stories and roofs of shopping parades c. Seek opportunity to provide direct access from the south of London Road to Norbury railway station.

C. Propose heights the same as the neighbouring shopping parades where single and 2 storey parades are proposed for redevelopment.

D. Seek opportunity to provide direct access from the south of London Road to Norbury railway station.

No change
Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Norbury District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. There are existing five storey high buildings in the area, including the rhythm of locally listed buildings No 1414-1432.

DM39.1 should only allow for 5 storey buildings on corner buildings and junctions

No change
Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Norbury District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. There are existing five storey high buildings in the area, including the rhythm of locally listed buildings No 1414-1432.
### Councillor Dudley Mead

**Comment**

DM39.1 should only allow for 5 storey buildings on corner buildings and junctions; A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along London Road.

**Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

The Norbury District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. There are existing five storey high buildings in the area, including the rhythm of locally listed buildings No 1414-1432.

---

### Councillor Jason Perry

**Object**

Soundness - Justified

**DM39.1** should only allow for 5 storey buildings on corner buildings and junctions.

**Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

The Norbury District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. There are existing five storey high buildings in the area, including the rhythm of locally listed buildings No 1414-1432.

---

### Councillor Mario Creatura

**Object**

Soundness - Justified

**DM39.1** should only allow for 5 storey buildings on corner buildings and junctions.

**Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

The Norbury District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. There are existing five storey high buildings in the area, including the rhythm of locally listed buildings No 1414-1432.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM39.1</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2128/03/12/DM39.1/O</td>
<td>Cllr Steve O'Connell AM</td>
<td>DM39.1 should only allow for 5 storey buildings on corner buildings and junctions. A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along London Road.</td>
<td>Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Norbury District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. There are existing five storey high buildings in the area, including the rhythm of locally listed buildings No 1414-1432.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2448/01/036/DM39.1/O</td>
<td>Andy Stranack Croydon Council</td>
<td>DM39.1 should only allow for 5 storey buildings on corner buildings and junctions. A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along London Road.</td>
<td>Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Norbury District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. There are existing five storey high buildings in the area, including the rhythm of locally listed buildings No 1414-1432.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2635/01/026/DM39.1/O</td>
<td>Paul Sandford Bourne Society</td>
<td>DM39.1 should only allow for 5 storey buildings on corner buildings and junctions. A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along London Road.</td>
<td>Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Norbury District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. There are existing five storey high buildings in the area, including the rhythm of locally listed buildings No 1414-1432.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Cllr Name</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2775/01/036/DM39.1/O</td>
<td>Cllr Tim Pollard</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM39.1</td>
<td>should only allow for 5 storey buildings on corner buildings and junctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2776/01/036/DM39.1/O</td>
<td>Cllr Helen Pollard</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM39.1</td>
<td>should only allow for 5 storey buildings on corner buildings and junctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2812/01/036/DM39.1/O</td>
<td>Cllr Jan Buttinger</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM39.1</td>
<td>should only allow for 5 storey buildings on corner buildings and junctions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cllr Margaret Mead
Croydon Council

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM39.1 should only allow for 5 storey buildings on corner buildings and junctions

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Norbury District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. There are existing five storey high buildings in the area, including the rhythm of locally listed buildings No 1414-1432.

Cllr Vidhi Mohan
London Borough of Croydon

Object

DM39.1

DM39.1 should only allow for 5 storey buildings on corner buildings and junctions; A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along London Road;

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Norbury District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. There are existing five storey high buildings in the area, including the rhythm of locally listed buildings No 1414-1432.

Cllr Richard Chatterjee
London Borough of Croydon

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM39.1 should only allow for 5 storey buildings on corner buildings and junctions

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Norbury District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. There are existing five storey high buildings in the area, including the rhythm of locally listed buildings No 1414-1432.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3430/01/036/DM39.1/O</td>
<td>Mr Donald Speakman</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM39.1 should only allow for 5 storey buildings on corner buildings and junctions</td>
<td>No change Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Norbury District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. There are existing five storey high buildings in the area, including the rhythm of locally listed buildings No 1414-1432.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3430/01/060/DM39.1/O</td>
<td>Mr Donald Speakman</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM39.1 should only allow for 5 storey buildings on corner buildings and junctions</td>
<td>No change Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Norbury District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. There are existing five storey high buildings in the area, including the rhythm of locally listed buildings No 1414-1432.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3669/01/036/DM39.1/O</td>
<td>Cllr J Cummings</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM39.1 should only allow for 5 storey buildings on corner buildings and junctions</td>
<td>No change Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Norbury District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. There are existing five storey high buildings in the area, including the rhythm of locally listed buildings No 1414-1432.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3804/01/035/DM39.1/O</td>
<td>Cllr L Hale</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM39.1</td>
<td>DM39.1 should only allow for 5 storey buildings on corner buildings and junctions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Norbury District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. There are existing five storey high buildings in the area, including the rhythm of locally listed buildings No 1414-1432.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3804/01/036/DM39.1/C</th>
<th>Cllr L Hale</th>
<th>London Borough of Croydon</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>DM39.1</th>
<th>A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along London Road</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The District Centre designation in combination with the physical gate of the railway line and historic character of the Local Heritage Area sufficiently marks entrance to the borough from the residential areas of the London Borough of Lambeth. Policy SP1 read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework provide sufficient policy support for enhancement and distinctiveness of Places of Croydon, including Norbury.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cllr M Neal

Object DM39.1

DM39.1 should only allow for 5 storey buildings on corner buildings and junctions; A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along London Road.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Norbury District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. There are existing five storey high buildings in the area, including the rhythm of locally listed buildings No 1414-1432. This road is part of the Transport for London Road Network, therefore the entry points to the borough on these roads are not under Croydon’s control. However, other entry points on borough roads will be enhanced in line with other area wide public realm improvements throughout the borough as appropriate. This will not form part of the Local Plan.

Cllr S Brew

Object DM39.1

DM39.1 should only allow for 5 storey buildings on corner buildings and junctions; A further policy should be added to enhance and mark the entrance into the borough along London Road.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Norbury District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. There are existing five storey high buildings in the area, including the rhythm of locally listed buildings No 1414-1432.
DM39.1 should only allow for 5 storey buildings on corner buildings and junctions

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Norbury District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. There are existing five storey high buildings in the area, including the rhythm of locally listed buildings.

Add DM39.2 to protect local green spaces from building encroachments other than facilities to enhance the usability of the spaces, and especially those which are sites of nature special interest from building developments on their borders which could damage their status.

No change

Policy SP 7.2 of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies provides sufficient protection to all designated green spaces in the borough, including Norbury Hall. This park is additionally protected due to its status of Historic Park and Garden.

Add DM39.6. to encourage business operating in buildings originally built as houses to re-locate to suitable units in the main and secondary retail parades, including floors over shops in order to release their buildings back for housing purposes.

No change

Policies DM4 (Development in Croydon Metropolitan Centre, District and Local Centres), DM6 (Development in Shopping Parades) and DM8 (Development in edge of centre and out of centre locations) regulate matters of business premises in the whole borough.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Effective</th>
<th>Page Number</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1610/01/024/DM39.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Sean Creighton</td>
<td>Norbury Residents Association</td>
<td>The Joint Planning Committee understands that there used to be a right of way to Norbury Hall Park from 1330 London Road. The property used to be part of the Norbury Hall Estate, a little nursery shop run by the gardener with a right of way leading directly to the park. It is the corner shop, which strangely has never operated as a shop as such, adjacent to The Edge Nightclub. If this right of way existed it should be re-instated. Add DM39.5. to protect public footpaths and to re-instate or make useable any public footpaths which have been blocked from public use.</td>
<td>1610/01/024/DM39.2/O</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610/01/039/DM39.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Sean Creighton</td>
<td>Norbury Residents Association</td>
<td>The JPC is concerned that this policy does not adequately protect the heritage of the parades. It is opposed to changes in the heights of parades which will detract from their design heritage unity. It is also opposed to any changes at roof level which break the design heritage unit, such as has happened with the former Dreamlands shop building. The amendments seek to achieve this. Proposed amendment Policy DM39.2. Within Pollards Hill Local Centre, to ensure that proposals positively enhance and strengthen the character developments should: a. Retain the edge and separation of Pollards Hill Local Centre from other adjoining character areas by limiting the urban grain within its boundaries; b. Complement should not exceed the existing predominant building heights of 3 storeys up to a maximum of 4 storeys; c. Incorporate multi-stock brick as the predominant facing materials of the whole building; and d. Retain the extent and enhance the quality of the existing public realm within the development, including reinforcing a consistent building line.</td>
<td>1610/01/039/DM39.2/O</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0102/02/001/DM39.3/O</td>
<td>Joint LPA Receivers</td>
<td></td>
<td>The JPC is very concerned at the fact that this list is so small, failing to protect buildings and therefore allowing the further loss of heritage and employment sites, and giving the nod to developers to proposed residential development when the Council’s stated preferred option is to retain use. This will undermine the overall vision of ‘limited growth’. By deleting the alternative option developers will know that they will have a more difficult task to achieve a change of use. Although many of the sites listed are outside the London Rd area which is covered by the RAs which take part in the JPC, the principles the JPC take apply to those sites in areas where there are no Residents Associations. Add the following to the list of Norbury sites in Table 11.12: a. BT building, Craignish Ave. Retain for employment purposes. b. 30-34 Fairview Rd business units. Retain for employment purposes. c. Areas accessed through alleys at back of shops which contain small business premises</td>
<td>0102/02/001/DM39.3/O</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610/01/040/DM39.3/O</td>
<td>Mr Sean Creighton</td>
<td>Norbury Residents Association</td>
<td>The JPC is very concerned at the fact that this list is so small, failing to protect buildings and therefore allowing the further loss of heritage and employment sites, and giving the nod to developers to proposed residential development when the Council’s stated preferred option is to retain use. This will undermine the overall vision of ‘limited growth’. By deleting the alternative option developers will know that they will have a more difficult task to achieve a change of use. Although many of the sites listed are outside the London Rd area which is covered by the RAs which take part in the JPC, the principles the JPC take apply to those sites in areas where there are no Residents Associations. Add the following to the list of Norbury sites in Table 11.12: a. BT building, Craignish Ave. Retain for employment purposes. b. 30-34 Fairview Rd business units. Retain for employment purposes. c. Areas accessed through alleys at back of shops which contain small business premises.</td>
<td>1610/01/040/DM39.3/O</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The achievement of the Strategic Objectives could be improved by the additional allocation of land at 1485-1489 London Road and Fairview Road for development. The Cooperative Group wishes to redevelop its landholding at the above site to provide a convenience foodstore along the London Road frontage and residential development on land to the rear on Fairview Road. Such development, including the re-instatement of Class A1 uses on London Road would improve the vitality and viability of the Nobury District Centre and contribute to the Borough’s new housing supply and would be consistent with both the Strategic Objectives and with national policy in the NPPF. The site should be included in Table 11.12 as an additional allocation.

Allocate 1485-1489 London Road and Fairview Road for development of retail and residential uses.

The site at 1485-1489 London Road is considered to be appropriate to be allocated for retail and residential uses.

It is acknowledged that the site is in Old Coulsdon and not Norbury. However, the site is no longer being considered for a proposed land use in the Plan.

There are no recent planning applications for this site.

The JPC is surprised that this has been included given the Council rejected the Lidl scheme, and given that the result of the appeal held on 8 December has not yet been announced. The Council should have designated this as ‘retain use’ and specified a possible alternative use as a site for improvements to St Joseph’s School. If the Inspector rejects the appeal then the designation will have to be amended in the report to the Cabinet on the outcome of the Local Plan consultation. If the appeal is upheld then the current designation can remain in the Plan. In the light of the news about the need for thousands more school places protecting this site may be the only way that St Joseph’s will be able to expand to take in more people.

Delete ‘Retail supermarket on ground floor with residential above’ in the site listing for S G Smith, 409-411 Beulah Hill.

No appeal decision has been issued yet. The principle of a retail supermarket on the ground floor is still considered appropriate for this site.
Further to the recent consultation I would like to submit my proposal for the above site as an alternative to the current detailed policies and proposals as submitted for a retail/residential mixed use development. It has been a very long term vision that the catalyst to Crown Point requires a much need revamp of the existing school offering as currently in situ at St Josephs College. The site and thus the whole area would gain by an enhanced Sixth Form College as already demonstrated by Lambeth Schools which have undergone substantial makeovers. Crown Point is entirely about an education base, the sheer volume of school children in the locality is undeniably like any other area. The travel sources are already in place and this puts no excess strain on an already dire traffic flow. The proposal of another retail operation to the area would cause significant traffic issues to say the least and quite clearly with the Tesco / local convenience shops and other small businesses it would create an unharmonised retail approach.

Therefore THE BASIS OF MY PROPOSAL:-
1. Revamp St Josephs College to the 21st century by building a new Block on site 320.
2. Create an addition entrance via Crown Lane (This will create an excellent flow for students commuting via the Lambeth borough and prevent the daily carnage and mayhem of boys running along a very busy Beulah Hill Road).
3. It will open the capability to encroach on the Lambeth Borders and stem argument to gain Inner London Teaching Pay scale. Crown Lane roadside is under Lambeth highways.
4. Provide a much needed further required residential facilities in addition from the Beulah Hill Frontage, more than the current proposed 5-11

Allocate the site for the extension of the existing St John's College

No change

No appeal decision has been issued yet. The principle of a retail supermarket on the ground floor is still considered appropriate for this site
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1610/01/04/1/DM39.3/O</td>
<td>Mr Sean Creighton</td>
<td>Norbury Residents Association</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610/01/04/2/DM39.3/O</td>
<td>Mr Sean Creighton</td>
<td>Norbury Residents Association</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610/01/04/3/DM39.3/O</td>
<td>Mr Sean Creighton</td>
<td>Norbury Residents Association</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM39.3</td>
<td>A281</td>
<td>The JPC is very concerned at the fact that this list is so small, failing to protect buildings and therefore allowing the further loss of heritage and employment sites, and giving the nod to developers to proposed residential development when the Council’s stated preferred option is to retain use. This will undermine the overall vision of ‘limited growth’. By deleting the alternative option developers will know that they will have a more difficult talk to achieve a change of use. Although many of the sites listed are outside the London Rd area which is covered by the RAs which take part in the JPC, the principles the JPC take apply to those sites in areas where there are no Residents Associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM39.3</td>
<td>A282</td>
<td>The JPC is very concerned at the fact that this list is so small, failing to protect buildings and therefore allowing the further loss of heritage and employment sites, and giving the nod to developers to proposed residential development when the Council’s stated preferred option is to retain use. This will undermine the overall vision of ‘limited growth’. By deleting the alternative option developers will know that they will have a more difficult talk to achieve a change of use. Although many of the sites listed are outside the London Rd area which is covered by the RAs which take part in the JPC, the principles the JPC take apply to those sites in areas where there are no Residents Associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM39.3</td>
<td>A283</td>
<td>The JPC is very concerned at the fact that this list is so small, failing to protect buildings and therefore allowing the further loss of heritage and employment sites, and giving the nod to developers to proposed residential development when the Council’s stated preferred option is to retain use. This will undermine the overall vision of ‘limited growth’. By deleting the alternative option developers will know that they will have a more difficult talk to achieve a change of use. Although many of the sites listed are outside the London Rd area which is covered by the RAs which take part in the JPC, the principles the JPC take apply to those sites in areas where there are no Residents Associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Soundness</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>1610/01/047/DM39.3/O</td>
<td>Mr Sean Creighton</td>
<td>Norbury Residents Association Joi</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>1610/01/048/DM39.3/O</td>
<td>Mr Sean Creighton</td>
<td>Norbury Residents Association Joi</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | Soundness - Effective | DM39.3 A460 | The Policy is fine, i.e. the stated Policy for Heritage Assets- Conservation Areas is: to strengthen the protection of and promote improvements in the following Heritage Assets and their settings. The proposed use is simply retain existing use which is fine, but the alternative use which is stated as redevelopment including residential use is inconsistent with the site’s position in the middle of a Conservation Area (the Norwood Grove Conservation Area). The alternative use should therefore not be considered.

The site detailed above is the rear of 69-71 Ryecroft Road which is part of the Norwood Grove Conservation Area.

The Conservation Area consists principally of large detached properties built around the 1920s/30s, together with some older properties in Arnulf’s Road, all having large gardens, providing an open, green and leafy environment, with low density, which it is to be assumed is the rationale behind the establishment of the Conservation Area.

Prior to the establishment of the Conservation Area there was a certain amount of development which was at odds with this generality, materially some higher density apartments in Ryecroft Road, some new town houses at the end of Arnulf’s Road (nos 16-38) albeit that their style blends in with the pre-existing properties, and Gibson’s Lodge, together with some flats and townhouses in Crown Lane and Ryecroft Road which might not be permitted now, but mostly the Conservation Area remains true to the detached property/ substantial garden/ open, green and leafy environment concept.

Any development of further housing behind the properties in question on their large gardens and the resultant increase in housing density would detract from the character of the Conservation Area and would be quite contrary to SP4.13 since it would not strengthen the protection of the Conservation Area, but would instead undermine it and should therefore not be permitted. Any increase in density in this established residential area would also conflict with Policy UD8.

The alternative use for this site detailed as A460 should therefore be removed. |

No change | This site is in multiple ownership and is unlikely to come forward for development on this site |
| 1610/01/049/DM39.3/O | Mr Sean Creighton  
Norbury Residents Association Joi |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The JPC is very concerned at the fact that this list is so small, failing to protect buildings and therefore allowing the further loss of heritage and employment sites, and giving the nod to developers to proposed residential development when the Council’s stated preferred option is to retain use. This will undermine the overall vision of ‘limited growth’. By deleting the alternative option developers will know that they will have a more difficult talk to achieve a change of use. Although many of the sites listed are outside the London Rd area which is covered by the RAs which take part in the JPC, the principles the JPC take apply to those sites in areas where there are no Residents Associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete ‘Redevelopment including residential use’ in every site in which it is designated as an alternative use in Detailed Policies and Proposals Table 11.12.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1610/01/050/DM39.3/O | Mr Sean Creighton  
Norbury Residents Association Joi |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The JPC is very concerned at the fact that this list is so small, failing to protect buildings and therefore allowing the further loss of heritage and employment sites, and giving the nod to developers to proposed residential development when the Council’s stated preferred option is to retain use. This will undermine the overall vision of ‘limited growth’. By deleting the alternative option developers will know that they will have a more difficult talk to achieve a change of use. Although many of the sites listed are outside the London Rd area which is covered by the RAs which take part in the JPC, the principles the JPC take apply to those sites in areas where there are no Residents Associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete ‘Redevelopment including residential use’ in every site in which it is designated as an alternative use in Detailed Policies and Proposals Table 11.12.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This site is in multiple ownership and is unlikely to come forward for development on this site.
The Policy is fine, i.e. the stated Policy for Heritage Assets - Conservation Areas is to strengthen the protection of and promote improvements in the following Heritage Assets and their settings. The proposed use is simply to retain existing use which is fine, but the alternative use which is stated as redevelopment including residential use is inconsistent with the site’s position in the middle of a Conservation Area (the Norwood Grove Conservation Area). The alternative use should therefore not be considered.

The site detailed above is the rear of 12-28 Ryecroft Road which is part of the Norwood Grove Conservation Area.

The Conservation Area consists principally of medium/large detached properties built around the 1920s/30s, together with some older properties in Arnull’s Road, all having large gardens, providing an open, green and leafy environment, with low density, which it is to be assumed is the rationale behind the establishment of the Conservation Area.

Prior to the establishment of the Conservation Area there was a certain amount of development which was at odds with this generality, materially some higher density apartments in Ryecroft Road, some new town houses at the end of Arnull’s Road (nos 16-38) albeit that their style blends in with the pre-existing properties, and Gibson’s Lodge, together with some flats and townhouses in Crown Lane and Ryecroft Road which might not be permitted now, but mostly the Conservation Area remains true to the detached property/ substantial garden/ open, green and leafy environment concept.

Any development of further housing behind the properties in question on their larger than average gardens and the resultant increase in housing density would detract from the character of the Conservation Area and would be quite contrary to SP4.13 since it would not strengthen the protection of the Conservation Area, but would instead undermine it and should therefore not be permitted. Increased density in this established residential area would conflict with Policy UD8.

The alternative use for this site detailed as A466 should therefore be removed.

No change

This site is in multiple ownership and is unlikely to come forward for development on this site.
The JPC is very concerned at the fact that this list is so small, failing to protect buildings and therefore allowing the further loss of heritage and employment sites, and giving the nod to developers to proposed residential development when the Council’s stated preferred option is to retain use. This will undermine the overall vision of ‘limited growth’. By deleting the alternative option developers will know that they will have a more difficult task to achieve a change of use. Although many of the sites listed are outside the London Rd area which is covered by the RAs which take part in the JPC, the principles the JPC take apply to those sites in areas where there are no Residents Associations.

The JPC is concerned about the potential loss of green space in an area which is regards as of special character. It has been suggested to it that such redevelopment would prevent road access to other back gardens thus protecting them from development in the future. The alternative would be to give them Local Green Space designation. Inclusion of this site in the list draws its attention to developers. It would be better if it was deleted.

Delete ‘Redevelopment including residential use’ in every site in which it is designated as an alternative use in Detailed Policies and Proposals Table 11.12.

Delete the grounds to the rear of St Philip's Church and gardens to rear of 72 and 82, Pollards Hill North from the Norbury site list in Detailed Policies and Proposals Table 11.12.

No change

This site is in multiple ownership and is unlikely to come forward for development on this site.
Object Policy DM40.1 says that a skyscraper of 16 floors can be built in the centre of Purley. We are sure this policy is written with the specific site of the Baptist church on Purley Cross in mind. The RRA totally oppose this proposal. A building of 16 floors will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of Purley town centre, which is no higher than 5 to 6 floors.

16 storeys should not be permitted in Purley Town Centre.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
My husband and I attended the consultation meeting at the Purley Baptist Church on the 8th December and we both felt that plans on show and the information given on what precisely was being proposed was vague to say the least, and the council staff were not able to clarify the details included in the information concerning such things as the amount of social housing, etc. Nor was there any copies of the plans which people could take away in order to be able to study them, and thereby understand what was being proposed. Also whereas the council has had up to two years to come up with these proposals, we have been given a very limited time to make any objections to them, that is ten days after the meeting, the 18th of December, hardly sufficient time given the paucity of information offered.

Nonetheless, there was an indication that the height of the proposed plan on this site would be in the order of sixteen stories.

My husband and I feel very strongly that this is entirely out of keeping with the area hardly in line with your description of Purley being a “market town located on wooded hillsides and in the valley”. Purley is not London where skyscrapers are totally acceptable or even Croydon where a profusion of skyscrapers exist. If this is built it will open up the floodgates for further buildings completely changing the character of Purley.

Purley also has massive traffic problems, which will not be helped by a building of this size. Let us also not forget that Purley also suffers from flooding problems as its sits on the sight of the Bourne, and a large site like this will only make matters worse.
Para (b) refers to existing predominant building heights of 3 to 8 storeys. PLEASE NOTE that we do not have any 8 storey buildings in Purley town centre. Whilst PWRA accepts the council strategy on the 16 storey landmark building, we do that on the proviso that the building sets a very high standard of design, as can be expected from a landmark building.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Policy DM40.1 (p166) says that a skyscraper of 16 floors can be built in the centre of Purley. This is ridiculous. A skyscraper of 16 floors will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of Purley town centre which is no higher than 5 floors. This will look so out of place and I cannot believe that anyone in their right mind would give permission for this to go ahead.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I totally disagree to the following planning applications which would spoil the character of our local environment and threaten our green belt. I choose to live in an area that is peaceful and quiet and resent the changes that are being forced upon me. In the spirit of true democracy I wish to make clear my objection to the following developments -

- Policy DM2 (p18); Policy DM40.1 (p165);
- Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p165); Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168); Policy DM4.13, Table 11.14, Site 30 (p171); Policy DM4.2, Table 11.17, Site 661 (p179); Policy DM4.2, Table 11.17, Site 662 (p179); Policy DM35, Table 11.8, Site 945 (p146); and Policy DM31.4 (p126)

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I understand the draft local plan is out for consultation and feedback is requested. Regarding the consultation my comments are as follows:

Policy DM40.1 : Development of a skyscraper in Purley is a ludicrous idea. It is wholly out of character in an area that does not have a single building over 5 stories high. It would be inappropriate development.

No change Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen Croydon’s recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Policy DM40.1, Paragraph DM40.1b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I agree that proposals should complement existing predominant building heights of 3 to 8 storeys. There is no need for a potential new landmark building but if there is to be one it should be no more than 8 storeys. Anything higher would detract from the character of the district and be overbearing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My preference is to reword the paragraph to: Complement the existing predominant building heights of 3 to 8 storeys.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from
I would like to object to item 40.1 (b) in the proposed local development plan.

A 16 story building in the centre of Purley would tower over the existing buildings as an eyesore, looming ominously over the one way system. My main objection - quite apart from the issues of parking, traffic and school places etc. - is that the attractive character of the town would be utterly ruined - it is a small suburban low rise shopping town, not city (or somewhere with ambitions to be one) where tall buildings might be more appropriate. Such developments should be restricted to Croydon Town Centre. Something so out of keeping height-wise could not possibly 'enhance the distinctive character of Purley Town Centre'.

I am assuming this item is anticipating the development of the Purley Baptist Church sites? Some of the draft plans I have seen also involve basement level community facilities - something which seems a ridiculous option considering the propensity for flooding in that area. Is it not an option for them just to build a normal sized church, and the community/meeting/hall space/whatever else that they want at the existing level of buildings on the adjacent parades - and be required to allocate plenty of land for parking so it isn't a nightmare there on a Sunday or for whatever events they might be aiming to hold there, and leave it at that?

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.

1819/02/002/DM40.1 Helen Jones Object

DM40.1

I would like to object to item 40.1 (b) in the proposed local development plan.

A 16 story building in the centre of Purley would tower over the existing buildings as an eyesore, looming ominously over the one way system. My main objection - quite apart from the issues of parking, traffic and school places etc. - is that the attractive character of the town would be utterly ruined - it is a small suburban low rise shopping town, not city (or somewhere with ambitions to be one) where tall buildings might be more appropriate. Such developments should be restricted to Croydon Town Centre. Something so out of keeping height-wise could not possibly 'enhance the distinctive character of Purley Town Centre'.

I am assuming this item is anticipating the development of the Purley Baptist Church sites? Some of the draft plans I have seen also involve basement level community facilities - something which seems a ridiculous option considering the propensity for flooding in that area. Is it not an option for them just to build a normal sized church, and the community/meeting/hall space/whatever else that they want at the existing level of buildings on the adjacent parades - and be required to allocate plenty of land for parking so it isn't a nightmare there on a Sunday or for whatever events they might be aiming to hold there, and leave it at that?

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.

No change
Policy DM40.1 (p166) says that a skyscraper of 16 floors can be built in the centre of Purley. I am sure that this policy is written with the specific site opposite Pizza Express on Purley Cross in mind. I totally oppose this. A skyscraper of 16 floors will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of Purley town centre which is no higher than 5 floors.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from...
Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
The building of a 16-storey skyscraper in Purley, has already raised massive objections. It is totally inappropriate for a town where buildings have a maximum height of 4 or 5 floors. It has to be dropped as it will completely change the character of the community, and is ill thought-out, particularly in terms of the implications for traffic and parking.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from...
I have strong objections and would like my objection to Policy DM40.1 (p166) says that a skyscraper of 16 floors can be built in the centre of Purley on the original Sainsbury’s site. I believe that this is a totally inappropriate development for Purley town centre. It is out of keeping to the entire town centre and would bring a total change to the feel and character of the town.

The proposal is inappropriate and would out of keeping to the entire town centre and would bring a total change to its feel and character.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from
Policy DM40.1 says that a skyscraper of 16 floors can be built in the centre of Purley. I am aware of recent proposals to develop the site opposite Pizza Express on Purley Cross and I think that a skyscraper of 16 floors will completely change the character of Purley town centre and would be wholly out of keeping with the rest of Purley town centre which is no higher than 5 floors.

Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from
Policy DM40.1 (p166) says that a skyscraper of 16 floors can be built in the centre of Purley. I am sure that this policy is written with the specific site opposite Pizza Express on Purley Cross in mind. I totally oppose this. A skyscraper of 16 floors will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of Purley town centre which is no higher than 5 floors.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.

The objection is noted but as there is no further information substantiating it no amendments the policy can be made as the basis for the objection is not known.
We would make the following objections to the proposed Draft Local Plan which is a poorly disguised attack on the southern part of the Borough Policy DM 40.1

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Policy DM40.1 (p166) says that a skyscraper of 16 floors can be built in the centre of Purley. I am sure that this policy is written with the specific site opposite Pizza Express on Purley Cross in mind. I totally oppose this. A skyscraper of 16 floors will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of Purley town centre which is no higher than 5 floors.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
The joke around Purley relates to the proposed skyscraper in the town centre. If it wasn't so ridiculous one would ask why you could possibly consider such a proposal which nobody except the Developers and the Council want. I understand the owners of the Land involved are also against it! There are serious parking problems in Purley already however many businesses or flats that can be accommodated will be to the point of saturation. Where will the people park and what a blot on the landscape of an essentially a low rise village if you go ahead.

16 storeys in Purley should not be permitted. There is already not enough parking.

No change
Policy DM40.1 (p166) says that a skyscraper of 16 floors can be built in the centre of Purley. This appears to be a policy written with the specific site opposite Pizza Express on Purley Cross in mind. I totally oppose this. A skyscraper of 16 floors will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of Purley town centre which is no higher than 5 floors.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from
Policy DM40.1 (p166) should not allow a skyscraper of 16 floors to be built in the centre of Purley. A skyscraper of 16 floors will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of Purley town centre which is no higher than 5 floors.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from
DM40.1 should not allow for up to 16 storeys as it will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of the town centre which is no higher than 5 storeys;

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen Croydon’s recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from
DM40.1

Object:

Purley-Policy DM40.1 should not allow for up to 16 storeys as it will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of the town centre which is no higher than 5 storeys;

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee
It is unclear why a new landmark building is suggested for Purley District Centre as this is the only location where a building of this prominence and potential height is specified. Where the potential for relatively tall building is proposed, additional text or cross-referencing to wider design policies such as proposed policies of SP4.6 of CLP1.1 and DM15 of CLP2 should be included to ensure that such buildings are of an exceptionally high quality design and complement the existing streetscape, contribute to the public realm and wider character of the area and wider views.

Where the potential for relatively tall building is proposed, additional text or cross-referencing to wider design policies such as proposed policies of SP4.6 of CLP1.1 and DM15 of CLP2 should be included to ensure that such buildings are of an exceptionally high quality design and complement the existing streetscape, contribute to the public realm and wider character of the area and wider views.

The comments are noted regarding cross-referencing other policies, however other policies are only cross-referenced in the policy itself if they are uniquely applicable, as in Policy DM15.1 which references the locations identified for tall buildings and all the policies of the Croydon Local Plan should be referred to when making a planning application including the Strategic Policies of the Local Plan. Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys hgh. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Policy DM40.1 - this email is sent to register my objection to Croydon Council allowing a 16 floors skyscraper to be built in Purley town centre.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from
| 2128/02/018/DM40.1/O | Cllr Steve O'Connell AM | Object | DM40.1 | I vehemently oppose the 16 floor skyscraper to be built in the centre of Purley as it would be totally out of keeping with the character of Purley town centre, where no other building exceeds five floors in height. | A 16 storey building should not be permitted in Purley. | No change | Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee. |
I wish to object to Policy DM 40, Purley Skyscraper. This is totally out of keeping with the area. Do we need a mini Croydon in Purley? This development will cause massive disruption on a very busy crossroads.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2181/01/002/DM40.1/O</td>
<td>Ray &amp; Anne Smith</td>
<td>DM40.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>I strongly object to the following policies:-</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purley Skyscraper Policy DM40.1 p166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2199/01/003/DM40.1/O</td>
<td>August &amp; Wendy Kolster</td>
<td>DM40.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Loss of greenbelt, green spaces, parks, gardens, etc. (Policy DM2 – page 18, Policy DM28 – pages 115-116, Policy DM40.1 – page 166) We believe that having ample green spaces is essential for a good quality of life. As such we feel that it is inappropriate to use the already limited existing green spaces for housing, retail, etc. If anything, in some instances new green spaces should probably be created whenever old buildings are pulled down.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 16 storey block proposed for Purley town centre is totally out of keeping with the area and is far too tall in comparison with other buildings in Purley. Purley does not need a "landmark". Keep the "landmarks" to Croydon town centre.

No change Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Policy DM40.1. Here you may be planning a 16 floor skyscraper in the centre of Purley. This is a very bad idea indeed. As it is Purley has lost its original appeal with the amount of building and the vast increase in traffic. But a skyscraper? This is not down town Croydon where a 16 storey skyscraper might fit in nicely. This will utterly destroy the character of Purley. Suggest you restrict buildings to no more than 6 storeys.

No change Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
The proposed skyscraper is TOTALLY UNSUITABLE for the centre of Purley, so much so that it will stick out like a sore thumb as 5 storeys is the maximum height of surrounding buildings. Even the diagram looks like some soulless monster, lacking any aesthetic appeal whatsoever. A ghastly eyesore, a permanent blot on the landscape. Purley has its own distinctive character which has evolved over many years, and deserves better than this hideous No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from
Policy DM40.1 says that a building of 16 floors can be built in the centre of Purley. I am sure that this policy written with the specific site opposite Pizza Express on Purley Cross. I totally oppose this. A skyscraper of 16 floors will completely change the character of Purley Town Centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of Purley Town Centre which is no higher than 5 floors.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Policy DM40.1 should not allow for up to 16 storeys as it will completely change the character of Purley town centre, set a precedent, and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of the town centre which is no higher than 5 storeys. Such a development would be in contradiction to Policy 7.60 which states that new development would ‘respect local character and distinctiveness’.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Purley Leisure Centre, does not mention that any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. There should be a requirement that the total number of public parking spaces is not reduced by any development.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Support

We are supportive of Croydon Council’s DPP site allocation at Purley Baptist Church for mixed use residential development comprising a new church, community facility and residential uses. We are also supportive of the residential site allocation at 1-9 Barestead Road in Purley. Further support is given to the recognition of a new landmark in Paragraph DM40.1 (b) of Croydon Council’s DPP. However, we are currently undertaking extensive pre-application discussions with Croydon Council for a 17 storey development, rather than 16 storeys. We would request Policy DM40 is amended to identify potential for a 17 storey tower in all events, and particularly if planning permission in granted in the intervening period. An additional storey will provide more homes, helping to meet the increased minimum housing target as identified in Policy SP2 of the emerging Croydon Local Plan (Partial Review).

We recommend that bullet point ‘b’ of Paragraph DM40.1 is amended to read “Complement the existing predominant building heights of 3 to 8 storeys, with a potential for a new landmark of up to a maximum of 17 storeys.”

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
The Purley area of Croydon has long been a distinctive part of the borough and should be regarded by the Council as having special merit. Until very recently it consisted almost entirely of Edwardian and early 20th Century family home buildings. The positive aspects of this include a very settled and long standing community of tax payers, together with above average density of trees and green spaces, which are VITAL in this area due to the high levels of emissions and noise pollution from both the A22 and A23 roads. It is certain that huge areas adjacent to these roads already exceed current levels of permitted pollution and massively increasing multi occupancy dwellings will only add to this. It is also true that most existing buildings in Purley are mostly no more than 3 storeys high and it is vitally important that this remains the case to preserve the character of the area.

In the existing guidelines for the borough there are NO provisions for the height of buildings to increase to the extent proposed. We are fully aware that the centre of Croydon contains skyscrapers, but that has been the case for over 50 years since the massive redevelopments of the 1960s. Also, these buildings are in the central business district of Croydon, and although some of the newer developments of skyscrapers are for residential use they do no overlook long established low level residential areas.

We wish therefore to object in the strongest terms to the proposal of Policy DM40.1 to build a 16 floor skyscraper in the centre of Purley. It would be totally out of keeping with the nature of the existing town, would set a precedent that would be totally unacceptable and would radically alter the character of this part of the Borough. We also believe that it would generate a wind tunnel effect in the area, almost certainly increasing pollution problems. As is well known, the A22/A23 crossroads is above a number of now canalized rivers underground. Repeatedly in the past, and particularly within the past couple of years, there has been catastrophic flooding here, resulting in a month long closure of the A22, a major strategic road link. We do not believe that it is safe or sensible to build anything of this nature on any site in or around the centre of Purley.

We understand that in the past few years, with the proliferation of multi occupancy dwellings already built...
near the centre, this part of the
Borough has more than exceeded. It
is clear that the local infrastructure
can no longer cope with the number of
buildings and certainly not the
existing number of new dwellings
required. Again, this MUST be
recognised in all future developments.

Again, this MUST be taken into account.
We accept that all areas require some
alterations to provision of housing but
feel that what is essential for this area is
small, affordable family houses to
encourage people to be able to stay in
the area once they start a family.

Building an endless supply of shoddy,
poorly designed and totally out of
carehouse buildings in no way
helps improve the quality of life in the
Borough (which we are sure is an
important aim of all developments) and
is in no way achieved by providing a
"Landmark" building outside the
centre of Croydon.
This would appear to pave the way for the much feared “Purely Skyscraper”. There is considerable local opposition to this monstrous idea, to place a 14/16 story building in a town which currently has a max of a 5 story building. Completely out of place and will destroy on its own, what little character Purley town Centre has left. Linked with the totally inadequate parking provision planned for the accommodation, based on fantasy theories of new residents using public transport rather than cars. The truth is the council do not care what the impact will be or what the people of Purley want for their town, they will rake in millions in planning levies, create more on street parking (pay) bays in the surrounding area, with no impact on their borough wide electability for the ruling party. If this proposal goes ahead, the negative change to Purley will be irreversible.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high, it received positive recommendation from
Having a 15 storey building in Purley makes no sense as again as apart from being totally out of keeping with the area there is no parking and the area is already gridlocked most days.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from
The proposed 16 storey Tower Block is totally out of character with the local architecture and landscape of Purley and will create a dangerous precedent for the future. Such a tall building would never been allowed in any other circumstances and is way beyond the original 6 storey proposal put forward by the Purley Baptist Church or the current building heights of 6 storeys. By simply calling the 16 storey Tower Block a "landmark" is no excuse to bulldoze through such a decision on the local community.

Such a mass development will have a tunnel effect in Purley, concentrating and increasing the levels of pollution that already exceeds EU guidelines thereby placing residents' health at increased risk from air pollution.

Traffic through Purley is set to increase further when "Westfield Croydon" is completed however despite this there appears to be no plan to take the opportunity to re-design the A22/A23 road layout other than side stepping the issue to TFL. To drive from Croydon to Purley (as I do every day) is a nightmare. It can take 45 mins and sometimes up to an hour if I leave Croydon at 5.15pm. There are no roadworks. It is sheer volume of traffic and everything gets clogged up at Purley Cross. This will make travelling for residents and for those travelling through Purley unbearable.

No details are available as to what impact such a development will have on the very real flooding issues in Purley, especially as rainwater can and has been dispersing naturally through the demolished Island site and properties located at 1-9 Banstead Road. As we know in 2014, Purley Town Centre and surrounding areas were under water and therefore this development will simply add to the likelihood of this happening again.

The developer has indicated the proposed development would create 200 2-3 bedroom homes with over 40% being affordable housing. This would add a further 500+ residents or 4% to Purley's population. There are no details available as to what measures are to be put in place with regard to local services having to deal with such an increase. Whilst much is made of the excellent transport services in Purley, trains are already at maximum capacity (you rarely get a seat in the morning and people fight to get on the carriages). The schools are also at maximum capacity and it is extremely difficult to get places for the new pupils. No change Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. If received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee
difficult to get your child into a local school. If I want to make a doctors appointment, I have to wait up to 2 weeks for an appointment because they are so busy.

The developer's proposal states 50 car park spaces will be included for the Baptist Church's visitors but only 38 car park spaces for the 200 homes. It is naïve to think that only 38 of the 200 new home owners will not have one or more cars in their family. I own a buy to let flat in central Croydon and I regularly have couples renting who own 2 cars. In addition to this, each resident will have visitors who will also require somewhere to park! Deliveries will also be made to all 200 properties, including large lorries carrying furniture etc. This would be a regular occurrence as residents update their belongings and their properties. There are rarely spaces to park in Purley Knoll and we already see owners/tenants of apartments in Purley without parking provision buying permits and parking permanently on designated car park spaces in and around the town. What plans have been made to cope with this additional demand?

As a resident of Purley Knoll, I strongly object to the plans. Such a massive development will change Purley forever - for the worse - And it will open the door for further development of high storey towers which would rapidly turn Purley into another Croydon, which it is not.

I ask that the proposed 16 storey build is rejected. Purley needs more doctors, some nicer shops and other services for existing residents, never mind any additional residents. If there were to be any housing on the site (which should be no more than 6 storeys high), sufficient free parking needs to be made available for all the properties.
I am also a resident of Purley Knoll and feel equally as strongly as Mr Barnes that the proposed 16 storey building will be both an eyesore and will cause an inordinate amount of other negative issues on the community. It certainly will not have any benefits for the current residents of Purley.

I have not seen the notices on lamp posts and I am not able to make the meeting on 28 November at such late notice and I will be at work on 8 December 2015. Given that the residents of Purley Knoll will be so closely affected by the proposals, I am very disappointed not to have received any sort of advance notification of the meeting through my front door or given an opportunity to express my opposition to the current proposals.

I have not met any local resident who is in favour of the proposals. On the contrary, we are all vehemently against them. I would be grateful if you could please consider the opinion of the local residents who will be directly affected by the proposals. For my part, I ask that the proposals are scrapped.
Object DM40.1

I feel that a building of 16 stories would be completely out of character for the currently derelict area in central Purley. Such a tall building would not only look completely out of place, but the additional traffic that its occupants would create - whether they be residential or commercial - would only cause further disruption at an already extremely road interchange.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
This is a poorly concealed attempt to allow one party to move forwards with plans which have already been roundly rejected by the local community, namely the redevelopment of the site opposite Purley Cross, formerly the site of Sainsbury’s. I fundamentally oppose policy as a skyscraper of 16 floors is completely out of keeping with the whole of the rest of Purley, where there are no buildings over five stories, and would profoundly change the character of Purley town centre.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from
This totally out of scale and unnecessary over development is driven by the developer exploiting the supposedly benefit of ‘gifting’ amenity buildings to the site owner which in fact paid for by the increased over development. It will result in Purley centre being blighted and changed yet again beyond its current denuded state following the over development permitted on the Tesco ‘site’ over the years. This will result in Purley centre being blighted and changed yet again beyond its current denuded state following the over development permitted on the Tesco ‘site’ over the years.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM40.1</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2706/02/002/DM40.1/0 Roy Stone</td>
<td>South Woodcote Residents Assoc</td>
<td>The suggestion of a skyscraper of 16 floors with 200 flats can be built in the centre of Purley is totally out of proportion to the area where the highest building currently is only 5 floors and something of this nature would be totally out of keeping. It is also suggested that there would only be a requirement for 37 parking places, to suggest that out of 200 proposed flats only 37 people would require a parking space is a nonsense and would mean increased pressure on the remainder of parking in Purley.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object. Such a building would change the character of the town, lead to added vehicle congestion in the town centre, would have no external recreational facilities causing street nuisance.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from...
The existing building heights: the report mentions the range of 3-8 storeys but please note that the character of Purley is defined predominantly by buildings at the lower end of this scale. The suggestion to allow this range to be extended up by factor of 100% (530% if based on the lower end of the scale) is outrageous – blatantly out of the existing character, as well as in violation of the Strategic Objective 5 (respecting & enhancing the borough’s natural environment and heritage). Such a drastic increase in the housing density would also create massive demands on local infrastructure (transport, parking, health services, schooling etc.).

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from...
The suggestion that the existing building heights could be complemented by a 16 storey building is patently untrue and has been inserted presumably to permit a structure of that height on the site opposite Pizza Express. An appalling idea that is worrying most local people who do not wish to live with an enormous eyesore in the centre of Purley.

An attempt is made to justify this in item 11.121 where it is stated that "This area has a varied topography which presents opportunities for tall buildings ..." a completely subjective view that is totally at odds with local opinion. A small green space, possibly a town garden would be much more appropriate and would offset the busy road junction and shops in the centre of Purley.

This item also suggests that there are existing buildings up to 8 stories in height when I cannot think of anything that is currently above 5.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from
Policy DM40.1 (p166) states that a skyscraper of 16 floors can be built in the centre of Purley. I totally oppose this as a skyscraper of 16 floors will completely change the character of the town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of Purley town centre which is no higher than 5 floors.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Purley does not need a landmark building as it already has a distinctive office building on the corner of Whyteleafe Rd, opposite Tesco's. Keep taller buildings in central Croydon as it will be detrimental to spread them through the borough. No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Apart from being completely out of character with surrounding buildings (none of which are more than 5 floors), this site at 16 floors does not allow for enough parking. Any block of flats should be reduced in height. This would be another traffic hazard on exiting the site.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from.
we do not object to planning being obtained on brown field sites and in instances where gardens are double plots. Purley is already becoming over developed with new flats. We would like to see some new terraced properties with gardens suitable for first time buyers and possibly older residents.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I disagree with aspects of your local plan which will impact on me a resident here since 1996. I object to the proposed 16 floor tower block in Purley - too high & where is everyone to park? If you continue in this vein, my husband & I will move out of the area, to somewhere up North, where they plan things differently! Your loss, our gain - pity, as this should be a really nice place to live, but you are definitely spoiling it.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Object DM40.1

Policy DM40.1 should not allow for up to 16 storeys as it will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of the town centre which is no higher than 5 storeys.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from
PURLEY SKYSCRAPER

I STRONGLY OBJECTION TO THIS DAFT PROPOSAL AS THE BUILDING IS TOO NEAR A BUSY ROAD JUNCTION AND WILL BE AN EYESORE. THERE IS NO COMMON SENSE APPLIED HERE. 16 FLOORS IS AWAY TOO HIGH. IT WILL ALSO HAVE AN IMPACT ON THE AMOUNT OF DAYLIGHT IN THIS AREA. WHERE IS THE GREEN SPACE THAT IS MUCH-NEEDED FOR GENERAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING? WHAT ABOUT THE NOISE FROM THE TRAFFIC AT PURLEY CROSS? THIS PROPOSAL IS NOTTHING BUT A VINDICTIVE AND NASTY ACT TAKEN BY THE LABOUR COUNCIL. I EXPECT THE LABOUR LOVIES WILL LONG BE GONE WHEN THERE IS A MAJOR INCIDENT IF THE PROPOSAL GOES AHEAD. ONLY LABOUR COULD THINK OF SUCH PROPOSALS IF THE FLOORS WERE REDUCED THEN I HAVE NO OBJECTION BUT WOULD NOT WISH TO LIVE AT PURLEY CROSS. IT WILL KEEP CROYDON SOCIAL SERVICES BUSY IN YEARS TO COME.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Though I support the need for more housing I believe the Purley Apartment block should be reduced to 12 floor maximum and more parking bays should be incorporated.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from
Object

DM40.1

You state that the current height of buildings in Purley is "3 to 8 storeys". There are not many, if any, that are 8 storeys high.

- A 16 storey building would be completely out of character for Purley.
- Any new development should be no higher than the adjacent premises.
- The new development on the corner of Pampisford Road is an example of what can be achieved with a contemporary design within an existing environment.

- A 16 storey building would not be a "landmark". It would be an EYESORE.
- Please ensure that this proposal is withdrawn.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
DM40.1 The skyscraper should be allowed a maximum of 10 stories. Anything higher will destroy the character of the area. Adequate onsite parking for the development should be made a condition of granting permission.

Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need.
I understand that the following Policies will threaten our green spaces. I was born in Croydon and have lived in this area all my life (I am now 63). My parents came here from Scotland in the early 1950s. They chose this area specifically for its green spaces and it is quite unique in that facility. I spent more than 35 years in Real Estate in this area and know very well that the reason people continue to move here is exactly for these facilities and yet remaining within easy reach of other amenities, London, the coast and airports. Of course, more housing is required but I believe the alternative suggestions to these proposals to be very valid and much more in keeping with the neighbourhood thus maintaining its attractiveness and good standard.

These proposals are ill conceived and will change this particular neighbourhood beyond all recognition and take away that for which it is well known and valued. Please hear the voices of people like me and do NOT continue with the proposed policies set out below and which can be found in your Local Plan:

2. Policy DM40.1 (p166)

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I write as a long time resident (33 years) of Purley and am horrified that there is even consideration being given to a skyscraper building in Purley. We are not alone in living in Purley because whilst being convenient for London it is still very countrified and does not have a ‘London’ feel to it unlike for example Croydon. If the skyscraper goes ahead this will surely be the thin end of the wedge and open the floodgate for further developments of such size. Having said that even one tall building of the type proposed will significantly blight the look of the area. If as more homes are required, then keep building in Croydon – one additional skyscraper will make little difference. In Purley one single solitary building of this size will be a major blot on the landscape.

If more homes are needed, tax the overseas investors heavily so that they do not purchase homes in London for investments which are then left empty which then means more and more people need to look outside London which in turn moves the supply/demand curve increasing prices and people are left looking to living further and further out of London. If Purley has a skyscraper then where next – Godstone?

I vehemently oppose the above proposal.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Purley town centre has been sadly neglected for over 30 years. The council should adhere to its claim in the Croydon Local Plan document that “the ‘sixties boom’ added many buildings with a range of varied and interesting attributes. Newer development in our borough has been respectful of this historic legacy, including enhancement of Croydon’s distinctive District Centres and suburbs.” The proposed 16 storey block will be completely out of character and will not complement the surrounding buildings in Purley town centre.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Please please can the council listen to the local residents of Purley-we do not want a 16 floor sky scraper imposing over our small town. It will ruin the area creating pressure on parking/schools and not to mention traffic that is already at breaking point at the moment, not to mention the character of the town.

Purley High Street needs to be rejuvenated along the lines of Coulsdon building this eyesore will destroy Purley.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I am writing to object to Purley Skyscraper authorisation.

Policy DM40.1 (p166) says that a skyscraper of 16 floors can be built in the centre of Purley. This will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of Purley town centre which is no higher than 5 floors.

Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need.
I would like to register my objection to the following policy reference numbers: DM40.1- Purley Sky scraper

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I do not believe that the plan for a 'skyscraper' in Purley is in keeping with the architecture of the surrounding area at all and will not improve the local area for shopping and community.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I object to the following policies:

DM40.1: a skyscraper in Purley would ruin the look and feel of the town and set a worrying precedent for similar ugly buildings that aren't in keeping with the town.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
We do not want a skyscraper; there are enough homes in Purley and we have lost many of our local stands alone shops over years and more effort should be made in bringing small businesses back into the area. Who would want to live on a roundabout which is more than busy 24/7 with thundering juggernauts going round every day I cannot imagine? As for schools, doctor surgeries already bulging and the local hospital (still only open half days for A&E) I am sure they have had plenty to say.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
In particular I object to:-

2. Purley Skyscraper (DM40.1) - totally out of keeping with the town centre

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I object to this proposal on the premise that it is totally out of character with the rest of the town centre which consists of much shorter buildings.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.

DM40.1

Object
A 16 floor building would be completely out of character in the town. On this site a building of 5/6 stories should be the maximum.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Mr Paul Gomm

please note my objection to the following policy reference numbers within your current draft plan for planning & development:

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
DM40.1 - A 16 storey skyscraper would be totally out of character with the rest of Purley town centre. It would tower over the main Brighton Road, totally dominating the area, which would be entirely inappropriate.

11.121 - Tall buildings are not suited for the local area. They would diminish the character of a predominately low-rise residential area.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I am greatly concerned at some of the proposals for Purley, which if implemented, would be seriously detrimental and degrade local amenities. Specifically:

1. The proposal for a 16 storey skyscraper (which for some reason is not specifically mentioned in the plan) is wholly inappropriate. The site is unsuitable for such a building, which would not fit in with the area. Elsewhere the plan clearly envisions height restrictions on development to preserve the character of the area. These restrictions need to be consistently applied and include the Council’s own vanity projects. The roads to the sides of the site already suffer from congestion at and outside peak times and the additional traffic generated could not be reasonably accommodated. The proposed building has insufficient car parking for its residents and other tenants and this will put further pressure on parking in the centre of Purley. This is not helped by the Council’s intentions to reduce parking elsewhere. The residents of Purley do not deserve to have their suburb

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
A 16-floor building in the centre of Purley is not only objectionable for aesthetic reasons, being quite disproportional in height to the surrounding buildings, but housing such a large number of people at this spot will surely greatly increase the rush-hour traffic (both pedestrians and vehicles) at what is already a very congested junction.

No change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3125/01/003/DM40.1/O Mr Kevin Hanley</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM40.1</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am also opposed to the building of any high building in Purley which would be completely out of keeping with the area. Croydon’s planning permission team seem to have lost their minds in allowing the awful tall purple structure to build on Wellesley Road. Everyone I know thinks it is an eyesore, and even strangers on the train I overhear refer to it as a monstrosity. It does nothing to enhance Croydon’s reputation when awful and short sighted building is allowed. On this basis that all the high rise flats are being built on the back of the biggest credit bubble in human history that is going to fall apart in the next few months, I suggest it is better to make a plan for the next 100 years and therefore the protection of our wild areas and communities should be placed ahead of the need for more short term profits and buy to let flats which will be left empty once the next credit bubble pops, and become nightmares in the style of La Corbusier.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee. |
Whilst I have no objection to building a residential property here as it is a brownfield site I can not see any reason for building this to the proposed height as this will be completely out of keeping with the surrounding environment.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I would like to voice my objection to the following plan DM40.1.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Mr Stephen Woodward

Object DM40.1

We have lived in Sanderstead for over 40 years, and have thoroughly enjoyed the areas to the south of Croydon being unspoilt. In our view these ill conceived proposals will change this area beyond recognition and take away that for which it is well known and valued. Please rethink, and do not continue with the proposed policies set out below and which can be found in your Local Plan:

Policy DM40.1 (p166)

No change Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I am writing to support my local MP Chris Phelp in his objections.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of the areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I wish you to record my objections to this Plan as set out below:

2. Policy DM40.1 allows a 16 storey building which would change the ‘CHARACTER’ of PURLEY drastically. No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I specifically object to:
DM40.1 The skyscraper is out of character with Purley or do you want to create a precedent for future high rise development. This is greedy developer driven and you are in thrall to these people at the expense of ordinary citizens. High rise has been discredited everywhere and many 60’s blocks have been demolished thank God. Just because its mixed development doesn’t excuse it. The developers have done the maths and want the greatest height they can get away with.

No change
Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I live in Purley, and am writing with regards to the Croydon Local Plan, about which I have the following comments:

Policy DM40.1 says that a building of 16 floors can be built in the centre of Purley. I strongly oppose this as it will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of Purley town centre which is no higher than 5 floors. Purley centre is already congested, and cannot accommodate any 'landmark' high rise development.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
The building of a 16 floor tower in the middle of Purley would be detrimental to the area. Purley has many problems with over development already. Many fine buildings have been bulldozed and the area seems to be deliberately left to run down. I beg the council to rethink this policy as it will destroy what was and could be again a perfectly acceptable low rise and vibrant community. The solution to housing/office space is seldom vertical as was proven during the late 1960’s and 70’s.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
With reference to the Local Plan which has been proposed, please note my objection to the following policies:
> Garden Grabbing
> Policy DM2
> Purley Skyscraper authorisation
> Policy DM40.1
> Purley Pool
> Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30
> Purley Parking
> Policy 40.4, Table 11.3,
> Sanderstead "Lidl" Site
> Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306
> Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane, next to Coombe Wood Gardens
> Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661
> Loss of Green Belt – (1) Coombe Playing Fields, (2) Croham Hurst, (3) Sanderstead Plantation
> The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662
> Lack of Parking in new developments
> Policy DM28
> More Protection; Less "Intensification"
> Policy DM31.4

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Mr Richard Brandwood

Purley is a small regional 'town', with a typical characterful/classic early C20 shops/flats centre - a little faded admittedly! But to add a skyscraper of 16 floors is ridiculous, and a move totally based on church/developer greed. This policy should be rejected, and for any other similar sized local centre - like Coulsdon. It will totally change the character of the area, sticking out literally like a 'sore thumb'!

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
2) DM40.1 p166 Purley Skyscraper
16 floors, this will be out of character in this area where 5 stories is the maximum

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I object to the following ridiculous proposals…

Policy DM40.1 (p166) Do not turn Purley into a very dreadful version of Croydon centre.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.

No change
Mr Richard Driver

Object

DM40.1

I should like to make it known that I object to this which is included in the recently published Local Plan.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.

Rital Patel

Object

DM40.1

I would like to object.

No change

No change can be made as a result of this comment as it is not detailed enough as to what is being objected to.
Object DM40.1

Policy DM40.1 (p.166) says that a skyscraper of 16 floors can be built in the centre of Purley. A skyscraper of 16 floors will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of Purley town centre which is no higher than 5 floors. This must not be allowed to go forward.

DM40.1

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I strongly oppose the building of 16 storey skyscrapers in Purley. This would be an eyesore and totally out of character for the area.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
As a resident of Purley Knoll (No 23) in Purley I write to make representations against the proposed 16-storey tower development at Purley Cross (as part of the Purley Baptist Church). I strongly oppose this development – inappropriate to the character of Purley which poses deep challenges to already congested roads and services and the local environment. I list below some points of objection:

- In a survey relating to the proposed development in excess of 2,500 people have pledged their opposition to the 16 storey tower block that would form part of this development of 200 homes. Furthermore some 97% of those who left a comment on the developers own website stated they were against the tower block. Surely with such overwhelming opposition from the local community the council would wish to reconsider its proposal for this tower block and amend their plans accordingly – if not then the community deserves an explanation as to what justification the council feels there is to impose such a out of character structure on the town.

- The proposed 16 storey Tower Block is totally out of character with the local architecture and landscape of Purley and will create a dangerous precedent for the future. Such a tall building would never be allowed in any other circumstance and is way beyond the original 6 storey proposal put forward by the Purley Baptist Church or the current building heights of 6 storeys. By simply calling the 16 storey Tower Block a “Landmark” is no justification to impose such a decision on the local community.

- Such a mass development as proposed by the Purley Baptist Church will have a tunnel effect in Purley concentrating and increasing the levels of pollution that already exceed EU guidelines thereby placing residents (including those that will live in the proposed new homes) health at increased risk from air pollution. Only this week the Global Summit in Paris agreed to reduce pollution worldwide and yet it would seem there is absolutely no interest from the Baptist Church or the Council to take steps to protect its residents health by the reduction of pollution on the contrary this development will concentrate levels of pollution further.

- Traffic through Purley is set to increase further when “Westfield Croydon” is completed however...
despite this there appears to be no plan to take the opportunity to re-design the A22/A23 road layout other than side stepping the issue to TfL. Why is the council not looking to incorporate traffic congestion solutions within the plan for Purley?

•No details are available as to what impact such a development will have on the very real flooding issues in Purley especially as rainwater can and has been dispersing naturally through the demolished Island Site and properties located in 1-9 Banstead Road. As we know as recently as 2014 Purley Town Centre and surrounding areas were under water and therefore this development will simply add to the likelihood of this happening again. The Council’s own Plan stresses developments “that sites at risk of flooding only allocated where absolutely necessary”. What plans do the council have to prevent future flooding events in Purley?

•With only 40 or so parking places planned – where are the majority of residents supposed to park? This can only have a further impact on already densely parked surrounding roads.

•What further plans are there to expand GP Services? The GP surgery at WoodCote Valley Practice is already overwhelmed and it is very hard to get appointments and receive good treatment. Local schools are already crowded to – so what plans are there to expand those in light of potentially a further 500 residents (many likely with children)?

This is a woefully ill-thought-through plan with very bad consequences. I strongly to join the only thousands of Purley residents to implore you to think again and seriously revise this proposal.
As a resident of Purley Knoll (No 23) in Purley I write to make representations against the proposed 16-storey tower development at Purley Cross (as part of the Purley Baptist Church). I strongly oppose this development – inappropriate to the character of Purley which poses deep challenges to already congested roads and services and the local environment. I list below some points of objection:

- In a survey relating to the proposed development in excess of 2,500 people have pledged their opposition to the 16 storey tower block that would form part of this development of 200 homes. Furthermore some 97% of those who left a comment on the developers own website stated they were against the tower block. Surely with such overwhelming opposition from the local community the council would wish to reconsider its proposal for this tower block and amend their plans accordingly – if not then the community deserves an explanation as to what justification the council feels there is to impose such a out of character structure on the town.

- The proposed 16 storey Tower Block is totally out of character with the local architecture and landscape of Purley and will create a dangerous precedent for the future. Such a tall building would never be allowed in any other circumstance and is way beyond the original 6 storey proposal put forward by the Purley Baptist Church or the current building heights of 6 storeys. By simply calling the 16 storey Tower Block a “Landmark” is no justification to impose such a decision on the local community.

- Such a mass development as proposed by the Purley Baptist Church will have a tunnel effect in Purley concentrating and increasing the levels of pollution that already exceed EU guidelines thereby placing residents’ health at increased risk from air pollution. Only this week the Global Summit in Paris agreed to reduce pollution worldwide and yet it would seem there is absolutely no interest from the Baptist Church or the Council to take steps to protect its residents health by the reduction of pollution on the contrary this development will concentrate levels of pollution further.

- Traffic through Purley is set to increase further when “Westfield

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. If received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Croydon” is completed however despite this there appears to be no plan to take the opportunity to re-design the A22/A23 road layout other than side stepping the issue to TfL. Why is the council not looking to incorporate traffic congestion solutions within the plan for Purley?

•No details are available as to what impact such a development will have on the very real flooding issues in Purley especially as rainwater can and has been dispersing naturally through the demolished island Site and properties located in 1-9 Banstead Road. As we know as recently as 2014 Purley Town Centre and surrounding areas were under water and therefore this development will simply add to the likelihood of this happening again. The Council’s own Plan stresses developments “that sites at risk of flooding only allocated where absolutely necessary”. What plans do the council have to prevent future flooding events in Purley?

•With only 40 or so parking places planned – where are the majority of residents supposed to park? This can only have a further impact on already densely parked surrounding roads.

•What further plans are there to expand GP Services? The GP surgery at WoodCote Valley Practice is already overwhelmed and it is very hard to get appointments and receive good treatment. Local schools are already crowded to – so what plans are there to expand those in light of potentially a further 500 residents (many likely with children)?

This is a woefully ill-thought-through plan with very bad consequences. I strongly to join the only thousands of Purley residents to implore you to think again and seriously revise this proposal.
DM 40.1. Skyscraper in the centre of Purley. A building of 16 floors is, in our opinion totally inappropriate for the centre of Purley. As in other parts of London, a building of this height will create strong wind along the Brighton Road and Russell Hill. It would also be totally out of character with our town centre.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Stop building or selling out with high rise buildings. We all know humans do not do well in high rise buildings and it is already embarrassing to see a 'pink' building in West Croydon dominating our skyline. Do not do the same to Purley. It has already been damaged by Tesco's.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
This refers to the Baptist Church site where the church propose to build a 16 storey tower block in the centre of Purley Cross and shopping centre. The tallest building in this area is 5 storeys and a 16 storey tower will be totally out of scale and will over dominate this small town shopping centre.

The Baptist Church have an over ambitious plan to provide church and facilities plus community facilities. There has been no consultation with the community to judge their preferences.

To cover the cost of their development they need to include flats for sale. The Croydon Council have demanded a £2m CIL and 20 social housing units, without parking facilities to cover the cost of the Council's demands which necessitates building to the height of 16 storeys.

The church should be required to reconsider their own proposals. For instance an open area on the 10th floor would rarely be used in our English climate and the people of South Croydon should have their own facilities incorporated in a new swimming baths and leisure centre.

A further blot on the area will be additional car parking required for the flats without car parking bays. Many people whether in social housing or other housing require a car for their living and other reasons. For the Council to assume all tenants will only use public transport is a lack of understanding of the needs of working / disabled tenants.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I object to this policy since I believe it is written for the building on the Purley Cross site. A multistorey building over a few storeys would not be appropriate in central Purley. This area is less intensively built on than further north in the borough since it is closer to the edge of London and the green belt. This is necessary since a graduated reduction in intensification allows a consistent change in character, rather than a sudden abrupt end to the intense building characterising a big city. At present the town centre is no higher than 5 floors, a significant increase to this would not be in keeping and should be blocked by the council not encouraged.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 3.1.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Mr Ian Leggatt  

Object DM40.1  

The proposal to allow development up to 16 storeys is totally out of keeping with the area and streetscape and adjoining buildings. I object to the proposal.

No change  

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Object DM40.1

Dear Sirs,

With reference to the recently published 'Croydon Local Plan', as a resident of the past 25 years I give my views as follows:

Policy DM40.1 (p166): Objection-16
storey skyscraper totally unacceptable in a 5 storey town.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Object DM40.1

16 storeys - Too high for the Purley Cross site! A sore thumb! It will cause even more chaos to the area, which is bad enough anyway with traffic from A22/Tesco traffic flow.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435.

Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from
Object: DM40.1

Please reconsider many of the policies that change the character of Purley, Sanderstead and Sth Croydon. Please do not build a 16 storey skyscraper in Purley. Please be thoughtful with redevelopments that seriously change the character of these towns. Once changed they cannot be put back. Garden grabbing, etc.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I oppose the construction of a 16 storey block of flats in central Purley. This is out of keeping with the surrounding area and will result in traffic and parking problems in an already very congested area.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Regarding the draft local plan I make the following objection:

DM40 Any buildings in excess of the present highest surrounding buildings (5 stories) will stick out like a sore thumb and will thus change the whole landscape of the area.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Policy DM40.1 (p166) says that a skyscraper of 16 floors can be built in the centre of Purley. I totally oppose this. A 16-floor skyscraper will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of Purley town centre which is no higher than 5 floors.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
A skyscraper of 16 floors will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of Purley town centre which is no higher than 5 floors.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Mrs Margaret Lawless

Object

DM40.1

I object to the proposals in this new Local Plan, which will threaten our green spaces. It also, does not address the real issue of the lack of parking. The Purley skyscraper is just going to be horrendous and MUST BE STOPPED.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from...
Mrs Margaret Laycock

Object

DM40.1

I am writing to you to oppose, in the strongest possible terms, the building of a 16 storey block in the centre of Purley. It beggars belief that such an eyesore should be considered in an area where nothing else is above four or five storeys. It will stick out like a sore thumb and the upheaval of actually building there will be immense. Quite why this is being considered I can't think. There surely must be an alternative to this proposal.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Policy DM40.1 which seeks to permit a 16-story skyscraper in the centre of Purley. It is claimed that this would ‘positively enhance and strengthen the character’ of Purley with a ‘new landmark’. The term ‘Landmark’ is overworked appearing over two dozen times in a lame attempt to bolster poor justification. The correct definition would be ‘monstrosity’ denying the area its current culture. Keep construction to no more than 5 floors.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
As a resident of Croydon all my life, I wish to register my opposition to the following “plans”:
DM 40.1 – Purley Skyscraper. The site is completely unsuitable for a 16 storey development which would completely out of character for the area.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
The tower would ruin the skyline of Purley and is completely out of keeping with the rest of the town. A sympathetic design, preferably mock Tudor, 4 floors max, in a much smaller scale would be more appropriate. This would stick out like a Monstrous Carbuncle! (where have we heard that quote before?)

I understand it is part of the London Plan which provides housing, but no parking?! I think it quite naive to think that the occupiers will not have cars they need to park, and will therefore go into the community to locate spaces for their need. Thus pressurizing the local community even further, for example Purley Vale area, who are already squeezed for parking with further restrictions coming which are unwelcome. The proposed development is on the junction of the A/22 and A23, one of the busiest junctions in the south east, surely any development there would cause devastating traffic tailbacks, it only takes one white van to break down outside Purley Library for the whole area to grind to a halt. A construction site for a 16 storey tower, no thank you. Purley is congested enough on a regular basis (the whole of this week on the school run I might add) with various works on the roads and diversions. It is totally unacceptable.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
A skyscraper in Purley will be totally out of character with the local scene!

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I do not believe that a 16 storey building would add anything to Purley, but would be totally out of character. Apart from the aesthetic point of view it is difficult to see how a the junction of the A22/A23 could possibly cope with a building of this size. Will any parking could be incorporated into the site? If so, where would the entrance/exit be?

I believe that this plan has been opposed by local residents since its inception. Why are local residents consulted if their views are ignored?

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.

No change

This comment is not clear enough as to what is being objected to.
Can you please explain how a brand new maximum 16 storey building “positively enhances and strengthens the character” of the existing average 5 storey area with town centre building styles dating mostly from about 100 years ago? A modern 16 storey development will merely cast a nasty pall over the town and obliterates the existing character before setting a precedent for future planning decisions which may then triple the height of local buildings forever into the future. The potential offered by the plan clearly does not “positively enhance and strengthen the character” but erases it. In order to “positively enhance and strengthen the character” the empty site at the centre of Purley should be developed to be in sympathy with the existing character and height of the immediate adjacent buildings. About half of those are retail premises of about 5 stories but many others, to the south are ordinary residential houses of 2 storeys. Quite what advantage the existing residents of the area gain by ruining the character of the town your planning document does not detail so, like the equally unacceptable flyover proposal mooted some years ago, any possibility of an out of character development beyond 5 stories also be kicked well into touch.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I own several properties in Croydon and belong to a large family who all strongly object to the local plan on the basis it encourages:

- Ridiculous Purley Skyscraper appears to be thought up by lunatics

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I would like to put in writing my objections to the following local plans: I am listing the relevant Policy Numbers:
2. DM40 - Purley Skyscraper

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Please register our objections to the following proposals:

Policy DM40: this relates to the proposal that a 16 storey skyscraper should be allowed, whereas the highest other building in that area is only 4 stories high. We submit, that this proposal is totally out of character and should be rejected.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Mr Malcom Mackenzie

We have objected separately to the plan to build a skyscraper in the middle of Purley Policy DM 40.1, as this will be completely out of character, with the rest of the town, as well as causing considerable traffic congestion.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
A Skyscraper in Purley is totally inappropriate, none of the designs seen so far will add to the character or ambiance of the town in any way.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Mr Thomas Lawson

I object to this proposal on the premise that it is totally out of character with the rest of the town centre which consists of much shorter buildings.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
With reference to the Local Plan which has been proposed, please note my objection to the following policies:

Purley Skyscraper authorisation Policy DM40.1

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I am emailing to record my objection to the following policies within the ‘Local Plan’.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee
Object Policy DM40.1 should not allow for up to 16 storeys as it will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of the town centre which is no higher than 5 storeys

No change Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
A 16 storey building will be so out of place in Purley town centre, I can't believe it is being considered. And what about the impact on traffic in an area which is already gridlocked for much of the day.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Purley (centre) at present generally has a maximum build of 5 floors. This policy appears to be written specifically to allow a skyscraper of 16 floors to be built in this location. I totally oppose this as it would completely change the character of Purley town centre.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Mr Peter Spragg

Object DM40.1

Policy DM40.1 (p166) says that a skyscraper of 16 floors can be built in the centre of Purley. A skyscraper of 16 floors will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of Purley town centre which is no higher than 5 floors. I totally oppose such a development as it will completely annihilate what is left of the centre of Purley.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Policy DM40.1 (p166) says that a skyscraper of 16 floors can be built in the centre of Purley. I am sure that this policy is written with the specific site opposite Pizza Express on Purley Cross in mind. I totally oppose this. A skyscraper of 16 floors will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of Purley town centre which is no higher than 5 floors.

Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. No change.
Policy DM40.1 (p166) says that a skyscraper of 16 floors can be built in the centre of Purley, which will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the existing buildings which are no higher than 5 floors.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
It is with regret that I feel the need to object to the following proposals:

Purley skyscraper Policy DM40.1
I feel this proposal is completely out of keeping with the surrounding area and I strongly oppose it.

Garden acquisition Policy DM2
This will make ‘garden grabs’ far too easy in my opinion, is far too subjective and is therefore a far weaker form of protection.

Sanderstead Lidl site Policy DM41.3
This proposal will likely cause real problems to traffic in the vicinity and I do not think it is an appropriate site for retail development.

Loss of Green Belt at Coombe Playing Fields and Croham Hurst Policy DM44.2
I believe that both of these locations should remain Green Belt and that re-designation is inappropriate. It will impact the area badly and in conjunction with other changes steadily change the nature of the area for the worse.

The Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane Policy DM44.2
Finally I most strongly object to Council plans to develop a Gypsy/Traveller site here. I feel it is totally inappropriate placing this on Green Belt land and is in direct contravention of the “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites” published by the Government just last August!

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Policy DM40.1.b. with potential for a new landmark building to a maximum of 16 storeys; I object to the allowance of a skyscraper up to 16 storeys high. It will look out of place in the area and will not enhance the character of the traditional buildings around it. It will create extra traffic in an area that is already congested. This should not be permitted.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore, the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I notice that in your Local Plan for development of the area there are several proposals which deserve reconsideration before they are promulgated. A skyscraper of this size would further destroy the remaining character of Purley which has declined markedly since I moved back here 45 years ago.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Object

Soundness - Justified

Purley Skyscraper – patently absurd to consider a building of 16 floor in the middle of an area of low buildings and surrounded by busy roads. The idea should be dropped immediately.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I strongly oppose the idea of a 16 storey building in Purley town centre. This would be totally out of keeping with the current skyline and look absolutely hideous. Town planners please please don't allow this.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Policy DM40.1. The proposal to allow a 16 floor skyscraper in Purley is totally out of character with the town and would add to congestion placed in any central area. In addition without adequate off street parking, congestion would increase.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Maureen Messett

Object DM40.1

I sincerely hope that my objections will be noted. I have lived in this borough for many many years and I hate seeing it gradually destroyed.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Any such development would be totally out of keeping with Purley town centre.

No change Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Policy DM40.1 allows for a skyscraper of 16 floors in the centre of Purley. This is completely out of character with the existing High Street of 4 floors with shops below.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Policy DM 40.1 - The proposed skyscraper in Purley would be completely out of character from the rest of the local buildings and would, in my opinion, be an eyesore.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore, the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
A skyscraper in Purley is simply madness. It is not in keeping with the area, the site does not lend itself to such a development and the area already struggles with traffic congestion (ask your delayed colleagues). It would not be able to cope with the additional pressure a skyscraper would bring.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Mr & Mrs Kim

We object to the following proposed plans.

DM40.1

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Policy DM40.1 (p166) says that a skyscraper of 16 floors can be built in the centre of Purley. I am sure that this policy is written with the specific site opposite Pizza Express on Purley Cross in mind. I totally oppose this. A skyscraper of 16 floors will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of Purley town centre which is no higher than 5 floors.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen the recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high.

It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I object to the construction of a tower block on this site. It would be quite out of place and ruin the street scene and overpower the adjoining buildings.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Object DM40.1

I strongly oppose the construction of a monster skyscraper in the heart of Purley town centre (DM40.1).

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from
Mrs R Jennings

Object

DM40.1

Policy DM40.1 - I absolutely object to the massive overdevelopment that would be a skyscraper of any kind in Purley.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Mr & Mrs Smith

We are strongly against the planning ideas you have over green spaces. Please add these six against to planning ideas with references below.

DM40.1
DM2
DM44.2
DM28
DM31.4

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
We are life long residents of Croydon. With reference to the local plan we would like to object to the following proposals:

- **DM40.1**: A skyscraper in Purley is total out of character for the town. Purley needs development but this is not the way to go about it.
- **DM40.4**: Purley Pool - whilst not objecting to this area being redeveloped it should include a swimming pool. Our children learnt to swim here and it is an important facility to the community. For instance our Further uses it regularly. It has been vital to maintaining his health and he would not be able to travel to more distant pools.
- **DM44.2**: It is not appropriate to have a travellers site on green belt land. We believe it is important to protect all Green Belt land from development.
- **DM31.4**: We are opposed to the intensification of these areas.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I object to this proposal on the premise that it is totally out of character with the rest of the town centre which consists of much shorter buildings.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I object to Purley Skyscraper Policy DM 40.1. It is completely out of character with the whole of Purley Town Centre where buildings are no more than 5 storeys high.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I am writing to object to:

3. Purley Skyscraper authorisation as listed in policy DM40.1 (p166) says that a skyscraper of 16 floors can be built in the centre of Purley. This will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of Purley town centre which is no higher than 5 floors.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I would like to officially put forward to you my strong objection to some of the policies that you are proposing within Croydon. My objections are particularly directed to the following policies:

DM40.1 Purely sky scraper development. The proposed building is totally out of character for the area and in my opinion will be a blot on the landscape.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Firstly, congratulations on drawing together this informative document, which is clear and consistently prepared. The summary form, particularly in detailing possible alternative uses for sites, does leave plenty of scope for possible argument over interpretation and it might be useful to link sections to more detailed background material.

I do have a number of concerns as follows:

I am disappointed that support for a very tall building at Purley Cross appears to have support. I think this would further destroy the comfortable feel for the old centre and discourage the development that is necessary.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
I wish to appeal against the plans for the 19 storey building at the Baptist Church site, Banstead Rd. Whereas, I wouldn’t object to some flats there, the plan needs adapting.

1) 19 storeys is far too high for Purley. It will dominate the whole area.
2) It is not really a suitable site for housing as it surrounded by pollution from cars - both noise and sulphur dioxide. It is definitely not suitable for families. It would be quite dangerous, also as there will no outdoor space for children.
3) Nor is it suitable for shops because of the lack of easy crossing places and the amount of cars passing nearby. There are already far too many empty shops in Purley.
4) If it must be housing, flats for young people trying to get on the housing ladder would be more acceptable and appropriate. If you would provide help with the deposit, or allow part rent, part ownership. There is a tremendous shortage of such places.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore, the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Object Soundness - Justified DM40.1

Policy DM40.1 (p166) - We totally oppose this. A skyscraper of 16 floors will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of Purley town centre which is no higher than 5 floors.

No change Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.
Maurice Brennan

Object DM40.1

I strongly object to the inclusion of: Policy DM40.1 (p166) that says that a skyscraper of 16 floors can be built in the centre of Purley. This is wrong and will destroy Purley for years to come. Shame on you for including this.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Purley District Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed landmark building, significantly taller than predominant up to 8 storey urban fabric, would maximise use of the sustainable location of the district centre, strengthen recognition and importance of Purley in the borough and also on the southern approach to Central London. Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. The currently proposed landmark scheme in Purley is 16 storeys high. It received positive recommendation from officers and the Planning Committee.

Dennis Carter

Object DM40.2

No change

The objection is noted but as there is no further information substantiating it no amendments the policy can be made as the basis for the objection is not known.

Ms C Soroczynski

Object DM40.2

Please note my objections to planning- Policy DM40

No change

The Council is unable to respond on this as no reasons are provided for the objection in relation to policy DM40.2.

Mr J Zhang

Object DM40.2

I certainly object to the following policies as DM40.2. We do need a health and green tone with its character.

No change

This comment is not clear enough as to what is being objected to.
No change

The objection is noted but as there is no further information substantiating it no amendments the policy can be made as the basis for the objection is not known.

Mr John Massie

Object

DM40.3

The junction of Brighton Road and Purley Downs Road items b) and c) seems to suggest that there should be a lot more 5 storey blocks of flats similar to Lansdowne Court along this stretch of the Brighton Road. Which would completely spoil the street scene and the area generally with too many over-large and visually intrusive buildings and put a huge strain on parking.

I note also in item 11.124 that Capella court is described as a "landmark" building when it is in fact a terrible eyesore, ugly and disliked by everyone who lives in the area, the result of 1960's planning failures. It can never be a focal point for decision making in the 21st century and should be demolished. Perhaps you should survey the local residents on this issue.

Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. Worting of the paragraph 11.124 refers to the future re-development as a landmark, a larger building terminating vistas from south and north due to its larger scale than surrounding buildings.

Dennis Carter

Object

DM40.3

The objection is noted but as there is no further information substantiating it no amendments the policy can be made as the basis for the objection is not known.

I Djemil

Object

DM40.4

On Table 11.13 add site name 'Woodcote Park Estate. Proposed use: back garden development.'

No change

No specific site is identified and there is a policy, DM2 policy on garden land, which will be applicable for proposed development on back garden land.

Dennis Carter

Object

DM40.4

The objection is noted but as there is no further information substantiating it no amendments the policy can be made as the basis for the objection is not known.

Beth Havelock

Support

DM40.4

TfL supports the plans for growth in this area and welcomes further discussions on the options for transport infrastructure.

Welcome support

H A Chakora

Object

Soundness - Justified

I strongly object to your policies .

DM 2
DM 40
DM 40.4
DM 41.3
DM 44.2
DM 28
DM 3
DM 31.4

Local shopping parades are empty due to draconian parking charges Whitgift and Centrales are empty Office Blocks empty.

No change

The Local Plan is required to allocate sites for development so it is not possible to remove this policy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2606/01/003/DM40.4/0</td>
<td>A&amp;J Mitchell</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>We object to this policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2792/01/002/DM40.4/0</td>
<td>Parham Holdings Ltd</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>112 Brighton Road is suitable for a primary school use. The site has a total area of 0.30ha, and can appropriately accommodate a primary school use. It is recognised in the Croydon Local Plan Strategic Policies (adopted in April 2013) that the South Western area of Croydon is in need of more primary school classrooms. The site has a long history of being developed. The existing land use is not protected. The Alternative Site is not subject to any relevant policies. A preferred or alternative option has not been specified for its use. It is considered that the Alternative Site is an ideal location for a primary school given its proximity to public transport and potential for access from both Brighton Road and Downlands Road (which also provides opportunity pupils to be dropped off away from the heavy traffic on the Brighton Road). It is unlikely that an educational (D1) use would result in adverse overlooking issues onto the adjoining properties while any acoustic impacts would be limited and occur within school hours only. No.112 Brighton Road presents a more appropriate location offering better safety and access outcomes and a quieter environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3345/01/003/DM40.4/0</td>
<td>Rital Patel</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>I would like to object.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3412/01/001/DM40.4/0</td>
<td>Mrs C McNaughton</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>I would like to register my anxieties as regards some of the proposals in the draft &quot;local plan&quot;. They are 40.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3725/01/003/DM40.4/0</td>
<td>Mr J Zhang</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>I certainly object to the following policies as DM40.4. We do need a health and green tone with its character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3982/01/004/DM40.4/0</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Smith</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>We are strongly against the planning ideas you have over green spaces in 40.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No change can be made as a result of this policy as there is no detail as to what is being objected to. 112 Brighton Road has been assessed and will not be allocated as a primary school due to the lack of suitable access and the close proximity to the adjoining residential properties.
4117/01/024/DM40.4/O Cllr S Brew

Object DM40.4

Lord Roberts, 19 Upper Woodcote Village, Purley: Given the text of para 5.38 on p54 of the CLP1.1 partial review document, I recommend that the Lord Roberts should be designated as a community facility, which serves a relatively isolated group of homes around the village green.

Change

Agreed it will be designated as a community facility as post offices have been added to the definition of community facilities and will be protected by Local Plan policies.

4117/01/023/DM40.4/O Cllr S Brew

Object DM40.4

Purley Library site: (not currently discussed in local plan): The existing listed building should be retained but converted to offices. (AFTER new library has opened on site 30 above.

No change

Change Agreed it will be designated as a community facility as post offices have been added to the definition of community facilities and will be protected by Local Plan policies.

2657/01/004/DM40.4/O Rebecca Pullinger CPRE London

Object Soundness - Effective DM40.4 130

A large number of the sites allocated for development through Detailed Policies and Proposals may result in the loss of green space. This appears to run counter to the Borough’s Strategic Objective 10 (The need to utilise brownfield areas first) and could be replaced with a goal to promote good quality high density developments that protect Croydon’s green spaces. Even undesignated green spaces provide important ecosystem services to Croydon’s growing population. We are concerned about the potential loss of Green Infrastructure through the possible reduction of garden space through the proposed development. Any plans should seek to protect and enhance the green space.

The Council should provide additional text in these policies to encourage developers to propose good quality, high density developments which promote the protection and enhancement of green space.

No change

This allocation would not result in the loss of open space.

2781/01/005/DM40.4/C Graham Bass

Comment DM40.4 130

Concerned about the design of this large, predominantly affordable estate. Need to ensure that it will be attractive & in character with the area & its surroundings- not replicate the stereotypical tatty council house estates of the past.

The proposal would need to be attractive and in character with the area and its surrounding.

No change

Any proposal would be required to meet the standards set out in the Urban Design and the Places of Croydon policies in the Croydon Local Plan.

2982/01/003/DM40.4/O Mrs Jeanne Driscoll

Object DM40.4 130

I wish to add my objections made on this document by our local M.P. Chris Philp.

No change

This comment has not been substantiated so no changes can be made.

3162/01/003/DM40.4/O Mr Joe Toner

Object DM40.4 130

I would like to voice my objection to the following plans DM40.4.

No change

The objection is not substantiated, (no reason given ), so the Council is unable to respond.

3322/01/002/DM40.4/O Mr Richard Driver

Object DM40.4 130

I should like to make it known that I object to this which is included in the recently published Local Plan.

No change

There is insufficient information to consider this comment further.

3419/01/002/DM40.4/O Mr & Mrs C MacKinnon Smith

Object DM40.4 130

We, the residents at 4 Purley Knoll, officially object to the proposed development of 1-9 Barstead Road which will have a detrimental effect on our property and Purley in general.

No change

The Council believes that the site is suitable for residential use and therefore the site will continue to be allocated for that use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM40.4 130</th>
<th>I object to Policy 40.4 table 11.3 - All of the above are unacceptable to me as a Sanderstead resident for the last 25 years. We need space and sensible development that compliments the environment. I totally agree with all the point that our member of Parliament has suggested. No change</th>
<th>This allocation sets out that residential development is acceptable in principle. Any planning application for this site will be assessed against the Local Plan planning policies, which include an assessment on the local environment and character.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4 30</td>
<td>40.4 Table 11.3 Site 30 Purley Pool I hope that this means that there will still be a public pool to serve this area of the Borough. I also hope that the parking spaces will remain. Parking is a key issue in Purley and this is also not helped by allowing dwellings to be built without a parking space. Change</td>
<td>The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM40.4 30</td>
<td>We are broadly in agreement with the proposals but feel that with such a big site and a large development that the wording should not allow for any ambiguity. We suggest the following proposed use: Mixed use redevelopment incorporating a new leisure centre, to include a 25metre swimming pool and a fully equipped gym. Other community facilities such as, healthcare facilities, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail, residential accommodation and public car park. We believe that there should be no ambiguity regarding this site as it was the subject of a massive public petition about a possible closure of the Pool. 6400 signatures were presented to the Council which bought about a full council debate. The debate finished with a 100% support of the Councillors from all sides to keep Purley Pool open. This should clearly indicate the wishes of the community and you should take note of them Change</td>
<td>The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

02 September 2016
Purley is the only logical place in the south of the borough for swimming facilities:
- It is a public transport hub and has the best bus, road and rail connections in the area and hence is easily accessible to a large number of residents.
- The current pool is very well used by schools, disabled groups, clubs and has classes for all ages.
- For geographic reasons it is the most readily accessible pool for residents in Coulsdon, Sanderstead, Selsdon and Kenley as well as Purley itself (estimated 87,000 residents have access). Loss of the facilities would mean that significant numbers from these areas who currently go swimming will not have ready access, and hence will not be able to go.
- The nearest other pool is in Waddon which because of poor accessibility for the south of the borough (two bus journeys and poor bus timetables) is for all practical purposes out of reach for users in the wards of Kenley, Sanderstead, Selsdon and Coulsdon. For those travelling by car, Waddon has insufficient parking places to take extra users, as well as adding to the congestion on the Purley Way.
- Loss of swimming facilities in Purley would result in a significant inequity in provision of such facilities across the borough and would be counter to the ‘Opportunity Croydon’ initiative

However, table 11.13 in CLP 2 states for the existing Purley Pool site that its proposed use will be: Mixed use redevelopment incorporating new leisure facilities and/or other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation and public car park.

This wording creates significant doubt as to the future purpose of the site, does not guarantee a pool, and doesn’t even guarantee leisure facilities of any description. We believe that in order for the CLP to property meet the safeguards set out in the NPPF, the London Plan and the UDP it should explicitly set out plans to retain a 6 lane 25 metre pool in the centre of Purley. If the existing pool site does need to be redeveloped then a new pool should be built before the existing one is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM40.4 30</th>
<th>Purley Pool - Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (page 168-CLIP2) talks about redeveloping the current Purley Pool and multi-story car park site. Redevelopment would be welcome, but any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. It should also make clear that the total number of public parking spaces should not decrease. The site should include a requirement for a swimming pool and the current level of parking should remain.</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ojemil</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4 30</td>
<td>Ensure Purley Pool is kept as a service to residents.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am writing in connection with the consultation documents for the Croydon community plan, which do not appear to guarantee the continuing provision of a swimming pool in Purley town centre. The plan appears to refer merely to ‘new leisure facilities and/or other community facilities’. All vague....

I am one of the many users of Purley Swimming Pool who protested a while ago at the threat of its closure and was at the meeting in the Town Hall when we were told that the Pool would be ‘saved’ for the foreseeable future (or words to that effect). I am contacting you now to emphasise what to me is perfectly obvious: a Purley municipal swimming pool is much needed and valued. It is no use if facilities are not easily accessible to those living in the borough, particularly in the south of it. Purley town centre is an absolutely ideal situation for a swimming pool: it is the hub of several bus routes and people can get to the pool easily from all over the borough. The pool is very, very, well used, particularly by the young and the elderly. As an elderly person myself, I know the value of swimming in keeping limbs supple and giving a sense of wellbeing. We oldies would be a much greater drain on social services if we couldn't get the good exercise that swimming provides....

I have lived in Purley since 1971 and well remember the free car park that was appropriated to build the (long gone) small Sainsbury’s store and multi-storey car park on the site. The provision of a municipal swimming pool in the town centre was at that time recognised as long overdue and was a condition of the whole building project. The site was then considered ideal: it is STILL the ideal site for a swimming pool. I swim regularly with users who come from Sanderstead and Coulsdon, as well as from Purley itself. It is just SO easy to get to. A new pool was built at Waddon the other year: this is of absolutely NO USE. WHATSOEVER to most people living in the south of the borough. There is virtually no car parking available there - and anyway who in their right mind would want to take a car along the Purley Way at any time of the day?! And there are few buses that go past Waddon Pool from Purley town centre.

A petition of many thousands of signatures was presented to you earlier in the year when the Pool was threatened with closure. You have...
ample evidence that a swimming pool in the centre of Purley is what your Community Charge payers want. Please listen to us and act accordingly: don’t even THINK of getting rid of our much-used and appreciated Purley swimming pool! It could well do with a bit of smartening-up, but it certainly does NOT warrant being replaced elsewhere.
I was pleased to learn that Purley pool is to remain open for the immediate future but that plans for closure still remain.

I am always shocked to learn that there is even mention of closure of the pool, which is a valuable resource for Purley town centre and its environs. As far as I am aware, the pool is only facility to the south of Croydon, serving not only Purley but also Sanderstead, Selsdon and the Coulsdon areas.

I appreciate that there is the new pool at the Waddon Leisure Centre but the bus service is poor and this means that one has to drive from Purley, sit in endless traffic along the perpetually congested Purley Way (so much for saving fuel and protecting the environment from pollution), whereas Purley pool is in a mainly residential area and can be easily accessed by public transport and even on foot by many users. Moreover, there is limited parking at the Waddon site, which is often full and involves the additional expense of car parking charges. We read endlessly in the press that fewer and fewer children learn to swim; I am not surprised. It is expensive enough having to pay entrance fees, for a parent and two or three children, let alone adding the cost of petrol and parking to a swimming session.

Whenever I visit the pool, it is usually busy and is obviously a valuable resource, not only for individuals but also for schools, and other groups with planned exercise activities. We are constantly urged to take more exercise and told of the associated health benefits but here we are facing a plan which will decrease the availability of local facilities for many users, in particular the over 65’s group, to which I belong.

I understand that a recent petition aimed against closure of Purley pool gained over 6,000 signatures; surely this is an indication of the level of objection by a significant number of local users and also council members against plans for closure of this valuable facility.
| 0145/02/001/DM40.4/O | Mr Bill Tubb | Object | DM40.4 30 | I understand you are collecting comments re future updating of the Leisure centre in Purley. I am a regular user of the existing facility and have been for several years. I recommend any new leisure centre will need to have a 25m swimming pool included in the plan. | Change | The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'. |
| 0150/02/001/DM40.4/O | Grant Georgiades | Object | DM40.4 30 | I note that the recently released Croydon Local Plan (CLP) does not guarantee a pool in Purley in the future, referring only to "new leisure facilities and/or other community facilities." I believe that the plan should contain a specific commitment to maintaining at least a 25m pool in Purley as Purley Pool is the only community swimming facility in the south of the borough. The accessibility of Purley town centre by public transport makes it the best location in the south of the borough for a pool (and convenient facilities encourage more use and exercise.) This is evidenced by the fact the current pool is widely used by schools, disabled groups, and has children and adult lessons, aqua aerobics and other activities. The popularity of the current pool both has been demonstrated in terms of usage and the fact that the petition to keep it open earlier this year received over 6000 signatures. Site 30 should include the requirement for a 25m pool | Change | The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'. |
| 0150/02/002/DM40.4/O | Grant Georgiades | Object | DM40.4 30 | The only alternative is the Waddon pool which has insufficient capacity, very few parking spaces and is difficult to get to for most people in Purley by public transport. As managing director of one of the biggest employers in Purley town centre it is already sufficiently difficult to sell Purley as a desirable working location for active employees. In recent years we have lost our cinema to a block of flats and the high street has deteriorated to the extent that footfall is hard to come by. Losing the pool, which is possibly the biggest attraction the high street has to offer, would be another nail in Purley town centre’s coffin! Site 30 should include the requirement for a 25m pool | Change | The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'. |
| 0150/02/003/DM40.4/O | Mrs Liz Marsden | Object | DM40.4 30 | Purley Pool - Redevelopment of Purley Pool would be good - but the policy does not specifically state there must be a pool in this complex - it should state a pool must be retained (it is heavily used and reduces NHS bills, as many people who use it are older and keeping themselves fit, which reduces NHS visits drastically). | Change | The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'. |
Sally Rodwell

Object DM40.4

I would like to add my support to the below comments from Chris Philp MP, Regarding the proposed Croydon Council Local Plan. As a resident of Purley I find your plans extremely worrying and ill thought out.

I am also a member of Enterprise Swimming Club who meet at Purley Pool on a Friday evening. We offer a vital service to disabled people in the form of swimming lessons and social activities (perhaps you should be more grateful to groups like ours who take responsibility for vulnerable groups in the community, allowing you to ignore them). Plans to close Purley pool would effectively end this club, which has been running for 56 years. Other swimming pools do not have transport links like Purley, or even adequate parking facilities. I hope you take note of the dissent and reconsider these plans.

Mr Roger Chapman

Object Soundness - Effective DM40.4

We need the pool in Purley to be kept open. It is the only one south of Croydon, I use it twice a week.

Change The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.
I have often been fighting for saving the swimming pool in Purley. It would appear that, whichever flavour of the council, they want to get rid of the pool which is heavily used in Purley.

It is heavily used by the over 60's which is the main group of people I am associated with. We need an easily accessible pool for easy exercising (with swimming as principal). Many other groups and families, from personal experience, also use this pool. It is essential for the schools who use it, to try to ensure all children learn to swim, a government mantra.

It is ideally situated for workers who travel towards or return from Croydon (which doesn't have a central swimming pool) or directly into/out of London and places in between.

Purley has excellent travel communications for most of the southern and western areas of Croydon.

If this pool has to be got rid of let a new pool be constructed in Purley in a very near location, (the buses and trains allow easy access and continued travel after the pool use), BEFORE THE CURRENT POOL IS CLOSED. I believe that once this pool is closed building a new one will easily be put off indefinitely. Waddon pool is not convenient to the vast majority of users as has been shown by the fact that despite it being a more modern pool most, early morning swimmers, still go to the Purley one. Only two of us have switched regularly, I because I have more control of my getting there (I walk) and the other because of it's earlier starting time. Waddon is badly served by buses, it isn't that close to Waddon train station. It doesn't have anywhere near enough parking spaces, which are required because of it's bad accessibility.

All the other Croydon swimming pools are totally out of reach of most people in this southern and western parts of the borough.

One further point is that the pool brings people into Purley, who might use it's shopping facilities, which are seriously lacking at Waddon pool (other than one supermarket).
Caroline Hughes

Comment

I refer to your notice, reference number 30, which has been placed on a sign-post in Purley High Street. It states: “there will be leisure facilities and/or community facilities..... etc.”

Can you please confirm that a) there WILL be leisure facilities and also that b) these WILL include a 25 metre pool?

As you know, over the years, there has been a number of campaigns to save the current swimming pool; the last being in January this year when over 6,000 signatures were gathered in a petition to save the pool from closure. It is obvious that there is a strong feeling among the people of Purley and in the rest of the south of the borough to keep a swimming pool in the town. If the pool were to be closed and not replaced, then there would be no swimming pool in the south of the borough. I know there are pools in other parts of the borough (Thornton Heath, New Addington, Waddon) but we all pay our Council Tax so why should the south be penalised? Not everyone is rich in the south with their own personal pool.

Roseline Laurence

Object

I was disappointed to see that you have not made it a certainty that whatever is built on the site of Purley pool and car park in the future includes a 25 metres long swimming pool in the draft consultation document. This is especially disappointing given the strong requirement amongst residents in the south of the borough for a pool in Purley town centre. This was well demonstrated when more than 6000 signed the petition to keep Purley Pool open. Swimming is a wonderful thing for children to learn for fitness and it can be a life saver. It is a good form of exercise for the more elderly and those with medical conditions that prevent other fitness regimes, eg. Where there is impact on the skeletal frame such as from running and jumping. Please would you make it a requirement on any developer to include a 25 metre pool on the site.

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.
My particular concern is that there is no mention of a swimming pool on the site. I am broadly in agreement with the proposal for a range of sports, leisure healthcare, community creative and cultural facilities, as well as residential and public car parking. Please include the mandatory requirement for a 25 metres Pool on the site.

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

Further to the draft of the above now being open for comment I would like to express a concern that it doesn’t guarantee Purley will retain its swimming pool. If it were to go I think it would have a detrimental impact on numerous people who regularly use it as not only a place to keep fit but also a place to meet friends and so it plays an important part in the community. Plus it’s also used by local schools and groups so given the recent press re children and lack of exercise/obesity Why we would even consider losing this resource for a healthier lifestyle. Unlike Waddon (which has totally insufficient parking and is a nightmare to get to even by public transport due to the volume of traffic on the Purley Way) it has excellent transport links and parking facilities and if it was closed it’s unlikely that Waddon could cope with the extra demands not only from Purley residents but other local areas as well i.e Selsdon Sanderstead & more.

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.
My family and I are very, very concerned that current redevelopment plans for Purley leisure centre do not state having a pool. We would like to clearly state that a pool is essential and should be specified within plans. Plus, a pool to the equivalent size of the current pool. We live in Sanderstead. Purley is our local hub. We use Purley Pool three to four times a week and then use shops, etc in the town. If the pool was not there we would not bother going to Purley nearly as often as we do. Both our children have learnt to swim at the Pool. My husband and I can use the pool before and after work due to the excellent transport links from central London. Going to Waddon Pool is simply not an option due to the lack of parking, congestion and lack of decent transport links. Like many families we also can not afford a private pool membership. We also voted for Tony Newman on the basis he had promised a pool in the town. Why not make Purley Pool a real destination as part of your plans? The pool is already well used my son’s primary school uses it but why not see having a pool as a real opportunity for the town? Swimming is the most inclusive form of exercise. The old, disabled, obese and very young can all benefit from it. Why lose this? I go for a bad back without swimming I need medication for it. By taking responsibility for my health by swimming, I am keeping out of the doctors surgery and being able to work - and pay my taxes. Keep a Pool in Purley.
I signed the petition to Save Purley Pool and was naively hopeful that when that garnered a stay of execution that would be the end of it. It is abundantly clear that there is a great need for a council run swimming pool at Purley that is accessible on low incomes and pensions.

I am very aware that in the current economic climate the council is under pressure to be financially viable and that the day of subsidised facilities are on the wain. That said, I have dedicated my working life to the long-term unemployed, people recovering from mental illness and to young offenders. It is vital to their rehabilitation that they have safe, affordable outlets for mixing with the community. Parks are wonderful but do not provide the feeling of safety required. Individual bursaries are not the answer.

I urge you to consider the hidden costs that will accrue if you remove another publicly funded leisure facility. The very fact that Purley Pool is so well attended despite its proximity to other, expensive, privately run pools and gyms must surely convince you that there is a real community need for the Pool.

I appreciate you are faced with very tough decisions about what can and can’t be funded in the area but I would like to add my voice to those campaigning to save Purley Pool.
I would like to register our concerns that within the Croydon Local Plans CLP1 and CLP2 that although “new new leisure facilities and/or other community facilities” are mentioned, the plan does not guarantee a pool in Purley.

May I remind you of the fact, that, when the pool was threatened with closure earlier in the year, 6000 signatures against the closure were collected in the very short time allowed by the council (indeed, had we had more time I am sure we could have gained many more signatures).

The inclusion of a new pool or the refurbishment of the old pool, we feel is essential to Purley for the following reasons:

The current pool is used by thousands of people in and around Purley, including Selsdon, Sanderstead, and Coulsdon.

It is used by most of the schools in the area, disabled groups, and has adults and children’s lessons, aerobics and other activities including the charity swimathon which takes place every year.

Purley is very convenient place for local transport making Purley an ideal place for a pool in the south of the borough.

Swimming is the perfect sport for everyone at any age, which keeps everyone healthy.

The nearest swimming pool at Waddon has insufficient capacity to accommodate Purley pool swimmers, is situated in a traffic hot spot, and has with few parking spaces.

Finally, why should we lose a valuable and well loved and used asset in Purley, which has been part of the town, and indeed, originally gifted to the town.

The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.
There are vague comments about leisure facilities, but I can see no reason why commitments already given should not be in the plan, and a failure to do this would ring alarm bells. As I am sure you are aware this is an important issue locally. It has been pointed out many times that the pool in Waddon is not practically accessible from Purley. For most people it is two bus journeys or a very tedious drive along a traffic saturated Purley Way, with no hope of parking when you get there. It makes a huge addition to the time needed to go and exercise. To be beneficial exercise needs to be taken regularly and at least twice a week. The Pool and Gymnasium are the only facilities in the South West of the Borough and serve not only Purley but Coulsdon, Kenley, Old Coulsdon, Riddlesdown, Sanderstead and South Croydon. They create many thousands of footfalls per annum in Purley and are a vital part of it being a sustainable community. The need for this facility will of course increase with the large housing development in Coulsdon, and the planned developments in Purley and surrounding areas. To bring in all these people whilst not having adequate leisure and exercise facilities is to condemn the area to being a dumping ground where people are expected just to sleep. This will likely cause an increase in anti-social behaviour in the town and a further decline in it as a community.

My suggestion for the future of the pool is to build alongside it a sports hall which will enable all sorts of activities including team events such as five-a-side football to provide activities for the new settlers in the area and of course the existing ones as well. If this area also included a new library building to serve the South west of the Borough then you would begin to create a community centre which would enhance the value of the area and increase the likelihood of the planned growth becoming successfully established.

The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.
Mrs Valerie Hunter

Object

DM40.4

30

Purley Swimming Pool must be included in the new leisure facilities in Purley and retained/rebuilt in the centre of Purley for the following reasons:

SWIMMING IS NOT ONLY A HEALTHY EXERCISE, BUT A LIFE SAVER!

From young babies and toddlers learning to swim before they develop a fear of the water, or before they accidentally fall in water and drown - from older children and teenagers burning up their energy in a positive rather than a destructive way, the exercise helping them lose weight instead of turning into lethargic overweight ‘couch potatoes’ in front of television or computer, especially during school holidays - from adults keeping fit, using muscles that they are unable to use in any other activity, especially those with a sedentary job - from the elderly helping them to keep active and healthy, when other exercise is not possible for them - from the disabled who have difficulty in walking, but can still swim - to those recovering from accidents, water buoyancy helping them regain strength - to those learning to swim at any age who can save others’ lives, or save their own - all need the opportunity of a near swimming pool.

Other activities are limited to certain age groups, or need considerably more space per person, or only suitable for good weather. No other activity can provide so many people at the same time with healthy exercise. There should be MORE SWIMMING POOLS, not less.

Why in the centre of Purley and not elsewhere?

Because buses go directly to the centre of Purley from ALL directions - convenient not just for Purley itself, but Kenley, South Croydon (Purley Oaks part), Sanderstead, Selsdon, Woodcote and Coulsdon, and other places. Older children can easily travel on a one-bus journey to Purley. [Parents would not be quite so happy about children having to walk around at bus stops on their own for a second bus to take them the longer journey elsewhere.]

Or parents can go shopping in Purley while their children can swim in safety. Swimming clubs and schools use the pool.

The proposed Coulsdon pool was never built, and would not have been
so easily accessible to so many people anyway.

The Waddon Pool is in an area of considerable traffic congestion, with infrequent bus service, and inadequate parking, and would be unable to fit in their timetable the number of activities of the various groups using Purley Pool including the disabled, the considerable number of schools, swim schools etc.

What possible 'leisure' complex activity could provide so much enjoyable or needy activity for so many?

Therefore it is essential that new leisure facilities include a swimming pool in the CENTRE of Purley.
Purley Pool has been an important part of Purley High Street since the early 1980’s, providing a much needed leisure/learning/health/recreational facility for a full age range of local residents from Purley, Selsdon, Sanderstead and Coulsdon. I go to Purley at least three times a week for swimming, banking, visiting the post office, Tesco, Sainsburys, dentist, doctor, pub and library. Purley is a great little town because there are a lot of useful facilities in one small area, easily accessible by foot, bus, train and car, which must be good for reducing carbon emissions. Purley is very local to me and I find it very useful to be able to get there quickly on foot, by bicycle, bus, train or car. Purley swimming pool had to close during 2013 for routine maintenance and I did try to get to the new pool at Waddon but in the end it proved too time-consuming to fit into my busy schedule to drive over to the Purley Way amidst the rush hour traffic. Driving to the Waddon Pool is my only way of getting there as there is no direct bus or train link available to me from Sanderstead and it is certainly too far to walk. I know there is a move to get us all cycling but I have no intention of risking my life cycling on Croydon roads, due to congestion, breathing in noxious fumes and painful joints. Pool users range from infants, toddlers, school children, teenagers, young adults before and after work through to those in their 60’s, 70’s and 80’s and need to be able to reach the pool quickly, easily and safely. There are very few car parking spaces at Waddon meaning that the few who do venture over there meet with problems of where to put their cars. Additionally, the roads around the Waddon pool are always heavily congested.

As far as I know, there are no other current or planned local public swimming pools that would meet the needs of Sanderstead, Selsdon, Purley and Coulsdon residents other than Purley Swimming Pool so I believe it is vital to include a pool in any future leisure centre plans for Purley as this is the only public pool which serves the south of the borough.

The popularity of the pool is clear considering the 6000+ signature petition achieved earlier this year to keep it open – not to mention the full support promised by Croydon councillors to keep it open. According to the publication ‘Great Lengths’ by Dr Ian Gordon and Simon Inglis “Swimming is Britain’s most popular participation sport. Nearly one in five people swim at
least once a month, with around 80 million visits to swimming pools recorded every year. “What other sport caters for such a wide age range and has such a health/feel good benefit? I believe that any future leisure facility/centre plans for Purley should include a new swimming pool. Who gets to decide what the needs of the local residents are – the residents or the council?”
I would like to comment on the draft Croydon Local Plan, with particular reference to a swimming pool at Purley.

I note that the Plan does not guarantee a pool in Purley, but refers only to “new leisure facilities and/or other community facilities”. I consider that it is essential that Purley continues to have a 25 metre swimming pool for the following reasons:

- **location**: the pool in Purley is ideally placed to serve the south of the borough. In addition there are excellent public transport links, as well as adequate parking. The pool at Waddon is difficult to reach by public transport and has insufficient parking.
- **popularity**: 6,000 people signed a petition earlier this year in support of retaining the pool which is extensively used by local schools and disabled groups. This was recognised at a council meeting in January when the councillors were in complete agreement that the pool should remain open.
- **health benefits**: these are well documented. At my recent free NHS health check I was told that swimming twice a week would have contributed to maintaining my weight, blood pressure and cholesterol at optimum levels.

At the consultation at Purley Baptist Church on 8 December I was told by one of the council officials (Lee, I’m afraid I have forgotten her surname) that the Plan would be amended from “leisure facilities” to “sports facilities” in Purley. However it would not be possible to include a swimming pool in the plan as this would restrict the developer and could lead to the site becoming blighted. While I recognise the need for pragmatism, I am concerned that in deciding whether to include a pool in the plan for Purley it would appear more important to consider the requirements of a potential developer rather than those of the residents.

I urge you to amend the Plan to include a 25 metre pool in Purley.

Change The site is allocated for “Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation”.

Object DM40.4 Change
Mr Tarsem Flora
Flora Associates

Object

Table 11.13 Proposals for uses of land of specific sites in Purley
Ref 30 Purley Leisure Centre
The local community has been campaigning for many years now to retain the existing Purley Pool or find an alternative site for this facility. It goes without saying that this pool is extremely well used not only by the residents but also by local school. Swinmalton is an excellent annual event and raises lots of money for charity. Equally important is to ensure that the multi storey public car park is not lost in any new redevelopment of the site. PWRA accept the fact that the building needs to be demolished and redeveloped but wish to stress the need to ensure that the pool and the parking is not lost.

Change
The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

C H M Marsh

Object

The proposal should specifically refer to a swimming pool and gym. The facility is well used by the public throughout the day. It is one of the only facilities in the south of the borough for young adults in the evening and should remain available. It is suggested that the use be amended as follows - Mixed use redevelopment incorporating a new leisure centre, to include a 25m swimming pool and a fully equipped gym. Other community facilities such as health care facilities, creative and culture industry centre, retail, residential accommodation and public car park.

Change
The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

Angie Nokes
British Medical Association

Object

I agree that the current site is in need of revamping, and as a regular user of the current facilities, I would like to stress that it is important to the residents, local business employees and schools that leisure facilities, including a public swimming pool and gymnasium should most definitely be included in any redevelopment plans. A petition earlier this year to keep Purley pool open proved that the community are passionate about this facility remaining in Purley.

Change
The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

Adil Qureshi

Object

Thank you for keeping the pool open last year. Please keep it open as it is very important to my family.

Change
The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.
1788/01/003/DM40.4/O Alice Desira

Object: Soundness - Justified

Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168) talks about redeveloping the current Purley Pool and multi-story car park site. Whilst I would welcome redevelopment of this site, I would hope that the council would introduce a much more improved leisure centre and swimming complex (for example Guildford Spectrum leisure centre is very popular) and something along these lines to accommodate more parking would be an excellent addition to the town centre.

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

1792/01/001/DM40.4/O Emma Bennett

Object: Soundness - Justified

As a member of Fusion (Purley Leisure Centre) Gym I would like the leisure facilities to be kept in Purley. I am a regular user of the gym which is opposite where I work so situated really conveniently for me to use after work. I will be very disappointed if Croydon Council decide not to replace the facilities in the redevelopment, I think it is important to keep such facilities located in Purley for myself, residents and children/schools to use. It's important that people have fitness/gym facilities including a swimming pool for their wellbeing.

Retain Purley Pool in any redevelopment of Site 30.

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

1797/01/004/DM40.4/O Andrea Telman

Object: DM40.4

I totally disagree to the following planning applications which would spoil the character of our local environment and threaten our green belt. I choose to live in an area that is peaceful and quiet and resent the changes that are being forced upon me. In the spirit of true democracy I wish to make clear my objection to the following developments - Policy DM2 (p18), Policy DM40.1 (p166), Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168), Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168), Policy DM40.4, Table 11.14, site 306 (p171), Policy DM44.3, Table 11.17, site 661 (p179), Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179), Policy DM28 (p115-116), Policy DM35, Table 11.8, Site 945 (p146), and Policy DM31.4 (p126).

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

1800/01/003/DM40.4/O Carly Litchfield

Object: DM40.4

Must ensure a pool, and parking volumes do not reduce.

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

02 September 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1800/01/002/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Carly Litchfield</td>
<td>The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1807/01/001/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Georgia Parente</td>
<td>I am a local resident writing in support of Purley Pool. Over the years Purley has changed considerably; as Tesco got bigger we saw the closure of the butcher, baker, greengrocer and fishmonger. The cinema became a block of flats and the red route saw other small businesses close – the only good thing to survive is the much loved pool. As a family of 5 all members have enjoyed the facilities at Purley Pool; when the children were younger they learnt to swim in the pool, and now I take my grandchildren there during the holidays when they come to visit. Personally I have attended aqua aerobics and found this a really beneficial way to exercise in light of my arthritis; if the pool were to be moved I would not be inclined to attend sessions as the logistics of attending lessons after a day’s work and negotiating traffic and parking would not be appealing, the grandchildren would miss out on quality time too as I would think twice if I had to travel too far. Admittedly the building does need a little bit of TLC - the gym could do with an update - but otherwise it would be a real shame to destroy such a wonderful facility. Please take into account how important this is for local people before making a decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The wording of this is too vague. The current leisure centre, which includes a swimming pool and fully equipped gym, is an important community facility which provides healthy exercise for the young, old and disabled. The facility is well used by the public before and after work, with a complete cross section using it during the day. It is one of the only facilities in the South of the Borough for young adults in the evening. Having this facility supports Policy DM 18 and particularly DM 18a. It is clear that there is a need for a 25 metre swimming pool and fully equipped gym and therefore the loss of such a facility should not be permitted. This need was supported by a massive public petition about a proposed closure of the pool in April 2015. 6400 signatures were presented to the Council which brought about a full council debate. The debate concluded with a 100% support of the Councillors from all sides to keep Purley Pool open. I agree that the existing Sainsbury’s/carpark/leisure centre should be redeveloped, given the redundant former supermarket. Therefore the temporary loss of a pool and gym during redevelopment would be acceptable.

I propose Site ref 30 should be amended to:

Mixed use redevelopment incorporating a new leisure centre, to include a 25 metre swimming pool and a fully equipped gym and other community facilities such as, healthcare facilities, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail, residential accommodation and public car park.

The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.
A swimming pool is a crucial resource for the local community. My eldest son goes to lessons with his school as they are able to walk to swimming lessons, and parents are available to help, because it is local. His progress has been very good thanks to the excellent teachers, and the opportunity to attend regularly as part of his PE lessons. Purley town centre is easily accessible for many schools by foot, or quick and frequent public transport links, which saves families the extortionate cost of coach transport and saves teaching time too, rather than spend hours trekking to a different pool: there is no-where else in the south of the borough. Waddon (the nearest alternative) is much less accessible by public transport - there is only one bus that goes from Purley (so if you can’t fit the whole class on, or that bus was late, you’d be in trouble) but it is very busy and when I looked at the times to get there in time for after school swimming lessons and back again at a decent time it just wasn’t practical, especially as no-one likes buggies on public transport in the rush hour! I wouldn’t drive there as on the occasions I have visited Waddon Pool by car to play badminton I have found the parking spaces to be limited, and often had to wait for someone to leave - not ideal if you have a lesson starting at a particular time. At least at Purley, for people coming from out of town, there is plenty of space in the multi-storey right next door, as well as a National Rail station, and buses every minute or so along the Brighton Road. The Leisure Centre (together with the Library) are the community centres of the town. People come to use them, and visit the shops and local businesses whilst they are here. Without them Purley really would become a nothing-but-Tescos place to pass through and not stop. A generic leisure facility (say gym or sports hall) would not be nearly so attractive to people without a swimming pool - it is essential for children to learn for their own safety, is lots of fun and healthy too, and is a perfect low impact exercise for people of all ages including the elderly, and is very popular with people from Purley and all the surrounding areas.
Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168) talks about redeveloping the current Purley Pool and multi-story car park site. Redevelopment would be welcome, but any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. It should also make clear that the total number of public parking spaces should not go down. Change

The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.

Object DM40.4 30 I object to Policy 40.4 table 11.3, site 30. Change

The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.

Comment DM40.4 30 Similar to REP 11 I am concerned that there is no specific mention of a swimming pool in your proposed use of the site occupied by the above. This is a necessary facility serving the needs of those living in the south of the Borough. To this end you will be aware of the petition presented and accepted by the Council to save Purley pool earlier this year. Swimming is a great form of all-round exercise whatever your age, reducing risks of heart disease, type 2 diabetes and stroke etc. It is essential that a pool is centrally situated close to amenities particularly public transport and car-parking. Change

The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.

Comment DM40.4 30 Car parking in Purley is generally inadequate resulting in surrounding roads becoming increasingly congested by commuters and dangerous. Your suggestion for a public car park must therefore be of sufficient size to accommodate not only their cars but the needs of those using the mixed use development. If it is inadequate the development will fail. I am also concerned that if all your proposed uses are included in the development the site may be too small. A mega storey development would be entirely out of character with the surrounding area and unwelcome. Change

The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.
Object Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168) talks about redeveloping the current Purley Pool and multi-story car park site. Redevelopment would be welcome, but any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. It should also make clear that the total number of public parking spaces should not go down.

Change The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

---

Redevelopment would be welcome, but any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. It should also make clear that the total number of public parking spaces should not go down.

Change The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

---

Purley Pool Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 talks about redeveloping the current Purley Pool and multi-story car park site. Redevelopment would be welcome, but as a pensioner and keen swimmer any new leisure centre must include a pool. Swimming is one of the best ways of ensuring elderly people are able to keep fit when other forms of exercise are not open to them. I believe the policy should make this clear. It should also make clear that the total number of public parking spaces available should not go down.

Change The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

---

Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 talks about redeveloping the current Purley Pool and multi-story car park site. Redevelopment would be welcome, but any new leisure centre must include a pool and this policy should make this clear. It should also make clear that the total number of public parking spaces should not go down and there should be arrangements made to provide temporary parking during construction.

Change The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

---

We would make the following objections to the proposed Draft Local Plan which is a poorly disguised attack on the southern part of the Borough Policy DM40.4, table 11.3 Site 30

No change No change can be made as a result of this comment as it is not detailed enough as to what is being objected to.
Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168) talks about redeveloping the current Purley Pool and multi-story car park site. Redevelopment would be welcome, but any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. It should also make clear that the total number of public parking spaces should not go down.

Redevelopment would be welcome, but any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. It should also make clear that the total number of public parking spaces should not go down.

Change
The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

Amend DM40.4, Table 11.13, Site 30 to refer to a swimming pool.

The accessibility of Purley town centre by public transport makes it the best location in the south of the borough for a pool (and convenient facilities encourage more use and exercise helping to meet the council’s public health objectives). The Waddon pool is difficult to get to for most users of public transport, and has very little parking. There can’t be financial constraints forcing the pool to be closed or the council would not be borrowing several million pounds to build a completely new pool at New Addington.

I very much hope the document can be amended to include a specific reference to maintaining a pool in Purley.

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.
Site 30, Purley Leisure Centre, does not mention that any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. There should be a requirement that the total number of public parking spaces is not reduced by any development.

Site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.

Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 talks about redeveloping the current Purley Pool and multi-story car park site. Any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. As noted above, it should also make clear that the total number of public parking spaces should not go down.

The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.

Redevelopment of the Purley Pool and multi-story car park is to be welcomed, but any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. It should also make clear that the total number of public parking spaces will not be reduced.

The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.

Site 30, Purley Leisure Centre, does not mention that any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. There should be a requirement that the total number of public parking spaces is not reduced by any development.

The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.

Site 30, Purley Leisure Centre, does not mention that any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. There should be a requirement that the total number of public parking spaces is not reduced by any development.

The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.
This email is sent concerning the redevelopment of the current Purley Pool, and to request that the new leisure centre should include a pool (currently not made clear in the policy). The policy should also make it clear that the total number of public parking spaces will not go down.

The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.

The proposed development of Purley Pool and the multi-storey car park must include a pool and ensure that the existing number of public parking spaces are maintained.

The site allocation should include a pool and retain public parking spaces.

We are no longer active swimmers ourselves, our daughters have until relatively recently used Purley Swimming Pool frequently. We imagine that there are still many other people who still enjoy using Purley Swimming Pool and closing it would necessitate them to travel a considerable distance to alternative swimming facilities. We believe that Purley Swimming Pool is a valuable asset to the Purley area that should be retained.

The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.

The redevelopment of the old Sainsbury’s site and Purley Pool is a good idea, but no mention is made of including a swimming pool in this development and yet it has been proved in the past that this is a very important part of Purley. The old Sainsbury’s car park also provides essential parking. Losing this parking facility would put people off coming to Purley to shop or using Purley station.

The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.
Purley Pool should not be sacrificed to residential or commercial development. There are SO FEW leisure facilities in Purley as it is. A number of your development proposals seem to suggest a severe reduction in the number of parking spaces available in both Purley and Coulsdon. As there is currently an acute shortage of parking spaces in both towns, this aspect of your proposals is clearly flawed. If residents/visitors have little or no access to parking, even for limited periods, trade will suffer and eventually decline will be unstoppable.

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

Object

Table 11.13, site 30 - The proposal does not make specific mention of a 25m swimming pool, although retail outlets, residential accommodation (flats) and others are.

Other than Tesco's and the many cafés, hairdressers, estate agents and restaurants, Purley has no community facilities such as the present Purley pool and gym. It is important that this leisure facility should remain available to people south of the borough even through development of the site may well cause disruption for a period of time.

Planning should take note of the wishes of the people as demonstrated when some 6400 signatures presented to the Council following announcement of pool closure of our pool a year or so ago.

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.
We disagree with the wording of the proposal which we feel is ambiguous. If the proposal is approved as currently worded almost anything can be built on the site. Furthermore there is no specific mention of a swimming pool and we think there should be.

The site currently houses a swimming pool and a gym. This is an important facility and is currently well used by young and old throughout the day. Its location close to the station is particularly helpful for residents who want to exercise before going to work or on their way home. If it is proposed to demolish the current pool we feel that the provision of a pool and gym should be specifically written into the planning proposals. This facility should be in Purley, to provide such an amenity in the south of the Borough and ideally should be close to the station. The proposed use should be "Mixed use redevelopment, incorporating a new leisure centre, to include a 25m indoor swimming pool, a children's/lemners pool and a fully equipped gym. Other community facilities, such as healthcare facilities, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail, residential accommodation and public car park". We believe there should be no ambiguity about the development as there was a massive petition when closure of the pool was mooted only recently with over 6400 signatures presented to the council objecting to pool closure. The debate which followed showed overwhelming support to retain the pool and we feel that this should now be
We disagree with the wording of the proposal which we feel is ambiguous. If the proposal is approved as currently worded almost anything can be built on the site. Furthermore there is no specific mention of a swimming pool and we think there should be. The site currently houses a swimming pool and a gym. This is an important facility and is currently well used by young and old throughout the day. Its location close to the station is particularly helpful for residents who want to exercise before going to work or on their way home. If it is proposed to demolish the current pool we feel that the provision of a pool and gym should be specifically written into the planning proposals. This facility should be in Purley, to provide such an amenity in the south of the Borough and ideally should be close to the station. The proposed use should be “Mixed use redevelopment incorporating a new leisure centre, to include a 25m indoor swimming pool, a children’s/learners pool and a fully equipped gym. Other community facilities, such as healthcare facilities, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail, residential accommodation and public car park”. We believe there should be no ambiguity about the development as there was a massive petition when closure of the pool was mooted only recently with over 6400 signatures presented to the council objecting to pool closure. The debate which followed showed overwhelming support to retain the pool and we feel that this should now be
Regarding the current Public Consultation and invitation to comment on the Local Plan, Detailed policies and Proposals. I would comment as follows.

Government/DHSS has made clear that the UK as a whole - including Croydon - has a desperate need to encourage and provide facilities for increased exercise by all sections of the population. Whilst more affluent individuals and families can afford private facilities, it is perhaps stating the obvious that this today implies every opportunity should be taken by local authorities to provide such facilities for the less advantaged sections of the community.

The existing Swimming Pool and Gym currently serve to address this requirement in South Croydon. It is difficult to see how any move to change this can be justified when the area’s facilities already fall so far behind others - having recently returned from the Isle of Bute in Scotland where a similar facility to that currently at Purley serves an island population of perhaps five thousand, compared with South Croydon’s two or three facilities serving perhaps two hundred thousand!

The existing facility is much used by many sections of the community, not least the disabled, younger and older groups, schools, and has been strongly supported by the public whenever its continued existence has been questioned.

Inasmuch as the role of the Council, and its subordinate Planning bodies, should be reflective of the public’s wishes, it is clearly a deficiency of the current “Proposed use” of site ref. 30 that such a vague statement is proposed.

I would suggest that the “Proposed use” should be amended to specifically include: “…any redevelopment to include, as a matter of priority, the continued maintenance of the 25m swimming pool and fully equipped gym facilities throughout and beyond any redevelopment period”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2606/01/002/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>A&amp;J Mitchell</td>
<td>Object DM40.4 30</td>
<td>We object to Purley Pool</td>
<td>The site is allocated for Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2635/01/031/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Paul Sandford</td>
<td>Object DM40.4 30</td>
<td>Purley Leisure Centre, does not mention that any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. There should be a requirement that the total number of public parking spaces is not reduced by any development</td>
<td>The site is allocated for Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2714/01/003/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Claire and Michael Shallcross</td>
<td>Object DM40.4 30</td>
<td>PURLEY POOL Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 talks about redeveloping the current Purley Pool and multi-story car park site. We have no objection, in principal to redevelopment, but any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. As noted above, it should also make clear that the total number of public parking spaces should not go down. We are only too well aware that when Astoria Court was built (on the site of the old cinema) we were told that the new development would include a small cinema - which of course did not happen. This must not be allowed for the pool.</td>
<td>The site is allocated for Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2730/01/002/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr David Turner</td>
<td>Object DM40.4 30</td>
<td>Re Purley Leisure Centre I am surprised that plans are being made to alter the existing centre, so as it had a repair earlier that year. The point that as now the pool is extensively used by local residents and schools, no doubt this important facility would not be included in any new format.</td>
<td>The site is allocated for Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Redevelopment of this site would be welcome, but there are no commitments around maintaining Purley Pool, or the level of parking available to the town. Both of these resources need to be protected for local residents and visitors and the policy should make that clear.

There needs to be a new 25m swimming pool for the South of the Borough. It could be, but doesn’t have to be, on this site. For a good model for the use of the site see the pre-application plans drawn up by Polaska, in conjunction with our Planning Dept during 2008, comprising some 300 homes, a pool (which as I said above I’d trade for more housing), a Library (freeing up the existing inaccessible & too damp for books building for alternative/better use), Car Parking (to replace what is currently fully used to support local workers & shoppers plus an appropriate amount for new residents), Retail, plus an improved site layout that logically links the station & town centre.

While I agree that the current facilities in Purley do need redeveloping, I feel that retaining a swimming pool is essential in the area, and one with adequate parking, unlike the Waddon Leisure Centre at Fiveways.

Similarly, whilst redevelopment of the Purley Pool and multi-story car park site would be more than welcome the total number of public parking spaces should not go down given the problems with parking in Purley town centre. Additionally any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. Currently there is no access to any other public pool in the south of the borough of Croydon without undertaking a substantial journey, especially if attempting to use public transport due to the lack of parking spaces (such as is encountered at the Waddon centre).
This site requires consultation and consideration without a reduction of parking, the current under use of parking is related to security issues and poor design of the original.

Change

The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.

Comments on Croydon Local Plan
As a Purley resident I would like to comment on the above. I hope that my comments will be considered in this format, as I did not pick up a representation form when I attended the meeting at Purley Baptist Church on 8.12.15.

Ref no. Site name
30  Purley Leisure centre etc

There is no mention of a swimming pool in the proposal – at least a 25 metre pool is required (otherwise a public swimming pool could be incorporated at the Ref 490 proposed school). The capacity of the development’s multi-storey car park will have to be much greater than the size of the current car park to accommodate today’s users and the new residential units in the development.

Change

The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.

It is welcomed that the current Purley Pool and multi-storey car park might be redeveloped but any new leisure centre must include a pool, if the current one is not to be refurbished, and the policy should make this clear. It should also be clear that the total number of parking spaces should not be reduced in any way whatsoever.

- Purley Pool is the only community swimming facility in the South of the borough.
- The current pool is widely used by schools, disabled groups and children and provides lessons.
- Swimming provides considerable health benefits, which benefit all and is particularly important in the South of the borough which has the highest proportion of over 65 year olds across Croydon.
- The accessibility of Purley Town Centre by public transport makes it the best location in the South of the borough for a pool.
- There is insufficient capacity at Waddon Pool to take the Purley Pool users, apart from Waddon being difficult to get to for many and having little parking provisions.

Change

The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.
Mr John Freeman

Object

DM40.4

30

Purley pool is the only community swimming facility in the south of the borough. The pool is widely used by schools, disabled groups and has children and adult lessons, aqua aerobics and other activities. Swimming provides considerable health benefits which is particularly important in the south of the borough which has the highest proportion of over 65s across Croydon. The accessibility of Purley by public transport makes it the best location in the south of the borough for a pool.

The popularity of the current pool, both in terms of usage and the fact that over 6000 signatures achieved earlier this year to keep it open. There is insufficient capacity at Waddon pool to take Purley pool users and current users are not just from Purley but also Selsdon, Sanderstead and Coulsdon, constituting a significant part of the borough’s population.

The site should provide a swimming pool.

Change

The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.

Jim Gibbons

Object

DM40.4

30

Any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. It should also make clear that the total number of public parking spaces should not be reduced.

Change

The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.

Peter Dolling

Comment

Soundness - Effective

DM40.4

30

Inadequate car parking in new developments would only increase demand for street parking and slow traffic flow as would reduction of existing public car parking.

In my opinion a car is no longer a luxury but more an essential for our way of life. I agree with you public transport should be used wherever possible. With it virtually a necessity for the husband and wife to work and at the same time bring up a family. Time is limited dropping off and collecting children at child minder, grand parents or school in some cases with babies before going off to work. Fitting in after school activities and shopping in such circumstances time is tight and public transport is not an option.

As regards to cycling I am not convinced how practical this is and when travelling around Croydon see very little use of cycling lanes. I agree it is desirable but I think it is being pushed by a small but vocal minority and not a suitable means of transport for the majority.

Change

The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name / Entity</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>DM40.4</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2828/03/01/DM40.4/S</td>
<td>Mr Eugene Regan</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>30 Purley Pool Redevelopment would be welcome, but any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. It should also make clear that the total number of public parking spaces should not go down.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2833/01/002/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Jeff and Susanne Webb</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>30 While redevelopment would be acceptable to incorporate a pool, we consider it would be absolutely essential to incorporate the same number of parking spaces that we currently have in the multi-storey.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2834/01/002/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Kathleen Tomlin</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>30 If you get rid of the pool/car park in Purley, you must replace it with equal car parking spaces &amp; better pool. If you continue in this vein, my husband &amp; I will move out of the area, to somewhere up North, where they plan things differently! Your loss, our gain - pity, as this should be a really nice place to live, but you are definitely spoiling it.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2841/01/024/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Cllr Vidhi Mohan</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>30 Site 30, Purley Leisure Centre, does not mention that any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. There should be a requirement that the total number of public parking spaces is not reduced by any development;</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2847/01/006/DM40.4/S</td>
<td>Polaska Developments</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>30 We fully support the objectives for Purley Leisure Centre, car park and former Sainsbury’s supermarket.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Elizabeth Killick

**Object**

ANY DEVELOPMENT MUST RETAIN / REPLACE THE POOL AND RETAIN CARPARKING SPACES. SWIMMING IS A GOOD FORM OF EXERCISE AND WE CONTINUE TO HAVE A PROBLEM WITH OBESITY ETC

### James Fleury

**Object**

I am writing to you as a Purley resident, young entrepreneur and local business manager regarding the uncertainty around the future of Purley Pool. Thanks to my dad Charlie, who is has been an active user of the pool for over 20 years, I learnt the value of Purley pool from such a young age - I was only a year old when he first started taking me there. An ex-Margaret Roper and John Fisher pupil, we were fortunate enough to learn to swim using Purley pool, and, now thanks to this training, I regularly swim, visiting the pool on average 3-4 times a week as part of my regular exercise routine. As a young entrepreneur who runs his business from home, the pool is perfect for me. It allows me to access it off-peak - when everyone's at work - and when I stay in Canary Wharf for work, I am still able to get to the pool via train and tube - something that I cannot do for either Waddon or South Norwood Leisure centre easily, because I don't drive. Did you know that many of my friends don't drive, because of our excellent travel facilities? We ALL rely on the accessibility of the pool - that's something that is vital to people coming to exercise regularly. I know that, if the pool closed, I probably would give up my routine, because I would lose so much time travelling on buses to an alternative leisure centre on the other side of the Borough. If there's one thing I can ask of you, it would be to listen to the people who live in the South of the borough. Speak to school children, elderly people of the area, disabled users of the pool, as well as active community members about what makes Purley pool so important, not just for our local area, but for the entire borough. If we love and invest in it as our Croydon residents do, we'll have a first-class leisure for all to enjoy in Croydon and beyond.

---

2850/02/003/DM40.4/O

**Object**

ANY DEVELOPMENT MUST RETAIN / REPLACE THE POOL AND RETAIN CARPARKING SPACES. SWIMMING IS A GOOD FORM OF EXERCISE AND WE CONTINUE TO HAVE A PROBLEM WITH OBESITY ETC

**Change**

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

2854/01/001/DM40.4/O

**Object**

I am writing to you as a Purley resident, young entrepreneur and local business manager regarding the uncertainty around the future of Purley Pool. Thanks to my dad Charlie, who is has been an active user of the pool for over 20 years, I learnt the value of Purley pool from such a young age - I was only a year old when he first started taking me there. An ex-Margaret Roper and John Fisher pupil, we were fortunate enough to learn to swim using Purley pool, and, now thanks to this training, I regularly swim, visiting the pool on average 3-4 times a week as part of my regular exercise routine. As a young entrepreneur who runs his business from home, the pool is perfect for me. It allows me to access it off-peak - when everyone's at work - and when I stay in Canary Wharf for work, I am still able to get to the pool via train and tube - something that I cannot do for either Waddon or South Norwood Leisure centre easily, because I don't drive. Did you know that many of my friends don't drive, because of our excellent travel facilities? We ALL rely on the accessibility of the pool - that's something that is vital to people coming to exercise regularly. I know that, if the pool closed, I probably would give up my routine, because I would lose so much time travelling on buses to an alternative leisure centre on the other side of the Borough. If there's one thing I can ask of you, it would be to listen to the people who live in the South of the borough. Speak to school children, elderly people of the area, disabled users of the pool, as well as active community members about what makes Purley pool so important, not just for our local area, but for the entire borough. If we love and invest in it as our Croydon residents do, we'll have a first-class leisure for all to enjoy in Croydon and beyond.

**Change**

The site should include a requirement for a pool.

**Change**

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2906/03/002/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Gerald Smith</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Do you think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3? No it remains to be seen if objections are taken into account. Do you think that the preferred approach is deliverable? No the onus for this is on the council. Is it sustainable? See response below. I agree with redevelopment of the pool and car park but there must be no loss of car park space and much improved conditions for those to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2962/03/002/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Charlotte Lewis</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>I would ask that a swimming pool be kept at Purley. I live in Coulsdon &amp; do not have a car so if I am to go swimming then it needs to be somewhere I can get to by bus. I have not been swimming for a long time, I haven't been able to afford it lately, but in the new year I hope to win an appeal against the DWP &amp; then I will need to do something about me being one of those overweight obese middle-aged women that are apparently as dangerous as floods &amp; terrorists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2963/01/003/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs A Djemil</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>Policy 40.4. Purley Pool should be kept as it provides a valuable local service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.
I understand that the following Policies will threaten our green spaces. I was born in Croydon and have lived in this area all my life (I am now 63). My parents came here from Scotland in the early 1950s. They chose this area specifically for its green spaces and it is quite unique in that facility. I spent more than 35 years in Real Estate in this area and know very well that the reason people continue to move here, is exactly for these facilities and yet remaining within easy reach of other amenities, London, the coast and airports. Of course, more housing is required but I believe the alternative suggestions to these proposals to be very valid and much more in keeping with the neighbourhood thus maintaining its attractiveness and good standard.

These proposals are ill conceived and will change this particular neighbourhood beyond all recognition and take away that for which it is well known and valued. Please hear the voices of people like me and do NOT continue with the proposed policies set out below and which can be found in your Local Plan:

3. Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168)

The site is allocated for Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation.

I have been reading parts of the Croydon Local Plan (my husband has attended one of your local meetings) and one aspect I am particularly concerned with is the lack of a specific commitment in the plan to a swimming pool in Purley. When we moved into the area in 1977 we were delighted when the Council let Sainsbury’s build on the central car park near Purley railway station - as long as they provided a multi storey carpark and public swimming pool.

We have made great use of the swimming pool in Purley over the years. Both our children learnt to swim there - lessons, family visits and school visits. Now I am retired I appreciate the opportunity to keep fit and mobile (especially the aqua aerobics helping my joints) using the pool. I know your plan mentions leisure facilities but we specifically need a public swimming pool. I now have two grandchildren living locally and hope they will be able to benefit from using a swimming pool in Purley in the years to come.

The site is allocated for Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Number</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2978/01/004/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr James Marland</td>
<td>Redevelopment welcomed but only if the level of facilities is maintained i.e. there must be a swimming pool included in any new leisure facilities and the car park should remain a car park of the same or greater size.</td>
<td>The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2982/01/004/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Jeanne Driscoll</td>
<td>I wish to add my objections made on this document by our local M.P. Chris Philp.</td>
<td>The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2984/01/003/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Jennifer Flanagan</td>
<td>The Purley Pool and multi story car park site must form part of the redevelopment of this site. Car parking spaces should be retained at the same level as available now.</td>
<td>The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I was disappointed to see that the Croydon Local Plan only stipulates that leisure facilities should be incorporated in any future development of the site in Purley which currently includes the swimming pool. I would strongly urge that an amendment is made to ensure that a swimming pool will continue to be provided in Purley.

When the current administration proposed that Purley Pool be closed as part of the budget proposals a compelling argument was made by users, the local community and others to keep the pool open and I do not see the need to repeat those arguments here as they are already well documented and recorded. Suffice it to say that they did result in a change of policy which I assumed would have been reflected in the Local Plan. I will however make my own individual case. I am a pensioner living in Coulsdon and do not drive. Waddon is really not a practical alternative (even for drivers given the shortage of car parking space). I swim for 45 minutes twice a week and for me this is crucial for my health, fitness and well-being. I live on a hill and had to stop cycling as I could no longer manage it. I used to use the gym but suffer too badly now from osteo-arthritis and swimming not only keeps me fit but helps to control the pain. My life, and I am sure that of many others, would be seriously adversely affected if Purley Pool were to close without another pool being provided in the south of the borough.
I was disappointed to see that the Croydon Local Plan only stipulates that leisure facilities should be incorporated in any future development of the site in Purley which currently includes the swimming pool. I would strongly urge that an amendment is made to ensure that a swimming pool will continue to be provided in Purley.

When the current administration proposed that Purley Pool be closed as part of the budget proposals a compelling argument was made by users, the local community and others to keep the pool open and I do not see the need to repeat those arguments here as they are already well documented and recorded. Suffice it to say that they did result in a change of policy which I assumed would have been reflected in the Local Plan.

I will however make my own individual case. I am a pensioner living in Coulsdon and do not drive. Waddon is really not a practical alternative (even for drivers given the shortage of car parking space). I swim for 45 minutes twice a week and for me this is crucial for my health, fitness and well-being. I live on a hill and had to stop cycling as I could no longer manage it. I used to use the gym but suffer too badly now from osteo-arthritis and swimming not only keeps me fit but helps to control the pain. My life, and I am sure that of many others, would be seriously adversely affected if Purley Pool were to close without another pool being provided in the south of the borough.
I was disappointed to see that the Croydon Local Plan only stipulates that leisure facilities should be incorporated in any future development of the site in Purley which currently includes the swimming pool. I would strongly urge that an amendment is made to ensure that a swimming pool will continue to be provided in Purley.

When the current administration proposed that Purley Pool be closed as part of the budget proposals a compelling argument was made by users, the local community and others to keep the pool open and I do not see the need to repeat those arguments here as they are already well documented and recorded. Suffice it to say that they did result in a change of policy which I assumed would have been reflected in the Local Plan.

I will however make my own individual case. I am a pensioner living in Coulsdon and do not drive. Waddon is really not a practical alternative (even for drivers given the shortage of car parking space). I swim for 45 minutes twice a week and for me this is crucial for my health, fitness and well-being. I live on a hill and had to stop cycling as I could no longer manage it. I used to use the gym but suffer too badly now from osteo-arthritis and swimming not only keeps me fit but helps to control the pain. My life, and I am sure that of many others, would be seriously adversely affected if Purley Pool were to close without another pool being provided in the south of the borough.
Mr Charles Fleury

Object DM40.4 30

I am writing in relation to a notice displayed at Purley Leisure Centre, in relation to the "redevelopment of Purley Leisure Centre, car park and former Sainsbury's supermarket". Firstly, may I start by stating that I am a member of Purley Leisure Centre and have been for many years. I am fully aware that the redevelopment programme has been ongoing for quite a few years now and in principle I do not have any objections in this area. However, I do have concerns in relation to the uncertainty and lack of information surrounding the refurbishment of the swimming pool in the leisure centre redevelopment plans. The swimming pool and leisure centre is one of the few positives aspects of the town centre and surely must remain. I say this, as I have lived in all parts of this borough for almost all my life (54 years) and Purley has always been something that the borough can be proud of. The swimming pool and leisure centre is part of the Purley community, which also serves all residents and businesses in the south of the borough. I know the redevelopment will come at a cost which may result in increased subscriptions, but I would be prepared to accept this as long as the facility was greatly improved. Can you please confirm that the swimming pool will remain and be part of the redevelopment plans.

Mr John Harris

Object DM40.4 30

I am writing to object to Redeveloping Purley Pool and the car park at 54-58 Whyteleafe Road South

Redevelopment of the pool as detailed in Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168) would be welcome, but any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. It should also make clear that the total number of public parking spaces should not go down.

Mr John James

Object DM40.4 30

I would like to register my objection to the following policy reference numbers DM 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (Purley pool)

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.
Mr John Pewtress

Object

DM40.4
30

Car parking must be preserved or replaced with equivalent number of spaces within the immediate area.

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

Mrs Julie Goacher

Object

DM40.4
30

I also, do agree that Purley pool needs re-development, but into a new leisure centre with updated services. I would definitely use a re-furbished leisure centre with a pool as Waddon is much further for us and the parking and traffic is very unfavourable in Waddon. I would love to support a local pool with all my family. My daughter recently used the pool with her school, Woodcote Primary, and this would not have been possible without a very local pool. It would definitely enhance the area and community to be updated and attract much more use. As many residents go to the next borough of Sutton to the re-furbished Westcroft as it was so much improved for being modernised.

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

Joanne Darville

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM40.4
30

I object to the following policies:

40.4- any development should save the pool in purley. We have already lost a cinema, without a pool, there is no local things to do.

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

Mrs Sally Justice

Object

DM40.4
30

The swimming pool is invaluable, even more so as Purley is full of old people now who need this type of exercise and cannot or couldn't travel to Waddon or Carshalton etc. What about the children who go there, how would the local schools be able to take them anywhere else?

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

Samantha Freeman

Object

Soundness - Effective

DM40.4
30

In particular I object to:-

3. Any redevelopment of the Purley pool site that would mean losing the pool (40.4 table 11.3, Site 30)

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

02 September 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM40.4</th>
<th>Policy/Reference</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3046/01/004</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>Stephanie Lawson</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>I object to this policy regarding the redevelopment of the current Purley Pool and multi-story car park site. It is important that the policy makes clear that any new leisure centre must include a pool and also that the total number of public parking spaces should not go down.</td>
<td>The site is allocated for Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3081/01/003</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>Mr John Morgan</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168) talks about redeveloping the current Purley Pool and multi-story car park site. Any new development must include a new pool facility.</td>
<td>The site is allocated for Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3091/01/003</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>Mr Paul Gomm</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>please note my objection to the following policy reference numbers within your current draft plan for planning &amp; development.</td>
<td>The site is allocated for Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3095/01/002</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>Mr Paul Kelly</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>It is critical that we retain the health, leisure and swimming facilities. Particularly for our young people and future generations</td>
<td>The site is allocated for Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3124/01/003</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>Mr Gerald Lambert</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>The present multi-story car park, despite the fact that the lifts don't work and the stairs are filthy and insanitary, is an essential facility as the on-street parking is inadequate. Redevelopment is desirable but must include adequate secure parking.</td>
<td>The site is allocated for Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When this is developed it is essential it includes a pool as the nearest alternative at Waddon is not viable as many of the people who currently use Purley are senior citizens who would find getting to Waddon very difficult.

I would like to voice my object to the following plan DM40.4.

I am writing to give my support for Purley pool. I work at Christ Church C of E Primary school and we have lessons weekly for the children in the school. These lessons are crucial to the children an essential life skill in swimming and whom many would otherwise not get the chance to go.

We have lived in Sanderstead for over 40 years, and have thoroughly enjoyed the areas to the south of Croydon being unspoilt. In our view these ill conceived proposals will change this area beyond recognition and take away that for which it is well known and valued. Please rethink, and do not continue with the proposed policies set out below and which can be found in your Local Plan: Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168)

The redevelopment of Purley Pool and multi-storey car park. These redevelopment should include a swimming pool and at least the same numbers of car parking spaces.

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.
Object DM40.4
30
I specifically object to: 40.4 Purley Pool. Again I suspect you really want to close it. It's a great amenity but is starting to show its age. What is wrong with updating or rebuilding the centre and including a new pool and leisure facilities? Why do I suspect that the developers are again driving this agenda and we all know what they want. Build to the boundaries with flats.

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

Object Soundness - Justified DM40.4
30
I live in Purley, and am writing with regards to the Croydon Local Plan about which I have the following comments:

3.Policy 40.4 (Table 11.3, Site 30) talks about redeveloping the current Purley Pool and multi-story car park site. This would be welcome, but must include a new leisure centre with a pool and the policy should make this clear. The wording is such that multiple options are available including building only shops or residential accommodation. We need to maintain a leisure centre, and we already have plenty of shops and residential accommodation.

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

Object DM40.4
30
The site is very much in need of redevelopment. However, I would appeal to the council to ensure the retention of a large swimming pool facility with ample parking. Public transport only goes so far to meeting the needs of residents who use the pool. I am able to walk to the pool despite being in near constant pain, if I lived any further away I would have to consider driving there and there are many people who would find being able to park at the facility more practical than relying on public transport.

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

Object DM40.4
30
Please do not destroy your area of responsibility DM2 will lead to more flooding - it's already happened in Purley through too much development.

DM40.4 the Government want us to be fitting and this is the only public swimming pool in the area

DM44.2 Coombe Wood Gardens - a beautiful area for your voters both north and south of the borough the green belt is precious to everyone

DM28 If you don't want to destroy local businesses you must allow people to park their cars. More homes will just mean more cars

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

02 September 2016 Page 1670 of 4384
Object

With reference to the Local Plan which has been proposed, please note my objection to the following policies:

> Garden Grabbing > Policy DM2
> Purley Skyscraper authorisation > Policy DM40.1
> Purley Pool > Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30
> Purley Parking > Policy 40.4, Table 11.3.
> Sanderstead "Lidl" Site > Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306
> Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane, next to Coombe Wood Gardens > Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661
> Loss of Green Belt – (1) Coombe Playing Fields, (2) Croham Hurst, (3) Sanderstead Plantation > The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662
> Lack of Parking in new developments > Policy DM28
> More Protection; Less "Intensification" > Policy DM31.4

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

Comment

Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168) - Clearly Purley Pool and multi-storey car park site needs redeveloping, but any proposal MUST include a pool and an equal number of car parking spaces. Similarly if the car park at 54-58 Whyteleiffe Road South is re-designated as residential, any proposal MUST include the same provision for public parking spaces as the current car park.

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

Object

With reference to the Local Plan which has been proposed, please note my objection to the following policies:

> Garden Grabbing > Policy DM2
> Purley Skyscraper authorisation > Policy DM40.1
> Purley Pool > Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30
> Purley Parking > Policy 40.4, Table 11.3.
> Sanderstead "Lidl" Site > Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306
> Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane, next to Coombe Wood Gardens > Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661
> Loss of Green Belt – (1) Coombe Playing Fields, (2) Croham Hurst, (3) Sanderstead Plantation > The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662
> Lack of Parking in new developments > Policy DM28
> More Protection; Less "Intensification" > Policy DM31.4

Soundness - Effective

3) 40.4 Table 11.3 site 30 (p168). The redevelopment of Purley Pool and multi-storey car park These redevelopment should include a swimming pool and at least the same numbers of car parking spaces

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Effective</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168)</th>
<th>Mr Ron Thomas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>So you want to change the site into the same site?? What is wrong with it as it is now?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Object | DM40.4 30 | | Change | The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'. | Ms C Soroczynski |
Mr Donald Speakman

Site 30: High street leisure centre, pool, MSCP etc: This site should be completely redeveloped. New plan would include library, some residential, plus car park of same capacity as at present (note: no leisure centre - moved to site 490 - see below). Alternatively, if the leisure centre is retained at this site in a new replacement development, it should include a 25m pool as at present, and with the same amount of car parking as at present.

Also Site 30: In the detailed policies & proposals document, there is reference to a healthcare facility on this site. This should be removed; Purley Hospital site and the clinic in Whyteleafe Rd S are in the immediate vicinity and should be able to provide any required facility, thus avoiding duplication of services and facilities.

The Enterprise Swimming Club

With the support of Croydon Council, we have been providing swimming sessions for disabled people in Purley and the surrounding area for 56 years since 1959. We are concerned that the amended proposed plan for Purley has now been downgraded from the inclusion of a new Swimming Pool, previously promised, to "incorporating new Leisure Facilities", only. A replacement Swimming Pool in Purley is essential in view of the many organisations; schools; swimming lesson for children and adults; recreation for elderly and retired people and especially for disabled people of all ages for whom we cater. Purley has excellent transport links with all surrounding areas whereas other pools in the Croydon area are difficult to access by public transport and all have inadequate parking facilities for most users, who must therefore arrive by car. The preference for a replacement Pool in Purley has been clearly demonstrated by the petition signed by in excess of 6000 people a few months ago, to keep the existing pool open. Coupled with the above is the need to ensure that sufficient parking is provided close-by, not only for users of the pool, but also to enable the many excellent shops; restaurants and myriad of small businesses to survive and prosper.

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation.'
DM 40.4 Site 30. Purley pool is an important part of the public amenities of our town, and is regularly used by a large number of people. Furthermore it is important to maintain the parking capacity of the current multi-storey which is extremely popular. Purley requires parking to maintain its commercial centre, to visit Purley Hospital and the numerous small shops in town. Lack of parking will destroy, rather than improve our town and reduce employment and the livelihood of small shopkeepers and specialist service providers.

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

Ms F Wood

Object

DM 40.4

30

Please allow the pool to stay in Purley. How else do you expect the public to swim without great costs in private gyms. We do not all have the ability to travel to Waddon. You ask for us to be healthy and then take away swimming facilities.

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

Mr Gregory Taylor

Object

DM 40.4

30

Policy 40.4, Table 11.3. Site 30 (p168) I am a strong supporter of developing this land and it is a travesty that this hasn't happened already. But any redevelopment must include a pool and provision for parking for people using purley town centre.

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

Rosemary Wiseman

Object

DM 40.4

30

Site 30 Purley Pool development. The pool is well used by local residents, schools etc. and it should definitely not be closed. It is not acceptable to expect us to go the Waddon Leisure Centre which means ploughing down an already over busy Purley Way (Again caused by the Council allowing too many retail developments without improving the road system).

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

Mr G Tubb

Object

DM 40.4

30

I am particularly concerned with regard to maintaining a swimming pool in Purley. This facility is popular and is good for health, the Purley location is very good for the South of the Borough and its site on bus and train routes enables these facilities to be reached easily by a wide section of persons, schools and clubs based in the South of the Borough. Maintaining the Pool therefore should be written into the local Plan.

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.
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Rachel Thompson Object DM40.4

Please keep a Pool in Purley. Why do current redevelopment plans not state a pool? Purley is a hub, we live in South Croydon and can easily use the pool before or after work. Our children swim with the local school. There is no way we can get to Waddon - simple as that. Waddon pool is inaccessible to those in the south. The council may have the idea that the south of the borough is rich and we can all afford huge private membership fees to swim in private pools (that are often tiny) this is not the case. Let's make Purley a destination and have a great pool as part of this. The current pool is a great size and well used. Don't lose the good things about the place as part of so called 'redevelopment'. People are trying to take responsibility for their health and the south of the borough needs an accessible pool for people to do this. Swimming is an exercise everyone can do. Our neighbour goes for a swim at Purley pool as it keeps her arthritis in check, without it she is in pain. Keep a Pool in Purley!

Mr Mike Rice Object DM40.4

Dear Sirs,

With reference to the recently published 'Croydon Local Plan', as a resident of the past 25 years I give my views as follows:-

Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168) Redevelopment to include swimming pool & no reduction in parking spaces.

I welcome redevelopment of Purley leisure centre, but any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. It is not fair that the South of the Borough should not have a swimming pool within easy reach. It should also make clear that the total number of public parking spaces should not decrease.

Linda Bevin Object DM40.4

I welcome redevelopment of Purley leisure centre, but any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. It is not fair that the South of the Borough should not have a swimming pool within easy reach. It should also make clear that the total number of public parking spaces should not decrease.

Mr Michael Southwell Object DM40.4

Regarding the draft local plan I make the following objection - Purley Pool. This is at present heavily used particularly I understand by the disabled. Is the Council against facilities for these people?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3561/01/003/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Linda Hione</td>
<td>3561/01/003/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Purley Pool Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168) talks about redeveloping the current Purley Pool and multi-story car park site. Redevelopment would be welcome, but any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. It should also make clear that the total number of public parking spaces should not go down.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3571/01/003/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Hewitt</td>
<td>3571/01/003/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168) This talks about redeveloping the current Purley Pool and multi-story car park site. Redevelopment would be welcome, but any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. It should also make clear that the total number of public parking spaces should not go down.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3577/01/005/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Peter West</td>
<td>3577/01/005/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>I object to Policy 40.4 table 11.3 - All of the above are unacceptable to me as a Sanderstead resident for the last 25 years. We need space and sensible development that complements the environment. I totally agree with all the point that our member of Parliament has suggested.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3579/01/003/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Noemi Molloy</td>
<td>3579/01/003/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Any new leisure centre must include a pool and the total number of public parking spaces should be maintained or increased.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3584/01/003/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Margaret Lawless</td>
<td>3584/01/003/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>I list below the relevant policy References to which I object: 40.1 Table 11.3 Site 30 (p168)</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3587/01/003/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Margaret Laycock</td>
<td>3587/01/003/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>I never write to complain about anything but having read also that Purley Pool is due for re-development I would like to ask that it should include having a swimming pool. There are too few amenities in the area as it is and it would be detrimental to lose the only swimming pool all the while agreeing that the plans to re-develop the facility would be welcomed.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3588/01/003/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Nigel Jones</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Table 11.13 Ref 30 does not specifically identify that a swimming pool is to be part of the leisure facilities. In a time when much effort is put into reducing/eliminating obesity this essential aid to healthy living must not be removed from the Purley area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3592/01/004/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Nicola Shipp</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>As a resident of Croydon all my life, I wish to register my opposition to the following &quot;plans&quot;...DM 40.4 SITE 30 – Purley Pool. This neglected facility should be kept for local people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3708/01/004/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs J McDonald</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I feel any redevelopment must include a pool and that parking levels should be maintained.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3710/01/002/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr J Nolan</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I am horrified at the idea of an eyesore being erected in the centre of Purley, which would be totally out of keeping with the character of the town.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3734/01/003/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Mott</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to this site allocation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

02 September 2016
Mr Tim Parsons

Object DM40.4 30

I am writing to add my support to the campaign to continue to have a pool in Purley. It is vital to have an explicit commitment to one in future plans.

- Purley pool is the only community swimming facility in the south of the borough.
- Swimming provides considerable health benefits, which benefit all and is particularly important in the south of the borough which has the highest proportion of over 65s across Croydon.
- The accessibility of Purley town centre by public transport makes it the best location in the south of the borough for a pool (and convenient facilities encourage more use and exercise).
- The current pool is very popular.
- At a Council meeting earlier this year keeping the pool open received full support from councillors.
- Current users are not just from Purley but also Selsdon, Sanderstead, Coulsdon constituting a significant part of the borough's population.

Mrs Anne Turner

Object DM40.4 30

I would like to put in writing my objections to the following local plans:

I am listing the relevant Policy Numbers:

3. 40.4 Table 11.3. Site 30 - Purley Pool

Change The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

Mr K Dawson

Object Soundness - Effective DM40.4 30

I have had the opportunity to read the proposals in the recently published Local Plan for Croydon and am submitting my views by the 18 December 2015 deadline.

Table 11.13: Ref 30:

I have previously signed a petition to oppose the closure of Purley Pool. Any redevelopment of that site MUST include a 25m pool for use by residents, schools, clubs, disability organisations etc. I note that it is on the list of potential developments, but that 'leisure facilities' don't appear to specify a pool.

Change The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.
Redevelopment would be welcome here, but the Purley Pool must be retained for the use of those living south of the borough.

Given the paucity of public swimming facilities in Croydon, and the ever increasing emphasis on more healthy lifestyles for all age groups, it is essential that this facility should be preserved whatever other changes may be made in this location. Furthermore adequate parking should be maintained in its support. Any version of the Plan should spell this out specifically.

I object to this proposal on the premise that it is totally out of character with the rest of the town centre which consists of much shorter buildings.

With reference to the Local Plan which has been proposed, please note my objection to the following policies: Purley Pool Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30

I am emailing to record my objection to the following policies within the 'Local Plan':
Comment

DM40.4

Site 30, Purley Leisure Centre, does not mention that any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. There should be a requirement that the total number of public parking spaces is not reduced by any development.

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

Object

DM40.4

This refers to the redevelopment of the current Purley pool. Sympathetic redevelopment would not be opposed, but any new leisure centre must re-instate a pool and the policy must make this clear. The existing number of parking spaces must not be reduced.

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

Object

DM40.4

Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168) refers to redeveloping the current Purley Pool and multi-story car park site. Redevelopment may well be welcome, but any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. It should also make clear that the total number of public parking spaces should not be reduced.

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

Object

DM40.4

Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168) talks about redeveloping the current Purley Pool and multi-story car park site. Redevelopment would be welcome, but any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. It should also make clear that the total number of public parking spaces should not go down.

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

Object

DM40.4

Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168) discusses development of the current Purley Pool and multi-story car park site. Redevelopment would be welcome, but any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. It should also make clear that the total number of public parking spaces should not be reduced.

Change

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.

02 September 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/01/003</td>
<td>DM40.4/4/O</td>
<td>Mr Michael Drury</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>I notice that in your Local Plan for development of the area there are several proposals which deserve reconsideration before they are promulgated. 2. Purley Pool policy DM40.4 Table 11.3 Site 30. The site certainly needs redeveloping as the car park is unsanitary and a disgrace. A swimming pool is a necessity if we are to encourage children to be active and participate in sport as the government is keen on encouraging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/010</td>
<td>DM40.4/4/O</td>
<td>Dr L Bowen-Long</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Purley Pool – Redevelopment of that area of Purley, including car park, needs to include plans to retain and improved pool facility – for car parking, see following paragraphs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/001</td>
<td>DM40.4/4/O</td>
<td>Mr L Porkolab</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>As mentioned above sporting facilities are valuable national assets and the retention of a good swimming pool in any redevelopment is most important. Also the present number of parking places must be maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/006</td>
<td>DM40.4/4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Hooper</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>I sincerely hope that my objections will be noted. I have lived in this borough for many many years and I hate seeing it gradually destroyed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Gill Willis</td>
<td>DM40.4 30</td>
<td>Purley Pool area should remain as a leisure Centre which contains a pool. It is well in need of redevelopment and to have a well laid out leisure centre with pool will greatly benefit the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Morgan</td>
<td>DM40.4 30</td>
<td>Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168) talks about redeveloping the current Purley Pool and multi-story car park site. Any new development must include a new pool facility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr M Veldeman</td>
<td>DM40.4 30</td>
<td>The arguments for keeping the pool have been laid out time and again. Purley needs some sort of community area. You cannot keep putting in more and more people into the area without any sort of recreation and health facilities. The pool is well used by schools and would be a huge loss to the area if it disappeared.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr M Neal</td>
<td>DM40.4 30</td>
<td>Site 30, Purley Leisure Centre, does not mention that any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. There should be a requirement that the total number of public parking spaces is not reduced by any development;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Kim</td>
<td>DM40.4 30</td>
<td>We object to the following proposed plans. 40.4 Table 1.3 Site 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site is allocated for mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3940/01/003/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Shirley Shephard</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3941/01/003/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Frances Sell</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3953/01/001/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs J Buckley</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168) talks about redeveloping the current Purley Pool and multi-story car park site. Redevelopment would be welcome, but any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. It should also make clear that the total number of public parking spaces should not go down.

Redevelopment and regeneration is good provided that public parking would not be less than that which exists. A swimming pool is good and is badly needed in this part.

Poor Purley! no bowling anymore, no Cinema anymore, we don’t have much left!!! please amend the new policy which leaves enough loopholes for there not to be a Pool in Purley, its sooo important; families can play together; babies to 100yr olds can enjoy, if you aren’t able bodied or fit, you can still enjoy, Purley pool is the only community swimming facility in the south of the borough, current pool widely used by schools, disabled people and groups, and has children and adult lessons, aqua aerobics and other activities, swimming provides considerable health benefits, which benefits all and is particularly important in the south of the borough which has the highest proportion of over 65s across Croydon, the accessibility of Purley town centre by public transport making it the best location in the south of the borough for a pool and convenient facilities encourage more use and exercises the popularity of the current pool both in terms of usage and the fact that over 6000 signatures achieved earlier this year to keep it open. Council meeting earlier this year received full support from councillors for keeping the pool open, insufficient capacity at Waddon pool to take Purley pool users as well as Waddon being difficult to get to for most, and having very little parking which is often full, current users are not just from Purley but also Selsdon, Sanderstead, Coulsdon constituting a significant part of the borough’s population. Please let it stay or be replaced like for like.

The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.

The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.

The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.

02 September 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3966/01/003/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs M Lam</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>I also oppose the demolition of Purley swimming pool because we use the gym and the pool quite often (40.4). If Croydon Council want to demolish it despite of local opposition, a new fitness complex including a swimming pool should be built in Coulsdon or Harley area.</td>
<td>The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3966/01/003/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs R Jennings</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Policy 40.4 Table 11.3 site 30 - redevelopment of purely pool is a good idea but it needs to maintain a public pool with an increase in parking spaces.</td>
<td>The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3965/01/001/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs A Gattey</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>I would like to protest at the proposed redevelopment of Purley Leisure Centre (site reference number 30). It is clear from the ambiguous wording of the proposal that there is no intention to provide a gym and swimming pool comparable to the ones we have in the leisure centre, and indeed it is a disgrace that this proposal should be entertained in view of the 100% support for Purley Leisure Centre given by councillors only a few months ago, after the full council debate caused by the massive local support for the centre. My husband and I use both the swimming pool and the gym regularly and would have great difficulty in accessing the alternative centres in Waddon or Roundshaw. We hope it is not necessary to ask our MP to once again intervene to protect the interests of local people whose views a Labour council seems determined to ignore. I hope soon to hear that the proposals have been scrapped, otherwise we will have to repeat the tedious ritual of a year ago, wasting the valuable time of councillors and residents when the outcome is completely predictable and bringing the council into disrepute.</td>
<td>The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3986/01/02/DM40.4/O | Mr & Mrs Crane | Object Soundness - Effective | We are life long residents of Croydon. With reference to the local plan we would like to object to the following proposals:  
• DM40.1 - A skyscraper in Purley is total out of character for the town. Purley needs development but this is not the way to go about it.  
• DM40.4 - Purley Pool - whilst not objecting to this area being redeveloped it should include a swimming pool. Our children learnt to swim here and it is an important facility to the community. For instance our Farther uses it regularly. It has been vital to maintaining his health and he would not be able to travel to more distant pools.  
• DM44.2 - It is not appropriate to have a travellers site on green belt land. We believe it is important to protect all Green Belt land from development  
• DM31.4 - We are opposed to the intensification of these areas. |
| 3986/01/03/DM40.4/O | Mr P Skuse | Object DM40.4 | I personally object to some of the proposals - The Local Plan Policy 40, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168) & Site 61. Purley Pool must stay a 25m swimming pool as the only one locally available to 38000 inhabitants. Car parking reduction can be coped with as the multi-storey is under-used, and there are very good public transport facilities throughout this area. |
| 3986/01/04/DM40.4/O | Ms S Lawson | Object DM40.4 | I object to this policy regarding the redevelopment of the current Purley Pool and multi-story car park site. It is important that the policy makes clear that any new leisure centre must include a pool and also that the total number of public parking spaces should not go down. |
| 4034/01/02/DM40.4/O | Ms S Quy | Object DM40.4 | Please don’t allow us to lose our pool. As a family of keen swimmers with Croydon Amphibians we know how hard it is to find pool time in our borough for either a leisure swim (we often have to go to West Wickham) or for clubs and schools to book regular slots. |

The site is allocated for 'Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation'.
Mr S Gattey

Object DM40.4

I would like to protest at the proposed redevelopment of Purley Leisure Centre (site reference number 30). It is clear from the ambiguous wording of the proposal that there is no intention to provide a gym and swimming pool comparable to the ones we have in the leisure centre, and indeed it is a disgrace that this proposal should be entertained in view of the 100% support for Purley Leisure Centre given by councillors only a few months ago, after the full council debate caused by the massive local support for the centre.

My wife and I use both the swimming pool and the gym regularly and would have great difficulty in accessing the alternative centres in Waddon or Roundshaw. We hope it is not necessary to ask our MP to once again intervene to protect the interests of local people whose views a Labour council seems determined to ignore. I hope soon to hear that the proposals have been scrapped, otherwise we will have to repeat the tedious ritual of a year ago, wasting the valuable time of councillors and residents when the outcome is completely predictable and bringing the council into disrepute.

Jenny White

Comment DM40.4

Purley Pool Policy 40.4

Redevelopment of new leisure centre would be welcome if it included a pool and that the existing no. of car parking spaces was not reduced.

Lister & Joyce D’Costa

Object DM40.4

I wish to object to the following items in Croydon Council’s Local Plan 2: Redevelopment of Purley Pool as listed in policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p.168). We are concerned as all the family are users. Redevelopment would be welcome, but any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. It should also make clear that the total number of public parking spaces should not go down.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4078/01/004/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Belsey</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>It is essential that Purley pool remains in Purley, as there is no other nearby.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4085/01/004/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Shelley Chatter-Singh</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>I would like to officially put forward to you my strong objection to some of the policies that you are proposing within Croydon. My objections are particularly directed to the following policies: 40.4 site 30, Purley pool. The community deserve to have a facility that will encourage them to keep fit and healthy, help combat obesity, manage chronic conditions and encompass people with disabilities. A swimming pool is vital to achieve this as this is the only way that people with disability or chronic conditions can exercise safely and comfortably.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4092/01/003/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Valerie Wilshaw</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>I object to the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4108/01/003/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>The Chudasama Family</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168) - Redevelopment would be welcome, but any new leisure centre must include a pool and the policy should make this clear. It should also make clear that the total number of public parking spaces should not go down.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’. The leisure centre is not to be moved to site 490 as this is required for a primary school to meet the need for school places in the borough.

No change The Council has worked with NHS partners to identify the need for additional facilities. For the Purley GP network they have identified a requirement of an additional 3,172sqm of GP practice floorspace required and this site has potential to contribute to this need. For any planning application on this site, the developer will be required to work with the NHS to assess whether additional facilities are still required.

The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’. The site is allocated for ‘Mixed use redevelopment incorporating public car park, new leisure facilities including a swimming pool and other community facilities, healthcare facility, creative and cultural industries enterprise centre, retail or residential accommodation’.

The report should explicitly mention that any redevelopment should include a public pool facility; a loss of this facility would be retrograde and contravene Strategic Objective 7 (foster safe, healthy and cohesive communities).

Support Telephone exchange 88 – 90 Brighton Road-We accept its conversion to residential if existing use is not required any more.

I wish to add my objections made on this document by our local M.P. Chris Philp.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Object/Comment</th>
<th>DM40.4</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3162/01/005/</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>Mr Joe Toner</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I would like to voice my objection to the following plan DM40.4.</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The objection is not substantiated, (no reason given), so the Council is unable to respond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3322/01/004/</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>Mr Richard Driver</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I should like to make it known that I object to this which is included in the recently published Local Plan.</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>There is insufficient information to consider this comment further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3577/01/006/</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>Mr Peter West</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to Policy 40.4 table 11.3 - All of the above are unacceptable to me as a Sanderstead resident for the last 25 years. We need space and sensible development that compliments the environment. I entirely agree with all the points that our member of Parliament has suggested.</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>This allocation sets out that residential development is acceptable in principle. Any planning application for this site will be assessed against the Local Plan planning policies, which include an assessment on the local environment and character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0065/03/001/</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>Mr Michael Barnett</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The GLA density matrix has identified that this site has capacity to provide between 172 to 900 homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0320/01/028/</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>Mr Tarsem Flora</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>TESCO Almost all local and adjoining Residents Associations objected very strongly to the previous Tesco scheme for a multi-storey redevelopment of the site some 10 years ago. The local community will NOT accept similar application and will strongly object. Is it really necessary to set a policy on this site? The previous application was withdrawn by Tesco in view of the serious concerns expressed by PWRA and other associations in adjoining areas.</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The site is considered to be under-developed and could accommodate both a retail store and much needed new homes during the lifetime of the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Network Rail notes that there are a number of sites adjacent to the Railway and attach a standard response which sets out the issues that need to be considered. In particular with large new developments there is a concern about the risk of trespass and all new developments should have proper and suitable boundary fencing. The risk of greater flooding and drainage that new developments could potentially have on the Network Rail infrastructure and we would not want any increase of flooding or the increase in run off onto Railway Infrastructure.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not:
- encroach onto Network Rail land
- affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company’s railway and its infrastructure
- undermine its support zone
- damage the company’s infrastructure
- place additional load on outbuildings
- adversely affect any railway land or structure
- over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land
- cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future

The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail’s adjoining land.

**Future maintenance**

The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant’s land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail’s adjacent land and air-space, and therefore all future building should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail’s boundary. The reason for the 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant. Any...
less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works. The applicant / resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer, the applicant / resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. all possession costs, all site safety costs, all asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard-against Network Rail’s boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction / maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary with Network Rail will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams’ ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.

Drainage

Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail’s property or into Network Rail’s culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail’s property. Full details to be provided to Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer for approval. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail’s existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near/within 10 – 20 metres of Network Rail’s boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property. After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to drainage must be solved by the applicant at their expense.

Plant & Materials

All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail’s property, must at all times be carried out in a “fail safe” manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are a hazard to Network Rail’s property or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property.
capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.

Scaffolding
Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant’s contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail’s existing fencing/wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail’s boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers’ vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling
arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer’s approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration
The potential for any noise/vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which hold relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night time train running and heavy freight trains.

Vehicle Incursion
Where a proposal calls for hard standing area/parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionSussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.asp.

What is this all about? Admittedly it’s some way off, but it’s difficult to comment without some clarification! Are we anticipating that in some 10 years’ time Tesco’s will pull out & leave us with a large virgin housing site – a rather tenuous assumption I would have thought - or are we back with the idea, soundly trounced by the community a few years ago, to build massive high-rise housing over the existing supermarket & parking - which would still be a very bad proposal.

The allocation should be clearer on what is proposed for this site.

The allocation sets out the preferred uses if this site was to be redeveloped. There is currently no developer interest for this site so the Council would need to work with this landowner to bring the site forward.
2789/01/003/DM40.4/C R P Reed Comment DM40.4 347 There is potential for housing development on this site, but up to 990 units is totally unrealistic. The proposed maximum should be greatly reduced in order that:-- The residents of the proposed housing have a decent quality of life-- Tesco’s business is unaffected-- the impact of this development on the surrounding area is minimised No change The allocation sets out the preferred uses if this site was to be redeveloped. There is currently no developer interest for this site so the Council would need to work with this landowner to bring the site forward. The impact of the development on the surrounding area and on future occupiers would be assessed with any planning application.

2982/01/006/DM40.4/O Mrs Jeanne Driscoll Object DM40.4 347 I wish to add my objections made on this document by our local M.P. Chris Philp. No change This comment has not been substantiated so no changes can be made.

3102/01/004/DM40.4/O Mr Richard Horton Object DM40.4 347 3. The plan I have seen appears to envisage the closure or redevelopment of the Tesco retail store. I cannot understand why this should be part of the plans (just as I cannot understand why similar proposals appear in relation to supermarkets at Waddon such as Morrisons and Sainsbury’s). The Tesco store is used extensively by local residents. No change There are currently no plans to close the existing Tesco store. However, the site has been identified as being suitable for residential if the landowner wanted to redevelop the site within the lifetime of the Croydon Local Plan.

3162/01/006/DM40.4/O Mr Joe Toner Object DM40.4 347 I would like to voice my objection to the following plan DM40.4. No change The objection is not substantiated, (no reason given), so the Council is unable to respond.

3322/01/005/DM40.4/O Mr Richard Driver Object DM40.4 347 I should like to make it known that I object to this which is included in the recently published Local Plan. No change There is insufficient information to consider this comment further.

3430/01/005/DM40.4/O Mr Donald Speakman Object Soundness - Effective DM40.4 347 Site 347: The document refers to a range of 172-990 homes on this site - even 172 is excessive, and 990 is totally unacceptable. For ANY housing development on this site, it would be necessary to have several floors of underground parking, with risk of flooding due to the river Bourne being nearby. Also, remove reference to possible healthcare facility; Purley Hospital site and the clinic in Whyteleafe Rd S are in the immediate vicinity. No change The site is considered to be under-developed and could accommodate both a retail store and much needed new homes during the lifetime of the Local Plan. 990 homes is the upper end of an indicative range for the site. It is unlikely that it would be developed to that level and all proposals would still need to be assessed against other policies of the Local Plan.

3577/01/007/DM40.4/O Mr Peter West Object DM40.4 347 I object to Policy 40.4 table 11.3 - All of the above are unacceptable to me as a Sanderstead resident for the last 25 years. We need space and sensible development that compliments the environment. I totally agree with all the point that our member of Parliament has suggested. No change This allocation sets out that mixed use development is acceptable in principle. Any planning application for this site will be assessed against the Local Plan planning policies, which include an assessment on the local environment and character.
4117/01/019/DM40.4/0 Cllr S Brew

Object DM40.4 347

Site 347: The document refers to a range of 172-990 homes on this site - even 172 is excessive, and 990 is totally unacceptable. For ANY housing development on this site, it would be necessary to have several floors of underground parking, with risk of flooding due to the river Bourne being nearby. Also, remove reference to possible healthcare facility: Purley Hospital site and the clinic in Whytecliffe Rd S are in the immediate vicinity.

No change The GLA density matrix has identified this site as having capacity for between 172 to 900 new homes. The exact number of homes would be assessed once a planning application was submitted. Parking provision would need to be in accordance with London Plan and Local Plan policies. The NHS have identified that additional healthcare facilities in the Purley GP network are required and this site could contribute to this need.

0094/02001/DM40.4/0 Mr Ken Whittick

Object DM40.4 35

1) I strongly oppose this policy on the grounds that the erection of a building of 15 storeys in Purley is entirely out of character with Purley
2) CLP1 itself describes Purley as a market town. A building of this height is out of keeping with a market town.
3) Parts of Purley (High Street, west side) are designated as heritage sites. Again, out of keeping.
4) The owners (The Baptist Church) are against a development of this height. They were threatened by a politician that a CPO would be raised (later withdrawn) if they did not agree.
5) The Baptist web site declares that the council expect this to be a one off for Purley. Is this believable or enforceable or will the next block be only 13 storeys?
6) CLP2 says a building of this size fits in well. Local architects say otherwise.

No change The allocation for mixed use redevelopment is acceptable for this site. The height of the building relates to policy DM40.1.
I am not against development on a scale that is in keeping with the nature of the town's surroundings, but the size of some of the planned buildings horrifies me and, if enacted, will totally alter the nature of Purley. A 16-storey block of flats situated on the Baptist Church will be 3 times taller than any other building in Purley. Children living there will be imprisoned in a giant roundabout with no outside space.

Apart from the scale of the proposed developments, my main concern is over parking. Whilst it may be acceptable for inner London residents to live without cars and rely on public transport, this will not work in outer London towns like Purley. The Baptist Church/Banstead Road development will have 200 dwellings with 38 parking spaces. This will not deter residents from having cars and they will simply be parked in the surrounding roads to the detriment of the quality of life of the existing homeowners. And the presumption is that all other developments in Purley will have similar car parking to dwelling ratios that will exacerbate this problem throughout the town.

No change

The allocation for mixed use redevelopment is acceptable for this site. The height of the building relates to policy DM40.1.
My husband and I attended the consultation meeting at the Purley Baptist Church on the 8th December and we both felt that plans on show and the information given on what precisely was being proposed was vague to say the least, and the council staff were not able to clarify the details included in the information concerning such things as the amount of social housing, etc. Nor was there any copies of the plans which people could take away in order to be able to study them, and thereby understand what was being proposed. Also whereas the council has had up to two years to come up with these proposals, we have been given a very limited time to make any objections to them, that is ten days after the meeting, the 18th of December, hardly sufficient time given the paucity of information offered.

Nonetheless, there was an indication that the height of the proposed plan on this site would be in the order of sixteen stories.

My husband and I feel very strongly that this is entirely out of keeping with the area hardly in line with your description of Purley being a "market town located on wooded hillsides and in the valley". Purley is not London where skyscrapers are totally acceptable or even Croydon where a profusion of skyscrapers exist. If this is built it will open up the floodgates for further buildings completely changing the character of Purley.

Purley also has massive traffic problems, which will not be helped by a building of this size. Let us also not forget that Purley also suffers from flooding problems as its sits on the sight of the Bourne, and a large site like this will only make matters worse.

Places of Croydon-PURLEY

We accept the fact that the council recommends major residential growth in the district centre with high quality development that will respect the existing residential character and local distinctiveness.

If the above is to form the Council's policy, how is it likely to support 7 stories affordable housing on the opposite side of the Baptist Church proposals. This will be completely out of CHARACTER with the surrounding.
Policy DM40.1 (p166) says that a skyscraper of 16 floors can be built in the centre of Purley. A skyscraper of 16 floors will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of Purley town centre which is no higher than 5 floors.

No change

The allocation for mixed use redevelopment is acceptable for this site. The height of the building relates to policy DM40.1.

A large number of the sites allocated for development through Detailed Policies and Proposals may result in the loss of green space. This appears to run counter to the Borough’s Strategic Objective 10 (The need to utilise brownfield areas first) and could be replaced with a goal to promote good quality high density developments that protect Croydon’s green spaces. Even undesignated green spaces provide important ecosystem services to Croydon’s growing population.

The Council should provide additional text in these policies to encourage developers to propose good quality, high density developments which promote the protection and enhancement of green space.

No change

This allocation would not result in the loss of open space.

I am pleased to see the new plan regularising its landmark high-rise feature.

Welcome support

This site is clearly ripe for development and the approach is sensible. In order to fit the quantity of housing onto this site I understand that it may be proposed to construct a tall building. Any such building should conform to the rule set out in DM15.1c. The design should be of exceptional quality and demonstrate that a sensitive approach has been taken to articulation and composition of the building which is proportionate to its scale.

No change

Any future development would be subject to all relevant policies in the Strategic Policies and Detailed Policies.

I object to the Purley Skyscraper development on the grounds it does not fit with the local area, its location on what is an already congested road layout, too high local area is around 5 floors in the main maximum and will not improve the local area for the better.

No change

The allocation for mixed use redevelopment is acceptable for this site. The height of the building relates to policy DM40.1.

I totally oppose this development. A skyscraper of 16 floors will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of Purley town centre which is no higher than 5 floors.

No change

The allocation for mixed use redevelopment is acceptable for this site. The height of the building relates to policy DM40.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM40.4 35</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2906/03/001/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Gerald Smith</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4 35</td>
<td>Do you think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 37 - No it remains to be seen if objections are taken into account. Do you think that the preferred approach is deliverable-? No the onus for this is on the council.Is it sustainable? See response below. How can you possibly give approval to such a monstrosity being built in the centre of Purley? Not only will it look totally out of place but it will destroy the appearance of the town centre. If one such structure is allowed how long will it be before more are built. This proposal should be buried and forgotten. No change The allocation for mixed use redevelopment is acceptable for this site. The height of the building relates to policy DM40.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2982/01/007/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Jeanne Driscoll</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4 35</td>
<td>I wish to add my objections made on this document by our local M.P. Chris Philp. No change The allocation for mixed use redevelopment is acceptable for this site. The height of the building relates to policy DM40.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3081/01/002/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr John Morgan</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4 35</td>
<td>Policy DM40.1 (p166) allowing construction of a skyscraper of 16 floors in the centre of Purley. No change The allocation for mixed use redevelopment is acceptable for this site. The height of the building relates to policy DM40.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3162/01/007/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Joe Toner</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4 35</td>
<td>I would like to voice my object to the following plan DM40.4. No change The allocation for mixed use redevelopment is acceptable for this site. The height of the building relates to policy DM40.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3164/01/002/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Jenny White</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4 35</td>
<td>I don’t want a skyscraper built in Purley, it will totally change the look of the place. I see no need for it. No change The allocation for mixed use redevelopment is acceptable for this site. The height of the building relates to policy DM40.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3166/01/002/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Maria Linford</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4 35</td>
<td>The high rise tower block in Purley is ridiculous how do people cross the road and where will they park. They can’t open a window as all they will get is car fumes instead of fresh air it is a death trap as they have no where to go in case of an emergency. No change The allocation for mixed use redevelopment is acceptable for this site. The height of the building relates to policy DM40.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3281/01/002/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr William Wheeler</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4 35</td>
<td>The erection of a 16 storey building in the centre of Purley would indeed be a ‘monstrous carbuncle’ where no other building exceeds 5 storeys and would be entirely out of keeping with the character of the area. Such a building as proposed would give a green light to similar developments in Purley which would soon resemble central Croydon. No change The allocation for mixed use redevelopment is acceptable for this site. The height of the building relates to policy DM40.1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Richard Driver: I should like to make it known that I object to this which is included in the recently published Local Plan.

Rosemary Wiseman: Purley Skyscraper development - absolute unacceptable. Will change the whole face of Purley and cause enormous traffic problems in an already congested area.

Mr Peter West: I object to Policy 40.4 table 11.3 - All of the above are unacceptable to me as a Sanderstead resident for the last 25 years. We need space and sensible development that compliments the environment. I totally agree with all the point that our member of Parliament has suggested.

Noemi Molloy: A 16 floor building in Purley would be totally out of character and is completely out of keeping with the rest of the town centre.

Mr J Logan: I am horrified at the idea of an eyesore being erected in the centre of Purley, which would be totally out of keeping with the character of the town.

Mr & Mrs Mott: I object to this policy.

Jay Luthra: Objects to the plan - the ridiculous Purley Skyscraper appears to have been thought up by lunatics.

Pauline Morgan: Policy DM40.1 (p166) allowing construction of a skyscraper of 16 floors in the centre of Purley.

Cllr M Neal: Policy DM40.1 should not allow for up to 16 storeys as it will completely change the character of Purley town centre and is wholly out of keeping with the rest of the town centre which is no higher than 5 storeys;

Valerie Wilshaw: I object to the proposal.
4092/01/006/DM40.4/O Valerie Wilshaw: Object DM40.4
35
I object to the proposal. No change
The allocation for mixed use redevelopment is acceptable for this site. The height of the building relates to policy DM40.1.

4716/01/002/DM40.4/O Rachel Marland: Object DM40.4
35
Policy DM40 - No Purley skyscraper please and as the petition shows no one want this.
No change
The allocation for mixed use redevelopment is acceptable for this site. The height of the building relates to policy DM40.1.

2982/01/008/DM40.4/O Mrs Jeanne Driscoll: Object DM40.4
405
I wish to add my objections made on this document by our local M.P. Chris Philp.
No change
This comment has not been substantiated so no changes can be made.

3162/01/008/DM40.4/O Mr Joe Toner: Object DM40.4
405
I would like to voice my objection to the following plan DM40.4.
No change
The objection is not substantiated, (no reason given), so the Council is unable to respond.

3320/01/007/DM40.4/O Mr Richard Driverr: Object DM40.4
405
I should like to make it known that I object to this which is included in the recently published Local Plan.
No change
There is insufficient information to consider this comment further.

3577/01/006/DM40.4/O Mr Peter West: Object DM40.4
405
I object to Policy 40.4 table 11.3 - All of the above are unacceptable to me as a Sanderstead resident for the last 25 years. We need space and sensible development that compliments the environment. I totally agree with all the point that our member of Parliament has suggested.
No change
This allocation sets out that residential development is acceptable in principle. Any planning application for this site will be assessed against the Local Plan planning policies, which include an assessment on the local environment and character.

2982/01/009/DM40.4/O Mrs Jeanne Driscoll: Object DM40.4
409
I wish to add my objections made on this document by our local M.P. Chris Philp.
No change
This comment has not been substantiated so no changes can be made.

3162/01/009/DM40.4/O Mr Joe Toner: Object DM40.4
409
I would like to voice my objection to the following plan DM40.4.
No change
The objection is not substantiated, (no reason given), so the Council is unable to respond.

3320/01/008/DM40.4/O Mr Richard Driverr: Object DM40.4
409
I should like to make it known that I object to this which is included in the recently published Local Plan.
No change
There is insufficient information to consider this comment further.

3577/01/010/DM40.4/O Mr Peter West: Object DM40.4
409
I object to Policy 40.4 table 11.3 - All of the above are unacceptable to me as a Sanderstead resident for the last 25 years. We need space and sensible development that compliments the environment. I totally agree with all the point that our member of Parliament has suggested.
No change
This allocation sets out that residential development is acceptable in principle. Any planning application for this site will be assessed against the Local Plan planning policies, which include an assessment on the local environment and character.

2982/01/010/DM40.4/O Mrs Jeanne Driscoll: Object DM40.4
410
I wish to add my objections made on this document by our local M.P. Chris Philp.
No change
This comment has not been substantiated so no changes can be made.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3162/01/010/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Joe Toner</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>I would like to voice my object to the following plan DM40.4.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3322/01/008/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Richard Driver</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>I should like to make it known that I object to this which is included in the recently published Local Plan.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3577/01/011/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Peter West</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>I object to Policy 40.4 table 11.3 - All of the above are unacceptable to me as a Sanderstead resident for the last 25 years. We need space and sensible development that compliments the environment. I totally agree with all the point that our member of Parliament has suggested.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2962/01/011/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Jeanne Driscoll</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>I wish to add my objections made on this document by our local M.P. Chris Philip.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3162/01/011/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Joe Toner</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>I would like to voice my object to the following plan DM40.4.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3322/01/010/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Richard Driver</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>I should like to make it known that I object to this which is included in the recently published Local Plan.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3430/01/006/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Donald Speakman</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective DM40.4</td>
<td>Site 411: Many local offices have been converted to residential. Surely we need to retain some offices? This is easy walking distance to town centre.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3577/01/012/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Peter West</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>I object to Policy 40.4 table 11.3 - All of the above are unacceptable to me as a Sanderstead resident for the last 25 years. We need space and sensible development that compliments the environment. I totally agree with all the point that our member of Parliament has suggested.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4117/01/020/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Cllr S Brew</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>Site 411: Many local offices have been converted to residential. Surely we need to retain some offices? This is easy walking distance to town centre.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Directors of Christchurch Road Residents' Association Ltd. have asked me to write to you with regard to the above proposals regarding Palmerston House.

For your reference Park View was built in 1976 and has 18 flats with parking places and garages for each flat. Palmerston House was acquired subsequently. There are only a few parking spaces in front of their offices for their staff and we allow the overflow to park in our spaces during the week only.

We have a brick built refuse area housing our 3 bins provided by the Council together with a food bin which is outside due to lack of space. We have allowed Palmerston House to have 2 bins for their refuse which is only just viable and any additional use would be impossible due to the limitations of the interior space.

Vehicle access to Park View and Palmerston House is via a single track which refuse collection vehicles only just manage to negotiate and any increase in use would not be possible. Other access to the site is not possible due to the lay of the land. Past investigations have established that this area lies in a flood plain and drainage problems would occur should there be an increased usage.

Finally we wish to record the above concerns against a change of usage of Palmerston House should they be proposed at any time in the future.

No change

The comments are noted and it is recognised that the issues raised may affect the deliverability of the site. However, in principle, the residential use of the site is acceptable and so no change is proposed.

The comment is noted. The Local Plan includes a policy on impact on health that will need to be considered in any detailed plans for this site.
| Object | Soundness - Justified | DM40.4 490 | The proposal for a primary school on the car park on Brighton Road is inappropriate for the following reasons:
- There is no suitable parking place for those who would need/wish to bring and/or collect children to/from the school. Brighton Road is a very busy A road and there are insufficient local parking opportunities.
- The removal of parking provision would be detrimental to the sustainability of the shops and other commercial premises on the opposite side of Brighton Road. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>This site has been required to meet the need for school places in the borough. The impact on traffic and parking would be assessed at a planning application where there are options for a school to be a car free development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Network Rail notes that there are a number of sites adjacent to the Railway and attach a standard response which sets out the issues that need to be considered. In particular with large new developments there is a concern about the risk of trespass and all new developments should have proper and suitable boundary fencing. The risk of greater flooding and drainage that new developments could potentially have on the Network Rail infrastructure and we would not want any increase of flooding or the increase in run off onto Railway Infrastructure.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not:
- encroach onto Network Rail land
- affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company's railway and its infrastructure
- undermine its support zone
- damage the company's infrastructure
- place additional load on outbuildings
- adversely affect any railway land or structure
- over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land
- cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future

The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail's adjoining land.

Future maintenance
The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant's land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail's adjacent land and air-space, and therefore all new buildings should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail's boundary. The reason for the 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant. Any

No change

Any development proposals for the site would be subject to consultation and Network Rail would be consulted as required.
less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works. The applicant / resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer, the applicant / resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. all possession costs, all site safety costs, all asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard-against Network Rail’s boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction / maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary with Network Rail will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams’ ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.

Drainage

Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail’s property or into Network Rail’s culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail’s property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail’s property; full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail’s existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near within 10 – 20 metres of Network Rail’s boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property.

After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants’ expense.

Plant & Materials

All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail’s property, must at all times be carried out in a “fail safe” manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are
capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.

Scaffolding
Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant’s contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass-proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail’s existing fencing/wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail’s boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers’ vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling
arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer’s approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration
The potential for any noise/vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which hold relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night time train running and heavy freight trains.

Vehicle Incursion
Where a proposal calls for hard standing area/parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionSussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.asp.

2635/01/026/DM40.4/O Paul Sandford
Bourne Society

Object

DM40.4
490

Ref 7.59 detailed policies: A new Primary School at this location on Brighton Road is ill considered. The site should better be assigned to housing with any new primary school located off main roads, with access to both parents obliged to use cars and those arriving by foot or public transport. In this case, an expansion of Woodcote Primary should be considered first.

No change

An extensive site search has identified that this is the only suitable site (in terms of size and location) within the urban area in the south west of the borough to build a new primary school.

2781/01/002/DM40.4/O Graham Bass

Object

DM40.4
490

The site should (as has been toyed with in the past) be enlarged to take in the under-exploited properties along that end of Old Lodge Lane. This would create an area large enough for both the proposed primary school and our 25m. pool/gym. Not only would this take advantage of the site’s excellent accessibility (train, bus, car) for the whole of the south of the borough, but be an excellent synergistic fit, school & pool.

The site should be extended to include the properties at the end of Old Lodge Lane and should provide a 25m pool/gym in addition to the primary school.

No change

The comment is noted. The site is allocated for a primary school use and the site includes three adjacent properties to the south of the car park. No land owner came forward to the Council with any additions to the site through the Call for Sites process.
Support

An excellent idea to use this large, vacant site for a much-needed school. Surely there would be space to incorporate a 25 metre public swimming pool into this development, which would take the pressure off Ref 30. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Plan, otherwise I think that the majority of the proposals are sensible given the great need for additional housing.

Welcome support

The school is not large enough to accommodate both a swimming pool and primary school. The site allocation for Purley Pool (site 30) sets out the requirement for a swimming pool as part of any redevelopment.
Parham Holdings Ltd

Object DM40.4 490

The purpose of this submission is to present an argument in response to the identification in Table 11.13 of the Subject Document of site 490, No. 95-111 Brighton Road, Purley ('the Subject Site') as a preferred use as a primary school, and instead to promote it as a preferred site for mixed uses including residential dwellings. There was a previous planning application for 08/03343 proposed the demolition of existing buildings; erection of 1 x six/seven storey building and 1 x six storey building comprising a total of 100 one bedroom, 81 two bedroom and 8 three bedroom flats; the formation of a 100 space parking area for commercial premises opposite and associated parking for flats with vehicular access road onto Brighton Road. The application was refused on the grounds that the proposed massing, bulk and scale was an overdevelopment of the site. The NPPF introduced a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. In response to the increase in London Borough of Croydon’s (LBC) existing housing requirements as directed by the Further Alterations to the London Plan (2014), the Subject Document has allocated certain sites for mixed use/residential development in order to ensure that the borough's housing land remains in surplus. It includes the identification of sites for future development within Section 11 - The Places of Croydon. Despite the Subject Site not having been identified as a preferred option for mixed uses, the intention for the land within the vicinity of Reedham Station as specified in policy DM40.2 of the Subject Document Environs of Reedham Station lends weight to the potential development of residential and mixed commercial developments, detailing: ‘In the environs of Reedham Station, to create the sense of place and facilitate growth proposals should:

a. Complement the existing predominant building heights of 2 storeys up to a maximum of 4 storeys;
b. Reinforce the predominant building lines and frontages which positively respond to the form of the Brighton Road/Old Lodge Lane junction;
c. Improve the pedestrian and cycle permeability, accessibility and connectivity across the railway between Brighton Road, Watney Close, Aveling Close and Fairbairn Close; and
d. Enhance the suburban shopping

The site should be allocated for mixed use, including residential.

No change The site is required to meet the need for primary school places in the south of the borough and will continue to be allocated for a primary school due to the unsuitability of 112 Brighton Road.
Although development of the site is yet to reach a conceptual design stage, it is evident that any future mixed uses scheme can integrate the above requirements within its design. The Subject Site has a total area of 0.83ha. This would permit in excess of 10 homes. Given the size of the Subject Site it is considered that there is also sufficient capacity to accommodate mixed uses including 3 bedroom dwellings (which are preferred for sustainable development under policy DM 1 of the Subject Document). There are no site specific policies currently relevant to the Subject Site that would prevent future mixed uses development. Moreover, the construction of mixed uses development on the Subject Site would fulfil the relevant national and local planning policies. The Draft Housing and Planning Bill 2015-2016 (The Bill) is currently at the debate stage. One of the primary objectives of The Bill is to provide starter homes for first time buyers. Potential development of the Subject Site would help facilitate an opportunity for LBC to meet any future starter home requirements likely to be directed from central Government following adoption of The Bill. There is capacity for the Subject Site to support 2 to 4 storey developments and therefore complement the existing surrounds recognised in part (a) of Policy DM 40.2 of the Subject Document. In keeping with part (c) of Policy DM 40.2, there is scope to incorporate pedestrian and cycle permeability between Reedham Station and Brighton Road, which unlike a primary school use would provide ‘casual surveillance’ throughout the day. There is additionally the potential to revive mixed uses on the Brighton Road frontage thereby upholding part (c) of policy DM 40.2, which seeks to enhance the character and vitality of the suburban area. The site is partially subject to a Network Rail Exclusion Zone. However this only affects a minor part of the Subject Site and it will not prevent future development. As maintained throughout this representation, the development of the site for mixed uses would assist the LBC in meeting its need for new housing. However an assessment to permit the Subject Site to be developed for alternative uses may not be undertaken until as late as 2021. Restricting the potential redevelopment of the Subject Site for a further six years would lead to stagnation and a blight on its area character of this section of Brighton Road.
potential while the uncertainty could be detrimental to the local community. The Subject Site comprises a developed area on brownfield land. Local bus links directly in front of the Subject Site allow easy access to wider public transport links at Purley and Easy Croydon. The Subject Site is prime for mixed uses development and would provide strengthened economic development. It is our view that mixed uses would improve the existing underused Subject Site and present a tremendous opportunity to create a range of high-quality, well-designed commercial uses, houses and apartments with associated amenities that create a desirable standard of living.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2982/01/01/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Jeanne Driscoll</td>
<td>DM40.4 490</td>
<td>I wish to add my objections made on this document by our local M.P Chris Philp.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3162/01/01/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Joe Toner</td>
<td>DM40.4 490</td>
<td>I would like to voice my objection to the following plan DM40.4.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With reference to the Local Plan which has been proposed, please note my objection to the following policies:

- Garden Grabbing
- Policy DM2
- Purley Skyscraper authorisation
- Policy DM40.1
- Purley Pool
- Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30
- Purley Parking
- Policy 40.4, Table 11.3.
- Sanderstead “Lidl” Site
- Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306
- Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane, next to Coombe Wood Gardens
- Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661
- Loss of Green Belt – (1) Coombe Playing Fields, (2) Croham Hurst, (3) Sanderstead Plantation
- The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662
- Lack of Parking in new developments
- Policy DM28
- More Protection; Less “Intensification”
- Policy DM31.4

No change

There is insufficient information to consider this comment further.

The sites at 1-19 Old Lodge Lane is in different ownership meaning there would be land assembly issues making the site difficult to deliver. As an out of centre site it is not a preferred location for a leisure centre.

This allocation sets out that a primary school is acceptable in principle. Any planning application for this site will be assessed against the Local Plan planning policies, which include an assessment on the local environment and character.
4117/01/021/DM40.4/0 Cllr S Brew Object DM40.4 490 Site 490: I would prefer to see this site expanded to include properties 1-19 Old Lodge Lane, possibly also up to railway bridge. The enlarged site could then be used for new leisure centre to include 25M pool and associated parking, as well as new primary school. If school is not required, then still build leisure centre with parking facility, open it before old one (site 30) closes, and use rest of site 490 for residential. No change The sites at 1-19 Old Lodge Lane is in different ownership meaning there would be land assembly issues making the site difficult to deliver. As an out of centre site it is not a preferred location for a leisure centre.

2982/01/013/DM40.4/0 Mrs Jeanne Driscoll Object DM40.4 495 I wish to add my objections made on this document by our local M.P. Chris Philp. No change This comment has not been substantiated so no changes can be made.

3162/01/013/DM40.4/0 Mr Joe Toner Object DM40.4 495 I would like to voice my object to the following plan DM40.4. No change The objection is not substantiated, (no reason given), so the Council is unable to respond.

3322/01/012/DM40.4/0 Mr Richard Driver Object DM40.4 495 I should like to make it known that I object to this which is included in the recently published Local Plan. No change There is insufficient information to consider this comment further.

3577/01/014/DM40.4/0 Mr Peter West Object DM40.4 495 I object to Policy 40.4 table 11.3 - All of the above are unacceptable to me as a Sanderstead resident for the last 25 years. We need space and sensible development that compliments the environment. I totally agree with all the point that our member of Parliament has suggested. No change This allocation sets out that residential development is acceptable in principle. Any planning application for this site will be assessed against the Local Plan planning policies, which include an assessment on the local environment and character.

0092/02/015/DM40.4/0 Riddlesdown Residents Associatio Object DM40.4 61 The car park at 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South is being re-designated as residential. Given the parking problems in Purley town centre, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park. This in turn could add additional parking issues in the streets close to Riddlesdown station, as an alternative for commuters to park. The site should retain as many car parking spaces as there are now. Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

0117/02/003/DM40.4/0 Mr Richard Applebee Object Soundness - Justified DM40.4 61 The Council seems to have no clear cut policy to accommodate commuter parking. Development of the car park in Whytecliffe Road would remove parking access to Purley Station and create further problems with parking in residential roads. Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

0145/02/002/DM40.4/0 Mr BI Tubb Object DM40.4 61 Also the existing multi storey car park should be raised by at least another three stories to keep pace with the parking requirement in this part of the Borough. Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0185/02/03/DM40.4/01</td>
<td>Mrs Valerie Hunter</td>
<td>DM40.4 61</td>
<td>Car Parking</td>
<td>Keeping a car park of substantial size is also essential for the survival of Purley shops. The chance is getting a space in the few on-street places available is unlikely. Many people do not live near a bus stop, have mobility problems, or several young children, and cannot use a bus - or even need to go to Purley Hospital with its many increased clinics etc but limited parking. A nearby car park is essential. Therefore both Purley Pool and car park should be kept open - and MUST be part of any future development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0320/01/026/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Tarsem Flora Flora Associates</td>
<td>DM40.4 61</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Car Park - 54-58 Whytecliff Road South-PWRA accepts the policy to redevelop this site into housing but wish to stress that the existing parking provision is not significantly reduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1788/01/004/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Alice Desira</td>
<td>DM40.4 61</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168). This car park at 54-58 Whytecliff Road South is being re-designated as residential. It is bad enough trying to find parking in Purley without getting rid of the multi-storey car park. When the red-route was introduced in Purley most of the shops went out of business. Thankfully the council introduced the half hour free parking bays and Purley has started to see new shops opening and surviving, however there are not enough parking bays and people use the multi-storey car park when the bays are full. If you remove the multi-storey car park then people will just go elsewhere as you will revert back to the problem of people not being able to park and going elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Andrea Telman  
Object DM40.4 61  
I totally disagree to the following planning applications which would spoil the character of our local environment and threaten our green belt. I choose to live in an area that is peaceful and quiet and resent the changes that are being forced upon me. In the spirit of true democracy I wish to make clear my objection to the following developments - Policy DM2 (p18); Policy DM40.1 (p165); Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168); Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168); Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 308 (p171); Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 (p179); Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179); Policy DM28 (p115-116); Policy DM35, Table 11.8, Site 945 (p146); and Policy DM31.4 (p126).  
Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Carly Litchfield  
Object DM40.4 61  
Any new scheme should have at least as many public car parking spaces as the current car park.  
Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Christine Cafferkey  
Object DM40.4 61  
Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168). This car park at 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South is being re-designated as residential. Given the parking problems in Purley town centre, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.  
Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Mrs A L Winkley  
Object DM40.4 61  
I object to Policy 40.4 table 11.3, site 61.  
Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Brian Matthews  
Object DM40.4 61  
Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168). Given the parking problems in Purley town centre, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.  
Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Chris Sleight  
Object DM40.4 61  
You are re-designating a vital commuter car park as residential?? Have you not seen what damage closing a major car park can do to a town centre?  
Given the parking problems in Purley town centre, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.  
Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

David Smith  
Object DM40.4 61  
Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 states that the car park at 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South is being re-designated as residential. Given the parking problems in Purley town centre, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.  
Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.
Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 states that the car park at 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South is being re-designated as residential. Given the parking problems in Purley town centre, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.

Given the parking problems in Purley town centre, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.

DM40.4 61

Change

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Object Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168). This car park at 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South is being re-designated as residential. Given the parking problems in Purley town centre, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park. I totally and strongly oppose this proposal unless it includes public parking for no smaller capacity than now.

DM40.4 61

Change

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Object We would make the following objections to the proposed Draft Local Plan which is a poorly disguised attack on the southern part of the Borough

Policy DM40.4, table 11.3 Site 61

DM40.4 61

Change

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Object Purley Parking

Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168). This car park at 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South is being re-designated as residential. Given the parking problems in Purley town centre, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.

DM40.4 61

Change

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Object There is little enough parking in Purley at the present time and especially now on the reduced High Street facility and around the Station. What parking there is totally controlled so the Council should consider carefully the closing of the public Whytecliffe Road Car Park.

The car park should not be closed.

DM40.4 61

Change

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Object Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168). This car park at 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South is being re-designated as residential. Given the parking problems in Purley town centre, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.

DM40.4 61

Change

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Object Soundness - Effective

Site 61, Car Park, 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South. Whilst the site is re-designated as residential, any new schemes should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.

DM40.4 61

Change

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.
The provision of sensible parking options is essential for improving traffic flow and encouraging use of local businesses. Not providing parking does not stop people owning or using cars. I am concerned that under Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 vital central parking capacity will be lost.

Should the site at 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South be re-designated as residential then any new scheme must have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168). The car park at 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South is essential to Purley. If the site is to be re-designated as residential any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.
Network Rail notes that there are a number of sites adjacent to the Railway and attach a standard response which sets out the issues that need to be considered. In particular with large new developments there is a concern about the risk of trespass and all new developments should have proper and suitable boundary fencing. The risk of greater flooding and drainage that new developments could potentially have on the Network Rail infrastructure and we would not want any increase of flooding or the increase in run off onto Railway Infrastructure.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not:
- encroach onto Network Rail land
- affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company’s railway and its infrastructure
- undermine its support zone
- damage the company’s infrastructure
- place additional load on outgoings
- adversely affect any railway land or structure
- over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land
- cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future

The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail’s adjoining land.

Future maintenance
The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant’s land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail’s adjacent land and air-space, and therefore all/any building should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail’s boundary. The reason for the 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant. Any
less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works. The applicant / resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer, the applicant / resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. all possession costs, all site safety costs, all asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard-against Network Rail’s boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction / maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary with Network Rail will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams’ ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.

Drainage
Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail’s property or into Network Rail’s culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail’s property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail’s property; full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail’s existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near within 10 – 20 metres of Network Rail’s boundary at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property. After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants' expense.

Plant & Materials
All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail’s property, must at all times be carried out in a “fail safe” manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are
capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.

Scaffolding
Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant’s contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail’s existing fencing/wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail’s boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling apparatus.
arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail's Asset Protection Engineer's approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration
The potential for any noise/vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which hold relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night time train running and heavy freight trains.

Vehicle Incursion
Where a proposal calls for hard standing area/parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionSussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.asp.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object/Comment</th>
<th>Policy/Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2365/01/002/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Ash Lewis</td>
<td>Policy DM40.4. Purley car park, a very valuable resource is to be re-designated as mixed residential/retail with car park. As half of the local bank and post office branches in the south of the borough have closed many of us are forced to go into Purley a lot more than we would like. Please, please make sure there is enough car parking spaces. There is certainly not enough parking on street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2448/01/038/DM40.4/C</td>
<td>Andy Stranack</td>
<td>Site 51, Car Park, 54-58 Whyteleffe Road South. Whilst the site is re-designated as residential, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object 61, Car Park, 54-58 Whyteleafe Road South. Whilst the site is redesignated as residential, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.

Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

In general the provision of sensible parking options is vital, both for improving traffic flow and encouraging use of local businesses and must be central to all future developments, both commercial and residential. Not providing parking does not stop people owning or using cars. In particular we are concerned that under Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 vital central parking capacity will be lost. Should the site at 54-58 Whyteleafe Road South be redesignated as residential then any new scheme must have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park. We understand that the current free parking in Purley town centre is to be removed - obviously the Council wants to finish off remaining businesses (possibly to build even greater numbers of skyscrapers). This is a retrograde step, and should be reversed at once. We strongly believe that just refusing to include parking within developments really does not stop a relatively large proportion of people buying and using cars. If current policies continue all streets in Purley centre and adjacent roads will just become permanent car parks for developments which don't include parking provision, making roads far less safe and clogging up traffic. We have noticed, since the parking charges in Purley Knoll were reduced, that we now have obvious commuter cars (mostly very large and expensive) using the road as very cheap parking. We are in general concerned about lack of provision of parking spaces in developments. If adequate space is incorporated, and preferably underground to retain maximum green spaces, then roads can be kept free of parked cars, particularly during busy commuting times, which will increase traffic flow, ease congestion and improve pollution and road safety.

Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2741/01/004/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Colin Dunk</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>There should be no net loss of public parking spaces to the town as a result of any redesignation. There is considerable pressure already on parking spaces in Purley, and proposal after proposal says nothing about maintaining the level of parking spaces, or contemplates relaxing parking place requirements of new developments. There is certainly no obvious ambition to improve the current situation. Opposed, unless the current public parking space provision in the town is guaranteed to be maintained or improved with specific, timescaled, projects.</td>
<td>Change: Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2775/01/038/DM40.4/C</td>
<td>Cllr Tim Pollard</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>Site 61, Car Park, 54-58 Whyteleafe Road South. Whilst the site is re-designated as residential, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.</td>
<td>Change: Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2776/01/038/DM40.4/C</td>
<td>Cllr Helen Pollard</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>Site 61, Car Park, 54-58 Whyteleafe Road South. Whilst the site is re-designated as residential, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.</td>
<td>Change: Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2781/01/004/DM40.4/S</td>
<td>Graham Bass</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Support a major residential development on this site. I am reminded of the tall buildings being proposed for Fairfield Phase 1, flanking &amp; masking the railway line. Given that the railway unattractively runs on an embankment, a well-designed high-rise development would be an asset to the appearance of the town. I suspect that the estimated number of homes is unduly low. A good supply of car parking would be prerequisite at least what we have today, to facilitate rail use, plus for residents.</td>
<td>Welcome support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2784/01/007/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Iain Waterson</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>If the car park at 54-58 Whyteleafe Road South is indeed re-designated as residential any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.</td>
<td>Change: Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2789/01/002/DM40.4/S</td>
<td>R P Reed</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>DM40.4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61: Carpark @ Whyteleafe Rd South. No objection to residential development, but it is essential that the station car park capacity is not adversely affected as Purley car parking is already minimal.</td>
<td>Change: Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parking is essential as car ownership increases and to reducing parking opportunities will drive shopper to out of town units resulting in empty high streets and loss of small shopkeepers.

The report should explicitly mention that any redevelopment should not reduce the number of public parking places, in fact, acknowledge a need to increase it. Purley already has a parking problem, with residential streets especially along Brighton Road being used by commuters. Purley is an important rail junction and is highly convenient for access to London as it incorporates both mainline services and two branch lines. Increasing population and growing employment opportunities in London will create increasing demands on these facilities further out.

The car park at 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South is being re-designated as residential why? Given the parking problems in Purley town centre, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park. Purley Station is very difficult to get to without a car. I oppose this change.

If you get rid of the pool/car park in Purley, you must replace it with equal car parking spaces & better pool. If you continue in this vein, my husband & I will move out of the area, to somewhere up North, where they plan things differently!! Your loss, our gain - pity, as this should be a really nice place to live, but you are definitely spoiling it.

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2841/01/025/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Cllr Vidhi Mohan</td>
<td>Site 61, Car Park, 54-58 Whyteleafe Road South. Whilst the site is re-designated as residential, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2842/01/038/DM40.4/C</td>
<td>Cllr Richard Chatterjee</td>
<td>Site 61, Car Park, 54-58 Whyteleafe Road South. Whilst the site is re-designated as residential, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2850/02/004/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Elizabeth Killick</td>
<td>ANY REDEVELOPMENT MUST HAVE CAR PARKING SPACES. PEOPLE ARE NOT GOING TO STOP OWNING CARS. LET US BE REAL.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2906/03/003/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Gerald Smith</td>
<td>Do you think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3? - No it remains to be seen if objections are taken into account. Do you think that the preferred approach is deliverable? - No the onus for this is on the council. Is it sustainable? See response below. If you designate the car park in Whyteleafe Road as residential where are the current users going to park? Redevelop yes- but do not reduce the number of spaces for the public to use.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2970/01/005/DM40.4/O Janet Dean Object DM40.4 61

I understand that the following Policies will threaten our green spaces. I was born in Croydon and have lived in this area all my life (I am now 63). My parents came here from Scotland in the early 1950s. They chose this area specifically for its green spaces and it is quite unique in that facility. I spent more than 35 years in Real Estate in this area and know very well that the reason people continue to move here, is exactly for these facilities and yet remaining within easy reach of other amenities, London, the coast and airports. Of course, more housing is required but I believe the alternative suggestions to these proposals to be very valid and much more in keeping with the neighbourhood thus maintaining its attractiveness and good standard.

These proposals are ill conceived and will change this particular neighbourhood beyond all recognition and take away that for which it is well known and valued. Please hear the voices of people like me and do NOT continue with the proposed policies set out below and which can be found in your Local Plan:

4. Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168).

2982/01/014/DM40.4/O Mrs Jeanne Driscoll Object DM40.4 61

I wish to add my objections made on this document by our local M.P. Chris Philp.

2987/01/004/DM40.4/O Mrs Jenny Andrews Object DM40.4 61

Soundness - Justified

As part of your consultations, please note my objections to the following in your Local Plan:

DM2, DM40, DM28, DM35, DM41.3, DM35, DM44.2, DM44.2 (11.17) Policy 40 (11.3), Policy 40.4 (11.3 site 61)

3003/01/005/DM40.4/O Mr John James Object DM40.4 61

I would like to register my objection to DM 40.4 Site 61 Purley Parking

3046/01/005/DM40.4/O Stephanie Lawson Object DM40.4 61

I object to this policy based on the existing parking problems in Purley and the fact that any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.

3075/01/007/DM40.4/O Mr Christopher Andrews Object DM40.4 61

It is proposed to re-designate the Whyteleffe Road car park as residential. Local Government plans must not reduce parking capacity under any pretext. Car usage is essential for local prosperity.
3081/01/004/DM40.4/O Mr John Morgan
Object DM40.4
61 Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168). This car park at 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South is being re-designated as residential. Any new development must provide the equivalent public parking.
Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

3091/01/004/DM40.4/O Mr Paul Gomm
Object DM40.4
61 please note my objection to the following policy reference numbers within your current draft plan for planning & development.
Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

3102/01/003/DM40.4/O Mr Richard Horton
Object DM40.4
61 2. It would appear that the long stay car park near the station is to be redeveloped with reduced car parking. This car park is the only long stay car park usable by commuters, of which there are large numbers. The designation of some spaces for the NHS has already put pressure on its capacity. Further reductions would be unreasonable.
Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

3162/01/014/DM40.4/O Mr Joe Toner
Object DM40.4
61 I would like to voice my object to the following plan DM40.4.
Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

3164/01/003/DM40.4/O Jenny White
Object DM40.4
61 The car park at Whytecliffe rd being re-designated as residential. There is very limited parking in Purley & this one should not go.
Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

3185/01/004/DM40.4/O Mr Stephen Woodward
Object DM40.4
61 We have lived in Sanderstead for over 40 years, and have thoroughly enjoyed the areas to the south of Croydon being unspoilt. In our view these ill conceived proposals will change this area beyond recognition and take away that for which it is well known and valued. Please rethink, and do not continue with the proposed policies set out below and which can be found in your Local Plan: Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168).
Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

3225/01/004/DM40.4/O Saundra Dudman
Object Soundness - Effective DM40.4
61 4) Policy 40.4 Table 11.3 Site 61 p168 Car park on 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South proposed re-designated residential. Parking is desperately short in this area.
Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

3234/01/005/DM40.4/O Mr Peter Newman
Object DM40.4
61 I specifically object to: 40.4 Whytecliffe Road car park. This rubbish strewn car park attests to another council failure to enforce proper standards of tidiness in the borough. Jeremy Paxman is not the only one depressed by our disgusting streets. Any development should duplicate the existing parking facilities and give respite to hard pressed local residents whose streets are parked out (both legally and illegally) by commuters on a daily basis.
Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM40.4</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3260/01/004/DM40.4/0</td>
<td>Wayne Starr Object Purley Parking. As above the parking facility should be maintained and improved for residents that find public transport impractical. The capacity should as a minimum be maintained for the use of all residents many of whom do not live on a public transport route or who find it impractical to use.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3275/01/004/DM40.4/0</td>
<td>Suzanne Connor Object With reference to the Local Plan which has been proposed, please note my objection to the following policies: Garden Grabbing Policy DM2 Purley Skyscraper authorisation Policy DM40.1 Purley Pool Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 Purley Parking Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Sanderstead &quot;Lidl&quot; Site Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306 Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane, next to Coombe Wood Gardens Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 Loss of Green Belt – (1) Coombe Playing Fields, (2) Croham Hurst, (3) Sanderstead Plantation The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 Lack of Parking in new developments Policy DM28 More Protection; Less “Intensification” Policy DM31.4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3281/01/003/DM40.4/0</td>
<td>Mr William Wheeler Object Any new leisure centre should include a swimming pool and should also retain the present number of parking spaces as at present because of the problem of parking in</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3316/01/004/DM40.4/0</td>
<td>Mr David Dudman Object Soundness - Effective 4) Policy 40.4 Table 11.3, Site 61 p168 Car park on 54-58 Whydah Road South proposed re-designated residential. Parking is desperately short in this area.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Ron Thomas
Object Soundness - Effective DM40.4 61
I object to the following ridiculous proposals...
Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168) This car park is so useful - we need it.
Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Mr Richard Driver
Object DM40.4 61
I should like to make it known that I object to this which is included in the recently published Local Plan.
Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Mr Richard Veldeman
Object DM40.4 61
Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168) This car park at 54-58 Whyteleafe Road South is being re-designated as residential. Given the parking problems in Purley town centre, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.
Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Ms C Soroczynski
Object DM40.4 61
Please note my objections to planning Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61
Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Mr Donald Speakman
Object Soundness - Effective DM40.4 61
Site 61: Public car parking should be retained at present capacity. There is scope here for major development of 4-6 storeys, well set back from road, and partially used to mask elevated railway, similar to current Fairfield Halls design phase 1.
Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Mr & Mrs Batki-Braun
Object Soundness - Justified DM40.4 61
DM 40.4 Site 61 It is important to maintain the parking capacity of the car park which is extremely popular. Purley requires parking to maintain its commercial centre, to visit Purley Hospital and the numerous small shops in town. Lack of parking will destroy, rather than improve our town, and reduce employment and the livelihood of small shopkeepers and specialist service providers.
Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Mr Dennis King
Object Soundness - Justified DM40.4 61
Car Parking in Purley the severe loss of car parking spaces to the 16 storey tower will generate severe street parking across the Purley centre, made worse by the policy to close the car park in Wycliffe Road car park which is close to main line Purley Station and the shopping area.
Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Rosemary Wiseman
Object DM40.4 61
The car park is a disgrace - lifts no longer working, and I have seen evidence of drug taking, heavy drinking and the smell of urine is atrocious - particularly in the mezzanine well between ground and first floor. I do not feel safe using it. Parking in Purley is difficult. Spaces have been reduced in the High Street - two in particular replaced with concrete monstrosities supposed to be seats. More short term parking is urgently required.
Change Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.
Mr Michael Southwell

Regarding the draft local plan I make the following objection - Purley Parking.
Following the leasing by the Council to the NHS of part of the Multi storey Car park owned by the Council opposite Purley railway station, this car park is usually full after the morning rush hour. The only car park with spaces at present is in Whytecliffe road nearby. To therefore make this residential as is proposed is therefore ridiculous.

Change

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Linda Hione

Purley Parking Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168). This car park at 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South is being re-designated as residential. Given the parking problems in Purley town centre, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park if not more.

Change

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Mr & Mrs Hewitt

Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168) This car park at 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South is being re-designated as residential. Given the parking problems in Purley town centre, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.

Change

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Mr Peter West

I object to Policy 40.4 table 11.3 - All of the above are unacceptable to me as a Sanderstead resident for the last 25 years. We need space and sensible development that compliments the environment. I totally agree with all the point that our member of Parliament has suggested.

Change

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Mrs Margaret Lawless

I list below the relevant policy References to which I object: 40.4 Table 11.3 Site 61 (p168)

No change

No changes can be made as the result of this comment as it not detailed enough to determine what is being objected to.

Mr Nigel Jones

Table 11.13 Ref 61 significantly reduces the area’s parking capability (as has been done in Coulsdon). This will lead to illegal and dangerous parking and / or further encroachment into residential roads for commuter parking.

Change

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.
As a resident of Croydon all my life, I wish to register my opposition to the following “plans”...

The car park is a necessity in Purley. I volunteer at the Cats Protection Shop in Purley High Street, every Saturday after working full time all week. Car parking is of a premium in all of Purley. Tescos car park has a time restriction and the station is very busy.

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Site 61, Car Park, 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South. Whilst the site is re-designated as residential, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

This car park at 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South is being re-designated as residential. Given the parking problems in Purley town centre, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

I object to this site allocation.

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

I would like to put in writing my objections to the following local plans: I am listing the relevant Policy Numbers: 4.40.4 Table 11.3 site 61 Purley Parking

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Policy 40.4 Purley Parking. This is an issue already and it would be wise to remove any parking facilities to allow further developments. If this happens additional parking must be found.

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

I object to this policy based on the existing parking problems in Purley and the fact that any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

With reference to the Local Plan which has been proposed, please note my objection to the following policies:

Purley Parking
Policy 40.4, Table 11.3.

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3796/01/004/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Tony Sales</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4 61</td>
<td>I am emailing to record my objection to the following policies within the 'Local Plan': Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3804/01/003/DM40.4/C</td>
<td>Cllr L Hale</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM40.4 61</td>
<td>Site 61, Car Park, 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South. Whilst the site is re-designated as residential, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park. Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3807/01/004/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Geoff Bell</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4 61</td>
<td>Parking is tight and difficult already. There are significant numbers of elderly people in Purley and Coulsdon, while everyone doing significant amounts of shopping also needs transport. The loss of the Lion Green car park has caused serious parking issues in Coulsdon. These problems must be addressed for the town centres to remain viable - we need more parking spaces, not less. Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3810/01/004/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Joan Sabatini</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4 61</td>
<td>This car park in Whytecliffe Road South is always 'well patronised' i.e., often FULL. Any new scheme should have, at least, as many equivalent parking spaces. Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3812/01/004/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Peter Spragg</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4 61</td>
<td>Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168). The car park at 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South is to be re-designated as residential. Given the current minimal car parking spaces within Purley town centre, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park. Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3813/01/004/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Brandon Hannan</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4 61</td>
<td>Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168). This car park at 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South is being re-designated as residential. Given the parking problems in Purley town centre, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park. Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3814/01/005/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Jon Adams</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4 61</td>
<td>Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168). The car park at 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South is being re-designated as residential. Given the parking problems in Purley town centre, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car parking provision. Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3816/01/003/DM40.4/O Lorraine Oakley  
Object  
DM40.4  
61  
Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61. I object to the removing of the much need parking facility in 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South. There is insufficient parking in Purley considering it has a busy station and many restaurants and shops. This parking space should remain and I object to the idea of designating it as residential.

Change  
Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

3837/01/007/DM40.4/O Mr & Mrs Hooper  
Object  
DM40.4  
61  
Policy 40.4, table 11.3 Site 61. I strongly object to the proposal to re-designate the car park at 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South as residential. It once again seems to be the objective of the planners to increase congestion. Purley needs more not less car parking.

Change  
Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

3849/01/005/DM40.4/O Maureen Messett  
Object  
DM40.4  
61  
I sincerely hope that my objections will be noted. I have lived in this borough for many many years and I hate seeing it gradually destroyed.

Change  
Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

3864/01/004/DM40.4/O Pauline Morgan  
Object  
DM40.4  
61  
Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61. This car park at 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South is being re-designated as residential. Any new development must provide the equivalent public parking.

Change  
Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

3896/01/011/DM40.4/O Mr M Veldeman  
Object  
DM40.4  
61  
Purley needs parking. A car park is required. People use cars and this will not change. Forcing cars out of the area will make all local businesses suffer and quite possibly fold as people will continue to use their cars and simply go somewhere more welcoming. Therefore losing the car park would be detrimental to people and to the environment as people will be driving further.

Change  
Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

3897/01/029/DM40.4/O Cllr M Neal  
Object  
DM40.4  
61  
Site 61, Car Park, 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South. Whilst the site is re-designated as residential, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.

Change  
Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

3940/01/004/DM40.4/O Shirley Shephard  
Object  
DM40.4  
61  
Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61. This car park at 54-58 Whytecliffe Road South is being re-designated as residential. Given the parking problems in Purley town centre, any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.

Change  
Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

3941/01/004/DM40.4/O Mr Frances Sell  
Object  
DM40.4  
61  
If the car park is redesignated an equal number of car spaces should be provided. Purley town centre demands this.

Change  
Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.
Ms S Lawson  
DM40.4 61  
I object to this policy based on the existing parking problems in Purley and the fact that any new scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.

Jenny White  
Purley Parking Policy 40.4  
Any new development should maintain the existing no. of car parking spaces.

Mr & Mrs Belsey  
DM40.4 61  
If Whyteleffe Road South car park is built on, there must be the same number of car park spaces or more made in Purley, as parking is already a problem and will get worse when more building occurs.

Mrs Shelley Chatter-Singh  
DM40.4 61  
I would like to officially put forward to you my strong objection to some of the policies that you are proposing within Croydon. My objections are particularly directed to the following policies: 40.4 Table 11.3, site 61. Parking in Purley is vital if we are to encourage people to use the local facilities.

Vaughan Pomeroy  
DM40.4 61  
Car parking requirements may change with time, hopefully reducing if we can break the dependence on the car. However, there is clearly not sufficient provision near to shopping parades now and some of the proposals involve changing the use of existing parking facilities, such as the Whyteleffe Road car park close to Purley Station. On road parking near to Sanderstead and Purley Oaks stations is creating dangerous driving conditions and somehow the Council must address this situation. More parking is clearly needed, and there is a clear aversion to paying for it, hence the on road parking. I would hope that wherever car parks are subject of a change of use the available public car parking will be maintained or increased. I did not see any reference to the provision of charging points for electric cars but with the sustainability theme present I would hope that such facilities are incorporated.

The Chudasama Family  
Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168). – We have severe parking problems in Purley town centre, any new proposed scheme should have at least as many public parking spaces as the current car park.
Public car parking should be retained at present capacity. There is scope here for major development of 4-6 storeys, well set back from road, and partially used to mask elevated railway, similar to current Fairfield Halls design phase 1.

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

An object to the inclusion of: Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168). Purley should NOT be losing public parking spaces.

Any development will require the retention of some of the existing parking spaces.

This comment has not been substantiated so no changes can be made.

The objection is not substantiated, (no reason given), so the Council is unable to respond.

There is insufficient information to consider this comment further.

The allocation requires the provision of a public car park.

Comment is noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29/01/016/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Jeanne Driscoll</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4 683</td>
<td>I wish to add my objections made on this document by our local M.P. Chris Philp.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/016/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Joe Toner</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4 683</td>
<td>I would like to voice my object to the following plan DM40.4.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32/01/005/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Suzanne Connor</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4 683</td>
<td>With reference to the Local Plan which has been proposed, please note my objection to the following policies:</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Garden Grabbing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Policy DM2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Purley Skyscraper authorisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Policy DM40.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Purley Pool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Purley Parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Policy 40.4, Table 11.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Sanderstead &quot;Lidl&quot; Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane, next to Coombe Wood Gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Loss of Green Belt – (1) Coombe Playing Fields, (2) Croham Hurst, (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sanderstead Plantation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Lack of Parking in new developments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Policy DM28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; More Protection; Less Intensification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Policy DM31.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33/01/015/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Richard Driver</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4 683</td>
<td>I should like to make it known that I object to this which is included in the recently published Local Plan.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34/01/008/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Donald Speakman</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective DM40.4 683</td>
<td>Site 683: Public car parking should be retained at present capacity, regardless of other development on this site.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM40.4 683</td>
<td>Policy 40-4 table 11.3</td>
<td>All of the above are unacceptable to me as a Sanderstead resident for the last 25 years. We need space and sensible development that compliments the environment. I totally agree with all the point that our member of Parliament has suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>4117/01/022/DM40.4/O</td>
<td>Cllr S Brew</td>
<td>DM40.4 683</td>
<td>Site 683: Public car parking should be retained at present capacity, regardless of other development on this site.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Network Rail notes that there are a number of sites adjacent to the Railway and attach a standard response which sets out the issues that need to be considered. In particular with large new developments there is a concern about the risk of trespass and all new developments should have proper and suitable boundary fencing. The risk of greater flooding and drainage that new developments could potentially have on the Network Rail infrastructure and we would not want any increase of flooding or the increase in run off onto Railway Infrastructure.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not:
- Encroach onto Network Rail land
- Affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company’s railway and its infrastructure
- Undermine its support zone
- Damage the company’s infrastructure
- Place additional load on outbuildings
- Adversely affect any railway land or structure
- Over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land
- Cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future

The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail’s adjoining land.

Future maintenance
The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant’s land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail’s adjacent land and air-space, and therefore all any building should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail’s boundary. The reason for the 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant. Any...
less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works. The applicant / resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer, the applicant / resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. all possession costs, all site safety costs, all asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard-against Network Rail’s boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction / maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary with Network Rail will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams’ ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.

Drainage

Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail’s property or into Network Rail’s culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail’s property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail’s property; full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail’s existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near / within 10 – 20 metres of Network Rail’s boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property. After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants’ expense.

Plant & Materials

All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail’s property, must at all times be carried out in a “fail safe” manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are
capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.

Scaffolding
Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant’s contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass-proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail’s existing fencing/wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail’s boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers’ vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling
arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer’s approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration
The potential for any noise/vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which hold relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night time train running and heavy freight trains.

Vehicle Incursion
Where a proposal calls for hard standing area/parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionsSussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.asp.
Network Rail notes that there are a number of sites adjacent to the Railway and attach a standard response which sets out the issues that need to be considered. In particular with large new developments there is a concern about the risk of trespass and all new developments should have proper and suitable boundary fencing. The risk of greater flooding and drainage that new developments could potentially have on the Network Rail infrastructure and we would not want any increase of flooding or the increase in run off onto Railway Infrastructure.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not:

- encroach onto Network Rail land
- affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company’s railway and its infrastructure
- undermine its support zone
- damage the company’s infrastructure
- place additional load on cuttings
- adversely affect any railway land or structure
- over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land
- cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future

The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail’s adjoining land.

Future maintenance
The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant’s land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail’s adjacent land and air-space, and therefore all any building should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail’s boundary. The reason for the 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant. Any
less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works. The applicant / resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer, the applicant / resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. all possession costs, all site safety costs, all asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard-against Network Rail’s boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction / maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary with Network Rail will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams’ ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.

Drainage
Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail’s property or into Network Rail’s culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail’s property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail’s property; full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail’s existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near within 10 – 20 metres of Network Rail’s boundary at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property. After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants’ expense.

Plant & Materials
All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail’s property, must at all times be carried out in a “fail safe” manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are
capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.

**Scaffolding**
Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant's contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

**Piling**
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail's Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

**Fencing**
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass-proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail’s existing fencing / wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail's boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

**Lighting**
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling
arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer’s approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration
The potential for any noise/ vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which hold relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night time train running and heavy freight trains.

Vehicle Incursion
Where a proposal calls for hard standing area / parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionSussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.asp.
Network Rail notes that there are a number of sites adjacent to the Railway and attach a standard response which sets out the issues that need to be considered. In particular with large new developments there is a concern about the risk of trespass and all new developments should have proper and suitable boundary fencing. The risk of greater flooding and drainage that new developments could potentially have on the Network Rail infrastructure and we would not want any increase of flooding or the increase in run off onto Railway Infrastructure.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not: encroach onto Network Rail land affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company’s railway and its infrastructure undermine its support zone damage the company’s infrastructure place additional load on outlings adversely affect any railway land or structure over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future

The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail’s adjoining land.

Future maintenance
The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant’s land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail’s adjacent land and air-space, and therefore all new building should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail’s boundary. The reason for the 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant. Any
less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works. The applicant / resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer, the applicant / resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. all possession costs, all site safety costs, all asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard-against Network Rail’s boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction / maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary with Network Rail will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams’ ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.

Drainage
Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail’s property or into Network Rail’s culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail’s property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail’s property; full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail’s existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near/within 10 – 20 metres of Network Rail’s boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property. After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants’ expense.

Plant & Materials
All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail’s property, must at all times be carried out in a “fail safe” manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are
capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.

Scaffolding
Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant’s contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass-proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail’s existing fencing/wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail’s boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling
arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer’s approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration
The potential for any noise/ vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which hold relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night time train running and heavy freight trains.

Vehicle Incursion
Where a proposal calls for hard standing area / parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionSussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.asp.
Network Rail notes that there are a number of sites adjacent to the Railway and attach a standard response which sets out the issues that need to be considered. In particular with large new developments there is a concern about the risk of trespass and all new developments should have proper and suitable boundary fencing. The risk of greater flooding and drainage that new developments could potentially have on the Network Rail infrastructure and we would not want any increase of flooding or the increase in run off onto Railway Infrastructure.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not:
- encroach onto Network Rail land
- affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company’s railway and its infrastructure
- undermine its support zone
- damage the company’s infrastructure
- place additional load on cuttings
- adversely affect any railway land or structure
- over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land
- cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future.

The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail’s adjoining land.

Future maintenance
The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant’s land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail’s adjacent land and air-space, and therefore all railway building should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail’s boundary. The reason for the 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant. Any
less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works. The applicant/resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer, the applicant/resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. all possession costs, all site safety costs, all asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard-against Network Rail’s boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction/maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary with Network Rail will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams’ ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.

Drainage
Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail’s property or into Network Rail’s culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail’s property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail’s property; full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail’s existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near within 10 – 20 metres of Network Rail’s boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property. After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants’ expense.

Plant & Materials
All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail’s property, must at all times be carried out in a “fail safe” manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are
Scaffolding
Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant's contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail's Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail's existing fencing/wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail's boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling
arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail's Asset Protection Engineer’s approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration

The potential for any noise/vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which hold relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night time running and heavy freight trains.

Vehicle Incursion

Where a proposal calls for hard standing area/parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionSussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.asp.

---

2839/01/002/DM41.1/C Cllr Yvette Hopley London Borough of Croydon

Comment Soundness - Effective DM41.1

Whilst Sanderstead and Hamsey Green are grouped together as local centres. Sanderstead is a historic centre mentioned in the doomsday book of 1086 and warrants that note.

Welcome support

2839/02/002/DM41.1/C Cllr Yvette Hopley London Borough of Croydon

Comment Soundness - Effective DM41.1

Whilst Sanderstead and Hamsey Green are grouped together as local centres. Sanderstead is a historic centre mentioned in the doomsday book of 1086 and warrants that note.

Welcome support

2839/01/019/DM41.2/O Cllr Yvette Hopley London Borough of Croydon

Object Soundness - Justified DM41.2

Concerned about intensification of both Sanderstead village and Hamsey Green. Support appropriate development (such as Ken's Autos and McCarthy & Stone application) provided in line with planning. Area that could be intensified was site of the four properties on Addington Road rather than Onslow Gardens.

No change

The policy encourages very limited intensification complementing the existing character of the local centre in Hamsey Green.
Concerned about intensification of both Sanderstead village and Hamsey Green. Support appropriate development (such as Ken’s Autos and McCarthy & Stone application) provided in line with planning. Area that could be intensified was site of the four properties on Addington Road rather than Onslow Gardens.

The policy encourages very limited intensification complementing the existing character of the local centre in Hamsey Green.

The objection has not been substantiated in planning terms and cannot therefore be taken into consideration.

The Local Plan is required to allocate sites for development so it is not possible to remove this policy.

Local shopping parades are empty due to draconian parking charges Whitgift and Centrale are empty Office Blocks empty
We wish to promote 359-367 Limpsfield Road for a mixed use site allocation. The Site is within the jurisdiction of LB Croydon, in the southern part of the Borough. The boundary with Tandridge District Council is located approximately 50 metres to the south of the Site. The Site is also located within Hamsey Green Local Centre and the character of the surrounding area comprises a mix of uses, including retail/commercial uses and residential. The Site is occupied by two main buildings. The western portion of the site is currently occupied by a large unattractive two storey commercial building. We understand that this provides accommodation for Ken’s Auto MOT Centre, a car wash, car showroom and gym. The eastern portion of the site is occupied by detached bungalow with a large pitched roof and its associated garden. The Site is located within Flood Zone 1 and TfL’s website states that the Site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) 1b. The operator of the existing MOT Centre operation (Ken’s Autos) has a number of other similar operations within the area and, due to market competition, is proposing to consolidate these existing operations within their surrounding retained MOT Centres. The current operations do not generate sufficient custom to meet costs and this are partly as a result of the location of the site within a predominately suburban area. The existing commercial buildings have been constructed for a bespoke purpose and are not constructed to a modern day standard and are limited in terms of its flexibility to accommodate new types of operators. We consider that this severely limits to opportunities for securing an alternative commercial operator on the site, in the future. The site has physical constraints which are likely to limit its attraction for a commercial end user. This includes that the site does not form part of a larger industrial area and its proximity of existing residential properties including those which back onto the subject site from Audley Drive and Kingswood Lane. The type of commercial operator/function that would occupy this site is therefore likely to be restricted by this constraint on the basis that environmental effects (e.g. noise, dust, pollution, etc) that could have a detrimental impact upon surrounding amenity. It is considered that the existing buildings are not attractive and do not contribute positively to the appearance of the site should be allocated for a mixed use scheme of residential and commercial. The site will be included in the Proposed Submission draft of the Croydon Local Plan. A density range will be applied to the site of 10-22 residential units and 1-3 commercial units on the ground floor.
Hamsey Green and are not compatible with existing surrounding residential uses. We are aware that the existing LBC planning policy context seeks to resist the loss of employment uses (Policy SP3). However, we do not consider that this policy applies in this instance on the basis that the site comprises a ‘sui generis’ operation. Notwithstanding this, we understand that the site has been marketed for approximately 11 months (from January 2015) for industrial / warehouse uses (B use classes) without success and is continued to be marketed for these uses to establish if there is any emerging interest from this market sector. Prior to this the landowner has been trying to secure a new occupier for the site since January 2013 without interest from commercial operators. It is therefore considered that the existing site has limited scope for continuing to provide an employment function in the future. To maintain some form of employment function and job opportunities on this site this would be achieved through the construction of a mixed-use development where the residential element of the scheme cross-subsidises the construction of new commercial floorspace. This commercial floorspace would be built to a modern day standard and which is flexible to attract a variety of commercial operators. The site provides a good regeneration opportunity. We consider that the mixed-use redevelopment of the subject site would help to bring back this site into full use. This would include the reprovision of high-quality, flexible commercial floorspace which will more attractive the commercial operators in the future and therefore significantly improve the likelihood of providing long-term job opportunities on the site. It could also provide active commercial frontages within Hamsey Green Local Centre which contribute to the vitality of this Local Centre. The regeneration of the site for housing development provides the opportunity for the delivery of a range of new homes, including a proportion of affordable homes and family accommodation. The redevelopment of the site also provides the opportunity for a scheme of a high quality design which will contribute positively to Hamsey Green.

In our opinion, the mixed-use regeneration would provide a variety of planning benefits including:
- The replacement of unattractive buildings with a high-quality scheme which visually contributes to the surrounding area;
- A mixed-use scheme which is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Plan and Design</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2839/02/017/DM41.3/O</td>
<td>Cllr Yvette Hopley</td>
<td>Ken's Auto site should be allocated for residential development.</td>
<td>The site will be included in the Proposed Submission draft of the Croydon Local Plan. A density range will be applied to the site of 10-22 residential units and 1-3 commercial units on the ground floor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3345/01/004/DM41.3/O</td>
<td>Ritai Patel</td>
<td>I would like to object.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3731/01/001/DM41.3/O</td>
<td>Nina Stobart</td>
<td>I am opposing and objecting the planning for the house on the footpath on west hill. My children often walk to school and this will make it unsafe for us to do so.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0002/02/016/DM41.3/O</td>
<td>Riddlesdown Residents Associatio</td>
<td>This site is owned by Lidl and has been the subject of a previous planning application by them. A Lidl or similar store on this site would cause increased traffic flows in the immediate and outer areas towards Riddlesdown. This site should only be considered for tasteful residential development, and not for retail.</td>
<td>The site should be allocated for residential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The provision of new homes;
- The provision of affordable housing to accommodate the local population;
- The provision of a range of housing types and sizes to meet a variety of needs;
- Construction job opportunities;
- A sustainable and 'green' development;
- CIL and S106 opportunities to improve London-wide and local infrastructure.
Alice Desira

Object Soundness - Justified

DM41.3 306

Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306 (p171) says that retail can be built on the old Good Companions Pub site at the junction of Limpsfield Road and Tilgate Shaw Road. The traffic problem in Selsdon is a problem and this would just make matters much worse. There is no need for another supermarket in Selsdon. There is Sainsbury's and Waitrose and Tesco's in Purley, which is only a short drive away.

No change

The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Andrea Telman

Object DM41.3 306

I totally disagree to the following planning applications which would spoil the character of our local environment and threaten our green belt. I choose to live in an area that is peaceful and quiet and resent the changes that are being forced upon me. In the spirit of true democracy I wish to make clear my objection to the following developments:

Policy DM2 (p18); Policy DM40.1 (p166); Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168); Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168); Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306 (p171); Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 (p179); Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179); Policy DM28 (p115-116); Policy DM35, Table 11.8, Site 945 (p146); and Policy DM31.4 (p126)

No change

The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Carly Litchfield

Object DM41.3 306

Objection to the policy. No further justification provided.

No change

The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Christine Cafferkey

Object Soundness - Effective

DM41.3 306

Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306 (p171) says that retail can be built on the old Good Companions Pub site at the junction of Limpsfield Road and Tilgate Shaw Road. This site is owned by Lidl and has been the subject of a previous planning application by them. A Lidl or similar store on this site would cause traffic chaos.

This site should only be considered for tasteful residential development, and not for retail.

No change

The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.
1843/01/005/DM41.3/O Mrs A L Winkley
Object DM41.3 306 I object to Policy DM 41.3 table 11.14, site 306 No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

1894/01/005/DM41.3/O Mr & Mrs Derek & Sue Reeves
Object DM41.3 306 We would make the following objections to the proposed Draft Local Plan which is a poorly disguised attack on the southern part of the Borough Policy DM41.3, table 11.4 Site 306 No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

1903/01/005/DM41.3/O Edgar Fielding
Object DM41.3 306 May I add my objection to the many (I hope) of objectors you have already for this store in Sanderstead -Hamsey Green, charming villages on a busy main road, which are already served by a combination of local shops with adequate car parking facility. Another store would cause massive problems. Residents do not want or need another big store. Retail should not be proposed for this site. No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

1916/01/005/DM41.3/O Andrew Hird
Object DM41.3 306 Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306 (p177) says that retail can be built on the old Good Companions Pub site at the junction of Limpsfield Road and Tilgate Shaw Road. This site is owned by Lidl and has been the subject of a previous planning application by them. A Lidl or similar store on this site would cause traffic chaos. This site should only be considered for tasteful residential development, and not for retail. This site should only be considered for tasteful residential development, and not for retail. No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.
Site 306, The Good Companions Public House, There needs to be a reduction in traffic movements from this site, and as such can the site cope with a mix of retail and residential?

No change

The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM41.3</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>209/05/001/DM41.3/O Loraine Pond</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM41.3</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>Policy DM41.3, table 11.14, site 306</td>
<td>This email is being sent to register my belief that the above site should be used for residential purposes and not for a retail development.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212/02/2021/DM41.3/O Cllr Steve O’Connell AM</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM41.3</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>The policy favours a retail outlet at the former Good Companions Pub site, at the junction of Limpfield Road and Tithepit Shaw Road, owned by Lidl. Any retail development at this site would cause traffic chaos; hence only residential development should be permitted.</td>
<td>The site should be allocated for residential only.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2175/01/003/DM41.3/O Mrs Veronica Prigg</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM41.3</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>I wish to object to Policy DM41.3 Table 11.14 Lidl site Hamsey Green. This application has already been refused, and also on appeal for a number of valid reasons, why has it re-emerged? We do not need another supermarket in the area, but we do need decent affordable housing, not overpriced flats. this site would be ideal for housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2181/01/003/DM41.3/C Ray &amp; Anne Smith</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM41.3</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>I strongly object to the following policies:- Sanderstead Lidl Site DM41.3 p171</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Soundess</td>
<td>DM41.3</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2364/01/05/DM41.3/O</td>
<td>Alison Crane</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>The site of the old Good Companions pub would be better suited to residential than large retail Lidl store. No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2448/01/039/DM41.3/C</td>
<td>Andy Stranack</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>Site 306, The Good Companions Public House, There needs to be a reduction in traffic movements from this site, and as such can the site cope with a mix of retail and residential? No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2635/01/033/DM41.3/O</td>
<td>Paul Sandford</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>Site 306, The Good Companions Public House, There needs to be a reduction in traffic movements from this site, and as such can the site cope with a mix of retail and residential? No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2657/01/034/DM41.3/S</td>
<td>Rebecca Pullinger</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>The Good Companions Public House, we support the redevelopment of this, and other brownfield sites across the proposals. Welcome support DM41.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2770/01/006/DM41.3/O</td>
<td>Mr Peter May</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306 the old Good Companions PH site is to be allowed to be used for retail usage. I note this site is currently owned by Lidl who would no doubt wish to build a supermarket here. This area already suffers with high traffic congestion and allowing a retail outlet here will only make the problem worse. This site would be more appropriate to be restricted to residential building only with suitable off road parking facilities. No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Soundness</td>
<td>DM41.3</td>
<td>Site 306, The Good Companions Public House, There needs to be a reduction in traffic movements from this site, and as such can the site cope with a mix of retail and residential?</td>
<td>This site would be better designated for residential only use</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Tim Pollard</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>Site 306, The Good Companions Public House, There needs to be a reduction in traffic movements from this site, and as such the site cannot cope with a mix of retail and residential. The judgement of the Inspector in the case of the planning application from Lidl (LBC ref 13/00927/P, appeal ref APP/L5240/A/14/2212949) for the construction of a supermarket on this site makes it clear that road safety considerations in this already junction-intensive area should preclude the site’s use for a supermarket and any retail development should therefore be of a secondary nature and not be likely to generate any significant levels of delivery or customer traffic.</td>
<td>This site would be better designated for residential only use</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses. The appeal referred to was mainly with regard to the issue of design and not with regards to the principle of retail use on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Helen Pollard</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>Site 306, The Good Companions Public House, There needs to be a reduction in traffic movements from this site, and as such can the site cope with a mix of retail and residential?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Cutts</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>This is yet another example of the site owners riding rough shod over planning law and local needs as evidenced by their dealing with the site to date. Yet another large supermarket between those existing at Warlingham, Sanderstead and Selsdon is not required. The increase traffic flow and congestion that will occur is proven by the new Aldi unit in Coulsdon and lack parking and increased traffic flow. This occur in this predominately residential location.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Gibbons</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>The current road layout and traffic density precludes any further increase in the level of traffic generated by development and the site should only be considered for residential.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Soundness</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Cllr Jan Buttinger  
London Borough of Croydon | Justified | DM41.3 306 | Site 306, The Good Companions Public House, There needs to be a reduction in traffic movements from this site, and as such can the site cope with a mix of retail and residential? | The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses. |
| Cllr Margaret Mead  
Croydon Council | Justified | DM41.3 306 | Site 306, The Good Companions Public House, There needs to be a reduction in traffic movements from this site, and as such can the site cope with a mix of retail and residential? | The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses. |
| Cllr Yvette Hopley  
London Borough of Croydon | Effective | DM41.3 306 | Lidl site now presented with 8-22 houses. Ref 306. Preferred option is Ken’s Autos. Need reduction in traffic movements on this site due to last Inspector’s report. This should be retail only but with controlled access. | The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses. |
| Cllr Yvette Hopley  
London Borough of Croydon | Effective | DM41.3 306 | Lidl site now presented with 8-22 houses. Ref 306. Preferred option is Ken’s Autos. Need reduction in traffic movements on this site due to last Inspector’s report. This should be retail only but with controlled access. | The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses. |
Object Site 306, The Good Companions Public House, There needs to be a reduction in traffic movements from this site, and as such can the site cope with a mix of retail and residential.

No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Comment Soundness - Justified

Site 306, The Good Companions Public House, There needs to be a reduction in traffic movements from this site, and as such can the site cope with a mix of retail and residential?

No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Object It is outrageous that having had their application to build a store on the site of the Good Companions Pub declined, this issue is now back on the table. This is a classic situation of ‘money talking’ with absolutely no regard to the impact such a store would have on the local shops and community, let alone traffic chaos which is certain. If this goes ahead the local businesses and character of the area will be destroyed.

No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Object The Good Companions site is already a traffic nightmare. With hundreds of children travelling to schools in Tithe Pit Shaw Lane mixing with lorries and general traffic to and from the M25 the last thing we residents need is extra activity from a Lidl supermarket. We are already served by Sainsbury’s, Waitrose and two Co-ops we have no need for any more large food outlets. Neither do we want our already over-parked side roads filled up with even more shoppers vehicles. Surely the Good Companions space would be better filled by residential development since there is such a great need for new housing.

No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.
I understand that the following Policies will threaten our green spaces. I was born in Croydon and have lived in this area all my life (I am now 63). My parents came here from Scotland in the early 1950s. They chose this area specifically for its green spaces and it is quite unique in that facility. I spent more than 35 years in Real Estate in this area and know very well that the reason people continue to move here, is exactly for those facilities and yet remaining within easy reach of other amenities, London, the coast and airports. Of course, more housing is required but I believe the alternative suggestions to these proposals to be very valid and much more in keeping with the neighbourhood thus maintaining its attractiveness and good standard.

These proposals are ill conceived and will change this particular neighbourhood beyond all recognition and take away that for which it is well known and valued. Please hear the voices of people like me and do NOT continue with the proposed policies set out below and which can be found in your Local Plan

5. Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306 (p171) This site should only be considered for tasteful residential development, and not for retail.

I wish to add my objections made on this document by our local M.P. Chris Philp.

DM41.3
306

I am writing to object to Allowing retail development at the junction of Limpsfield Road and Tithepit Shaw Road as detailed in Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306 (p171)

This site is owned by Lidl and has been the subject of a previous planning application by them which was refused by the council and the subsequent appeal dismissed due to traffic safety concerns. This site should only be considered for tasteful residential development, and not for retail.

DM41.3
306

The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.
3003/01/004/DM41.3/O Mr John James Object DM41.3 306 I would like to register my objection to DM41.3, Table 11.14, Site 306 (Sanderstead "Lidl" Site) No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

3004/01/004/DM41.3/O Mr John Pewtress Object DM41.3 306 The Good Companions site (now owned by Lidl) should not be developed as a supermarket unless ample parking, access and exit facilities can be provided. Congestion will kill the area and other local businesses. No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

3046/01/006/DM41.3/O Stephanie Lawson Object DM41.3 306 I object to a proposal to build retail on this site as it will have a negative impact on traffic and cause congestion and traffic chaos. I believe this site should only be considered for residential development that are in keeping with the local area and should not be used for retail. No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

3081/01/005/DM41.3/O Mr John Morgan Object DM41.3 306 Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306 (p171) says that retail can be built on the old Good Companions Pub site at the junction of Limpfied Road and Tilhept Shaw Road. This site is not suitable for retail as determined during the last planning application due to road safety issues. It should be designated residential only. No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.
Mr Paul Gomm
Object DM41.3 306
please note my objection to the following policy reference numbers within your current draft plan for planning & development; No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Mr James Clarke
Object DM41.3 306
"Lidl" site at Hamsey Green DM 41.3 Building another retail outlet here is nothing short of insane. There are 4 similar businesses within half a mile of this site and the traffic problems that will be caused does not bear thinking about. No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Mr Stephen Woodward
Object DM41.3 306
We have lived in Sanderstead for over 40 years, and have thoroughly enjoyed the areas to the south of Croydon being unspoilt. In our view these ill conceived proposals will change this area beyond recognition and take away that for which it is well known and valued. Please rethink, and do not continue with the proposed policies set out below and which can be found in your Local Plan: Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306 (p171) This site should only be considered for tasteful residential development, and not for retail. No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Sheila Wicks
Object DM41.3 306
I am against this site as a use for retail. Traffic is nose to tail every day in front of this site in the rush hours and when the schools turn out. The proposed site of retail would kill the local shops. Build houses on the site of good quality that would blend in with the local ones already there, but please add doctor facilities in the build or nearby. No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.
3201/01/003/DM41.3/O Sharon Smith  
Object: DM41.3  
DM41.3 306  
I am writing to support my local MP Chris Phelp in his objections  
No change

3225/01/005/DM41.3/O Saundra Dudman  
Object: Soundness - Justified  
DM41.3 306  
5) policy DM41.3 Table 11.14 site 306 p171 proposed retail development on old Good Companions Pub site. A retail store would cause traffic chaos in this area and I think residential development more suitable.  
No change

3275/01/007/DM41.3/O Suzanne Connor  
Object: DM41.3  
DM41.3 306  
With reference to the Local Plan which has been proposed, please note my objection to the following policies:  
> > Garden Grabbing  
> > Policy DM2  
> > Purley Skyscraper authorisation  
> > Policy DM40.1  
> > Purley Pool  
> > Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30  
> > Purley Parking  
> > Policy 40.4, Table 11.3,  
> > Sandenstead "Lidl" Site  
> > Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306  
> > Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane, next to Coombe Wood Gardens  
> > Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661  
> > Loss of Green Belt – (1) Coombe Playing Fields, (2) Croham Hurst, (3) Sandenstead Plantation  
> > The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662  
> > Lack of Parking in new developments  
> > Policy DM28  
> > More Protection; Less "Intensification"  
> > Policy DM31.4  
No change
Mr William Wheeler  
Object: This proposed development has been previously refused and Lidl’s new proposals will not overcome the dangers involved with traffic and proximity to schools in the vicinity. The site should be reserved for a small residential development.

No change

Mr Matthew Dickson  
Object: Putting a supermarket in this site will make an already difficult traffic situation almost impossible. The Limpsfield Road forms part of my drive to work in Whyteleafe; I drive south in the morning. In the opposite direction going north the traffic is usually queuing from this site all the way to Sanderstead roundabout and it goes past 2 primary schools. The traffic is also very congested on Tithe Pit Shaw Lane going past a primary and then a secondary school. The entrance and exit to a supermarket will make this almost gridlocked both in the morning rush hour and then from 3pm when the schools finish. All the extra traffic fumes will be bad for the children. I think the most suitable development for this site is retirement flats.

No change

Mr Richard Brandwood  
Object: Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306 (p171) - this site should be reserved for suitable housing only - there is a crying need for it - NOT a retail store!

No change

Mr David Dudman  
Object: 5) policy DM41.3 Table 11.14 site 306 p171 proposed retail development on old Good Companions Pub site. A retail store would cause traffic chaos in this area and I think residential development more suitable.

No change
Mr Ron Thomas
Object  Soundness - Justified  DM41.3 306
I object to the following ridiculous proposals...
Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, Site 306 (p171) I have always objected to a Lidl on this site. Traffic, schools, and the destruction of our community are all valid reasons to say NO NO NO!

No change
The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Mr Ron Thomas
Object  Soundness - Justified  DM41.3 306
I object to the following ridiculous proposals...
Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, Site 306 (p171) I have always objected to a Lidl on this site. Traffic, schools, and the destruction of our community are all valid reasons to say NO NO NO!

No change
The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Mr Richard Veldeman
Object  DM41.3 306
Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306 (p171) says that retail can be built on the old Good Companions Pub site at the junction of Limpfield Road and Tithepit Shaw Road. This site is owned by Lidl and has been the subject of a previous planning application by them. A Lidl or similar store on this site would cause traffic chaos. This site should only be considered for tasteful residential development, and not for retail.

No change
The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Joy Gadsby
Object  DM41.3 306
I strongly oppose the building of another supermarket in the area. We already have Waitrose, two Sainsbury's, a Tesco at Purley and a Co-op in Hamsey Green - all of which are accessible by local public transport or have their own car parking facilities. I think they already have enough competition and the effect on traffic congestion and emissions from yet more cars would increase the present problems far more than, for example, housing.

No change
The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.
Mr A Coxe  
Object  
DM41.3  
306  
We also do not need another supermarket in Sanderstead the Limpsfield Road is extremely congested especially during rush hour, the proposed site for a Lidl would cause chaos and would be extremely dangerous as there are schools in such close proximity, it is time children’s safety is put before financial rewards for large companies.  
No change  
The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Ms C Soroczynski  
Object  
DM41.3  
306  
Please note my objections to planning Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306  
No change  
The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Mr Donald Speakman  
Comment  
Soundness - Justified  
DM41.3  
306  
Site 306, The Good Companions Public House, There needs to be a reduction in traffic movements from this site, and as such can the site cope with a mix of retail and residential?  
No change  
The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Ms F Wood  
Object  
DM41.3  
306  
I do not want to have a massive Lidl’s in Sanderstead. It is a beautiful area and Lidl’s are out-pricing local stores and stores that look after animals on farms such as Waitrose and Sainbury’s. It just cheap food at a cost to our standards of living and caring. Lidl’s will not help the way we live in the long run.  
No change  
The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Object Description</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Mr Dennis King</td>
<td>Sanderstead Residents' Associatio</td>
<td>This proposed development was rejected by the Government’s Planning Inspector when Lidl went to appeal having previously having their scheme rejected by both Croydon Council and Surrey County Council. This was not on the grounds of Lidl’s shop design, but the dangerous use of delivery vehicles having to cross two lanes of Limpfield Road to gain entry and exit to the shop. The recent purchase by Lidl of two adjoining properties in Tithepit Shaw Lane is an indication of their wish to proceed with the scheme encouraging the Council to support the application by the provision of possibly social housing flats above the shop. The site has already been rejected by the Planning Inspector for safety reasons, particularly because of hundreds of children using the area. The safety of the children is paramount and any retail proposal should be rejected which puts their lives in danger. The 2 acre site is ideal for housing and should be used for that much needed purpose.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rosemary Wiseman</td>
<td>Hamsey Green - “Lidl” Site</td>
<td>Lidl on Good Companions site Hamsey Green. I was born and brought up in that area, although now living in Purley. The last thing it needs is another supermarket of any kind. There is a Waitrose, Co-op and Sainsbury all within a radius of one mile. The traffic would be horrendous in such a residential area, with two schools close by which could be a Health and Safety issue. This application must be refused at all costs.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Objection Type</td>
<td>DM41.3</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3523/01/006/DM41.3/O</td>
<td>Mr Mike Rice</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM41.3</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3561/01/014/DM41.3/O</td>
<td>Linda Hione</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM41.3</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3577/01/001/DM41.3/O</td>
<td>Mr Peter West</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM41.3</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3584/01/005/DM41.3/O</td>
<td>Mrs Margaret Lawless</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM41.3</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3594/01/010/DM41.3/C</td>
<td>Mr Malcom Saunders</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM41.3</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cllr J Cummings

Comment
Soundness - Justified

DM41.3 Site 306, The Good Companions Public House, There needs to be a reduction in traffic movements from this site, and as such can the site cope with a mix of retail and residential?

No change

The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Mr J Logan

Object

DM41.3 I am also opposed to the building of yet another supermarket in Tithepit Shaw Lane in Hamsey Green, an area which is totally unsuitable for such a development due to existing traffic problems. Another public house with additional small shops, or even new housing would be far more acceptable.

No change

The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Mrs J McDonald

Object

DM41.3 Nothing should be allowed that will encourage traffic chaos, location is totally inappropriate for this and it should be a residential development, not retail.

No change

The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Mr J Nolan

Object

DM41.3 I am also opposed to the building of yet another supermarket in Tithepit Shaw Lane in Hamsey Green, an area which is totally unsuitable for such a development due to existing traffic problems. Another public house with additional small shops, or even new housing would be far more acceptable.

No change

The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name(s)</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3712/01/007/DM41.3/O</td>
<td>Mr Nick Peiris</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM41.3 306</td>
<td>We need to maintain (if not improve) the infrastructure the benefit Traders, shoppers as well as residents. Certainly easier access and MORE underground parking spaces with any suitable new developments.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3734/01/005/DM41.3/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Mott</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM41.3 306</td>
<td>I object to this site allocation.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3742/01/003/DM41.3/O</td>
<td>Mr Trevor Smith</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM41.3 306</td>
<td>Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306 (p171) – proposed Lidl store. The area cannot handle another supermarket due to the amount of additional traffic this will attract. Warlingham village has shown the affects a supermarket brings and this would happen to Hamsey Green and have a knock on affect to Sanderstead where traffic is already a serious problem</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3750/01/006/DM41.3/O</td>
<td>Mrs Anne Turner</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM41.3 306</td>
<td>I would like to put in writing my objections to the following local plans: I am listing the relevant Policy Numbers; 5. DM41.3 Table 11.14, site 306 Lidl Site</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Thomas Lawson

Object

DM41.3

306

I object to a proposal to build retail on this site as it will have a negative impact on traffic and cause congestion and traffic chaos. I believe this site should only be considered for residential development that are in keeping with the local area and should not be used for retail.

No change

The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Mr Tony Connor

Object

DM41.3

306

With reference to the Local Plan which has been proposed, please note my objection to the following policies:
Sanderstead "Lidl" Site Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306

No change

The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Mr Tony Sales

Object

DM41.3

306

I am emailing to record my objection to the following policies within the 'Local Plan'.

No change

The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Barbara Garratt

Object

DM41.3

306

object to

DM41.3 Table 11.14 Site 306 - this parcel of land is not suitable for a retail building mainly because of the access problems. The main road is frequently at a standstill due to the volume of traffic and to have an entrance/exit would be impossible without spending a lot of money putting in a roundabout. The most suitable use for the land would be o.a.p. flats which wouldn't create much traffic and would be ideal for the close proximity of the shops. Also, there are plenty of stores in close proximity - we don't need another one.

No change

The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.
Cllr L Hale
London Borough of Croydon

Comment

DM41.3
306

Site 306, The Good Companions Public House, there would need to be a reduction in traffic movements from this site in order for it to cope with a mix of retail and residential;

No change

The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Joan Sabatini

Object

DM41.3
306

This policy appears to allow the site of the old Good Companions Pub to be re-developed. As the current owners are Lidl it is assume they or a similar store owner may apply for planning permission. I strongly object to this site being developed for a retail store as this would lead to a huge peak increase in traffic. This is an ideal site for residential development.

No change

The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Mr Peter Spragg

Object

DM41.3
306

Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306 (p171) says that retail can be built on the old Good Companions Pub site at the junction of Limpsfield Road and Tithepit Shaw Road. This site is owned by Lidl and has been the subject of a previous planning application by them. One of the main tenets of the refusal to permit planning, was the increased traffic generated by such a retail development. It would appear therefore counter intuitive for a Lidl style or similar store on this site to receive planning permission. Residential development may well be the appropriate development of choice for this site rather than retail.

No change

The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Mr Brandon Hannan

Object

DM41.3
306

Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306 (p171) says that retail can be built on the old Good Companions Pub site at the junction of Limpsfield Road and Tithepit Shaw Road. This site is owned by Lidl and has been the subject of a previous planning application by them. A Lidl or similar store on this site would cause traffic chaos. This site should only be considered for tasteful residential development, and not for retail.

No change

The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Mr Jon Adams</td>
<td>DM41.3</td>
<td>Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306 (p171) proposes that retail development can be built on the old Good Companions Pub site at the junction of Limpfield Road and Tithepit Shaw Road. This site is owned by Lidl and has been the subject of a previous planning application by them. A Lidl or similar store on this site would cause traffic chaos. This site should only be considered for residential development in line with existing building styles.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Mr Jon Taylor</td>
<td>DM41.3</td>
<td>It is with regret that I feel the need to object to the following proposals:- Purley skyscraper Policy DM40.1. I feel this proposal is completely out of keeping with the surrounding area and I strongly oppose it. Garden acquisition Policy DM2 This will make ‘garden grabs’ far too easy in my opinion, is far too subjective and is therefore a far weaker form of protection. Sanderstead Lidl site Policy DM1.3 This proposal will likely cause real problems to traffic in the vicinity and I do not it is an appropriate site for retail development. Loss of Green Belt at Coombe Playing Fields and Croham Hurst Policy DM44.2 I believe that both of these locations should remain Green Belt and that re-designation is inappropriate. It will impact the area badly and in conjunction with other changes steadily change the nature of the area for the worse. The Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane Policy DM44.2 Finally I most strongly object to Council plans to develop a Gypsy/Traveller site here. I feel it is totally inappropriate placing this on Green Belt land and is in direct contravention of the “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites” published by the Government just last August!</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The residents in the area have made it clear that a retail facility is not required and would cause traffic issues in an area that is used by many school children. I object to the option of designating the site for retail use.

No change

The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

I notice that in your Local Plan for development of the area there are several proposals which deserve reconsideration before they are promulgated. 3 Old Good Companions site. Policy DM41.3 Table 11.14 site 306, Lidl and Aldi seem able to get away with destroying local amenities, often without permission,(cf The Red Lion site in Coulsdon), then eventually gaining acquiescence for their original plan with a few minor modifications. How do they achieve this? The chaos in Coulsdon, right on a roundabout, will be replicated in Hamsey Green on a very busy road junction. I would suggest that within 10 years if not 5 Aldi will obtain permission to turn their car park into a private one instead of a public one in direct contravention of their planning permission.

No change

The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Lidl Site in Sanderstead – completely the wrong location for a large retail facility. The road system there could not cope with extra traffic and the numerous attempts at entering and leaving such a site. Health and safety should be the priority.

No change

The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

I sincerely hope that my objections will be noted. I have lived in this borough for many many years and I hate seeing it gradually destroyed.

No change

The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.
Object DM41.3 This should not be classed as a retail site. There would be traffic chaos. This is already a busy area. To add more retail outlets would be overkill for the community.

No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Object DM41.3 Hamsey Green "Lidl" site Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306. This site is not appropriate for retail development but should be considered as residential instead.

No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Object DM41.3 Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306 (p171) says that retail can be built on the old Good Companions Pub site at the junction of Limpfield Road and Tithepit Shaw Road. This site is not suitable for retail as determined during the last planning application due to road safety issues. It should be designated residential only.

No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Object DM41.3 Below is a list of our objections:

5. Policy DM41.3 - Development of a new Lidl store - we strongly oppose these plans. Opening a new Lidl store on site will intensify traffic causing chaos on roads which are not ready for such volume. There are currently enough shops in the area (including Waitrose) and there are numerous large shopping and supermarket facilities nearby (Superstore Sainsbury's in Selsdon, Aldi in Selsdon, another Sainsbury's in Warlingham).

No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.
Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306 indicates retail development on the old Good Companions Pub site at the junction of Limpfield Road and Tithepit Shaw Road. A large store on this site will cause traffic chaos and damage the existing local shopping.

No change, The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

Policy DM41.3: The site owned by Lidl in Sanderstead should be for housing development, not a superstore that would cause great traffic problems in the area.

No change, The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

The arguments against a Lidl site still stand and it is unacceptable that we have to keep objecting to the idea because they tweak the application. There are schools in the area and the resulting extra traffic generated by having a Lidl on the site would be a danger to the children of the area. People must come before business.

No change, The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

The Good Companions Public House, There needs to be a reduction in traffic movements from this site, and as such can the site cope with a mix of retail and residential;

No change, The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.
3906/01/002/DM41.3/O Mr & Mrs Blissett  
Object: Soundness - Justified  
DM41.3 Table 11.14 site 306. This site is more suitable for residential development, or mixed used development such as residential accommodation over 'A' uses classes.  
No change: The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

3941/01/005/DM41.3/O Mr Frances Sell  
Object: DM41.3  
306  
No more supermarkets required, a very large one exits nearby. Supermarkets are now being closed, not new built. If built serious transffic congestion would arise, it is serious now.  
No change: The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

3960/01/004/DM41.3/O Mrs R Jennings  
Object: DM41.3  
306  
Policy DM41.3 table 11.14 - Sanderstead Lidl site should be kept for residential development only. The proposed commercial development would cause traffic chaos.  
No change: The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

4014/01/003/DM41.3/O Mr R Swatton  
Object: DM41.3  
306  
Policy DM43.3 (note: policy reference is incorrect in representation) Table 11.14 Site 306  
This site should only be considered for residential development or possibly additional schooling?  
No change: The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.
Ms S Lawson: I object to a proposal to build retail on this site as it will have a negative impact on traffic and cause congestion and traffic chaos. I believe this site should only be considered for residential development that are in keeping with the local area and should not be used for retail.

Mrs Shelley Chatter-Singh: This development will create unsafe traffic flows in the immediate area.

Valerie Wilshaw: I object to the proposal.

Valerie Wilshaw: I object to the proposal.
4095/01/006/DM41.3/O Vaughan Pomeroy
Object DM41.3 306 The use of the former Good Companions site continues to be problematic. It is not conducive to anything requiring heavy vehicle access which probably restricts sensible use to residential with limited entry points as far away from the main road junction as possible.
No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

4108/01/005/DM41.3/O The Chudasama Family
Object Soundness - Justified DM41.3 306
• Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306 (p171) - This site is owned by Lidl and has been the subject of a previous planning application by them. A Lidl or similar store on this site would cause traffic chaos. This site should only be considered for tasteful residential development, and not for retail.
No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

4114/01/011/DM41.3/O Mr & Mrs Kaczanowski
Object DM41.3 306
Below is a list of our objections:
5. Policy DM41.3 - Development of a new Lidl store - we strongly oppose these plans. Opening a new Lidl store on site will intensify traffic causing chaos on roads which are not ready for such volume. There are currently enough shops in the area (including Waitrose) and there are numerous large shopping and supermarket facilities nearby (Superstore Sainsbury’s in Selsdon, Aldi in Selsdon, another Sainsbury’s in Warlingham).
No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.

4117/01/032/DM41.3/O Cllr S Brew
Object DM41.3 306 Site 306, The Good Companions Public House. There needs to be a reduction in traffic movements from this site, and as such can the site cope with a mix of retail and residential;
No change The site will continue to be allocated in the Proposed Submission draft. Any development of the site would be required to satisfy all other policies of the Local Plan which would include those which consider traffic generation and management. It is considered appropriate for both retail and residential uses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4125/01/03/DM41.3/C</td>
<td>Councillor M Fisher</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM41.3 306</td>
<td>Site 306, The Good Companions Public House, There needs to be a reduction in traffic movements from this site, and as such can the site cope with a mix of retail and residential?</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4716/01/04/DM41.3/O</td>
<td>Rachel Marland</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM41.3 306</td>
<td>Policy DM41.3 - I do not think a busy retail outlet is the right thing to be built on this site</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3816/01/05/DM41.3/O</td>
<td>Lorraine Oakley</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM41.3 A336</td>
<td>I don't really understand why this is mentioned but I would prefer the option of retaining the site for its existing use as it is a valuable asset to the area and used a lot by local people.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929/02/07/DM42/O</td>
<td>Mr Charles Marriott</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM42</td>
<td>I particularly object to your proposals for Selsdon.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2819/02/01/DM42/C</td>
<td>Peter Dolling</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM42</td>
<td>Why is not listed the redevelopment of the Old Selsdon Garage next to Aldi on Addington Road. Which has been derelict for more years than I can remember. Cannot the owner rumoured to be Channel Island based be forced to cleanse the area of any toxic waste and sell or redevelop the site preferably as residential property.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2708/01/001/DM42/S</td>
<td>Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>DM42 A317</td>
<td>Supports retention of store</td>
<td>Welcome support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am sad to find these intentions of new housing heavily and one-sidedly impacting Shirley and Addington, but I must especially emphasise that with every new housing public transport has to be increased to adequate. I would propose to consider extending tramlink to Shirley as the area in between is poorly covered, before it is built up even more. Perhaps a new tram line ending via Ashburton fields, or from Elmers end to Addington. I am near Edenham school and the only bus 367 is a joke. Please develop the tramlink as London is expanding south then people would be more happy.

I would propose to consider extending tramlink to Shirley as the area in between is poorly covered, before it is built up even more. Perhaps a new tram line ending via Ashburton fields, or from Elmers end to Addington.

No change

Extension of the tramlink to Shirley has not been put forward by TfL. Should TfL consider this an option, the Council will work with TfL at such time.
To supplement the details set out within Table 11.16, which identify potential sites allocated for development, the Council has also produced a detailed proposal document; setting out for each site a reference number, postcode, description, local character area designation, location, public transport accessibility, description of option, justification for option, phasing of development, evidence of deliverability and the number of homes proposed. However, the detailed proposals document fails to provide empirical evidence that justifies:

- how the Council arrived at identifying these specific sites, especially in light of the policies set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, the population of the Borough (being the most populous in London) and the projected population growth expected by 2036;
- how the Council arrived at the number of homes/units proposed per site;
- the proposed use of the sites (i.e. residential development, gypsy and traveller site, retain existing use); and
- how the Council is tackling the housing need for the Borough and specifically how Shirley can play its part in delivering development requirements.

It is requested that in order to be considered as ‘sound’ the emerging Local Plan should address the above matters, and provide evidence on the deliverability of each of the proposed sites. Moreover, it would be helpful if Table 11.16 clearly sets out the proposed yield from each of the emerging sites.

Notwithstanding the above, the Council’s proposed allocated sites for development in Shirley need to be clearly laid out on a Borough-wide proposal’s map. As it currently stands, the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options) provides inset maps of the sites, however, this does not make it easy for the reader to identify exactly where the sites are in the broader context of the Borough.

A draft Policies Map will accompany the Proposed Submission draft of the Local Plan. Housing numbers will not be included within Table 11.16 themselves as this will make them part of the policy but a schedule will be included in the back of CLP2 with details of all the proposed allocations.

I’d like to know more about the proposed building on Shirley Oaks Village please.

The representation does not specify any particular document or policy and therefore this comment is considered as not duly made.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3396/01/008/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms A Pavon-Lopez</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I would like the following question answered: What part of the land by Poppy Lane (Site 128) exactly are you proposing to redevelop? Currently there are allotments there and open space that is home to a wide variety of wildlife. What is the impact on these areas? No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3428/01/008/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Daniel Nuthall</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Replacing some of the beautiful housing with medium rise blocks of flats is appalling No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3515/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Rosemary Wiseman</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Once again it would seem that you regard the South of the Borough as fair game, and we are a bit fed up of being regarded as the &quot;cash cow&quot; for the Council. Many people in the South are worse off than those in the North of the Borough, but appear to be penalised the most. I agree with all the concerns put forward by Chris Philip our MP, but have only listed those which personally affect me, and about which I have some knowledge - ie Lidl development at Hamsey Green - words fail me that you should ever consider such a scheme, but again it would seem that the South of the Borough is regarded as unimportant and just a resource to be exploited. As a rider, can I suggest that one way to save money is to cut paper work and thereby halving the number of Council employees earning more than £50,000 a year, with ridiculous sounding titles, and reducing salaries of all the Senior Executives. A lot of money could be saved by adopting this policy, particularly in the long term. You may then be able to reconsider redevelopment requests more sympathetic to local residents. No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3557/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Keith Abrey</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>As a resident of Shirley I wish to add my concern about the proposed developments that would affect this area. I do not need to go into them in depth as you are well aware of what they are. I fully support Gavin Barwell’s comments and would request that you do your utmost to prevent them occurring No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mrs Marilyn Arbisman

Object DM43.4

I do not have a Policy number for it, but I also understand that there is talk of Compulsory Purchasing of land and property in the private village of Shirley Oaks. I sincerely hope that this does not go ahead.

No change The Local Plan does not seek to Compulsory Purchase Order any land at this time, nor is it the purpose of allocating land. If sites are not developable they are not considered deliverable and cannot therefore be allocated within the Local Plan.

Mr Bob Sleeman

Object DM43.4

128

I am therefore writing to formally object to:

- the use of the following five sites for housing:
  - land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Addiscombe Residents Association

Object DM43.4

128

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, the five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces and not used for housing.

No change The site should be Local Green Space. The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
I am therefore writing to formally object to:

1. de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;

2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   - land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   - land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
   - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>De-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land bordering Addiscombe Place (around Shirley Oaks Village) – OBJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/16/19</td>
<td>Mrs Mira Armour</td>
<td>HOME Residents Association</td>
<td>If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, the five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces and not used for housing: Ref 128: Land at Poppy Lane Ref 504: Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane Ref 541: Land east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, Shirley Oaks Road Ref 542: Land to west of Shirley Oaks Road, Shirley Oaks Road Ref 548: Land to rear of, 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/06/19</td>
<td>Mr Mathew Frith</td>
<td>London Wildlife Trust</td>
<td>We object to the proposed development on green spaces, which should remain designated as part of the Shirley Oaks MOL (see comments on Policy SP7 (Table 9.1)). This site meets criteria for Metropolitan Open Land, in terms of its nature conservation value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08/19</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs K Davenport</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am horrified at the proposals regarding Shirley. There may be a need for more housing but there are alternatives and it is up to the Council to find these rather than making it easier and more profitable for builders which is what is now happening.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Arbysman

Object DM43.4

128

I hereby inform you of my STRONG OBJECTION to allow development on the land noted on your Policy Map 43, Ref 541; Ref 542; Ref 548; Ref 128; Ref 504. This land forms the reason why I, along with the majority of my neighbors purchased our homes. As freehold property owners we each have a shareholding in the company owning the land and do not wish for this OGLR land to be built on. We also find it unbelievable that the Council wishes to have a legal battle against 800 of its residents who not just own the land but are determined that the land keeps its Metropolitan Open Land protected status. The idea of building on these main green spaces when the existing houses were built with minimal sized gardens is disastrous, such development would obviously not just spoil the look and value of the area but would damage the health of the residents. This is the land where the residents catch the summer sun, go for walks, jog, children play, and has the most amazing natural wildlife that we all enjoy.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Balvir & Shobhna Patel

Object DM43.4

128

I as resident of Shirley Oaks Village am against any change of our Metropolitan Land (with protection to being built on) being allowed as acceptable for development. I have been living in the Village for almost 30 years and paying for this land to be maintained as grass areas. We own the land as shareholder in our management company (Once designated as Amenity Open Land and transference to our Management company). I strongly oppose any moves to develop on these grass areas.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Colin Ward

Object DM43.4

128

I am writing to express my objection to the planning proposals in the Shirley Oaks area. The land has been set aside for our use as we have very undersized gardens on the estate and we have also paid to keep those areas in a well maintained condition. The road around Shirley Oaks only has 2 exits as well, so would make it very congested as there are only 2 options for traffic to leave and enter and there are already a lot of problems at the Wickham Road end as people drive in and out. I object to the following Ref Numbers; Ref 541; Ref 542; Ref 548; Ref 128; Ref 504.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
I am writing to express my objection to the planning proposals in the Shirley Oaks area. The land has been set aside for our use as we have very undersized gardens on the estate and we have also paid to keep those areas in a well maintained condition. The road around Shirley Oaks only has 2 exits as well, so would make it very congested as there are only 2 options for traffic to leave and enter and there are already a lot of problems at the Wickham Road end as people drive in and out. I object to the following Ref Numbers: Ref 541, Ref 542, Ref 548, Ref 128, Ref 504. I would appreciate any information you could send me in relation to upcoming meeting’s about the proposals.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
I wish to object the following planned proposals; ref:541, ref:542, ref:548, ref:128 and ref:504. These planned proposals will not fit within the current aesthetics of the estate so please accept this email as an objection to the proposal.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Re your development plans 541,542,548,128 and 504. Consultation. I am writing in response to your notices for development of the greenfield sites on the Shirley Oaks Village estate, changing the status of this land to allow development of around 700 new homes. When I bought my house here 18 years ago, it was on the understanding that this had been designated by Croydon Council as metropolitan amenity open land, an attractive feature of the original development, important not least due to the relatively small gardens of some properties, a mixture of unit sizes in an harmonious design. Thus there is a mixture of family unit sizes and age groups at home here. For many years, I and my fellow-resident members of the Shirley Oaks Management Ltd company have contributed regularly to First Port Property Services and their predecessors under our common upkeep obligation, including provision of boundary posts at various points of these areas to ensure that visiting Travellers could not reoccupy them. As I understand your plans, you now wish to “designate” this as non-metropolitan land, on which purchasers could build however suits their purposes. This does of course risk a complete change in the nature of our Village. I cannot pretend to understand how you can effectively cut a swathe through all of this, even if you do consider it justified. Some residents might I imagine now be considering the impact on their original investment and individual legal aspects. Against these general considerations, I would like to highlight some specific and practical concerns at the outset.

ROAD SAFETY

The perimeter road via Primrose Lane and Shirley Oaks Road is arguably no longer fit for purpose, increased car ownership and parking, fast through traffic including commercial and public transport all contributing. Buses on the 367 route for example frequently mount pavements to pass each other. There have been accidents, some serious, even fatal and involving elderly pedestrian residents. The road surface is nowadays subject to excessive heavy usage. Clearly, 700 new homes will surely accentuate these problems and dangers.

ENVIRONMENT

Your plans will effectively remove an important green-field area and with it much unique wildlife. Residents will lose many of the valuable areas for walking, exercise and fresh-air, as will visitors. Any balanced village...
appearance and community feel to the estate will be consumed by so many new properties of different designs. In summary many will surely feel betrayed by a Council which proposes removing green-fields against all promises. Some might also suspect that, whatever the social arguments, their interests are being sacrificed against political and ultimately commercial imperatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object Description</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>DM43.4 128</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1713/02/002/DM43.4/O Alison Connor</td>
<td>Once the area surrounding Shirley Oaks Village is re-designated the Council plans to build 751 homes on 5 separate sites. Supposing the average house is for 4 people, 3000 people in total will move to the area. The housing will attract families - potentially half being children. The Council mention no where in their 700 page document about the building of new schools (primary and secondary) nor the building of doctor surgeries, nor the expanding of the local shopping area let alone the already stretched local road infra structure. Our local area can't cope as it is - St John's primary school has applied for an extension to cope with the current demand on its places. During rush hour buses frequently don't stop at bus stops because they are full. Traffic is often diverted down our road, Shirley Church Road, if there is an accident on Wickham Road or Gravel Hill. The dual carriage way (Shirley Park) is crawling along during rush hour. The council are planning to add another 1000 plus cars to this equation. Shirley is often described according to estate agents as leafy, popular, excellent schools. Prices reflect this. Just walking around the area people look after their houses and take pride in living here. People pay more money to live in this area. By building 751 more homes the character of the area will change completely.</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751/01/001/DM43.4/O Alice and Andrew Hicks</td>
<td>The erosion of green space in the borough generally and specifically the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in the Poppy Lane (ref no. 128) and Shirley Oaks areas (ref nos. 504, 541, 542 &amp; 548). We object to these 5 sites being designated for residential development. It would entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area. Additionally the local road infrastructure could not cope with the extra traffic generated</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We are also writing to object to Croydon Council’s plans to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village, changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Your draft Local Plan identifies five sites:
1. the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, reference number 128);
2. Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Princess Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, reference number 504);
3. land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, reference number 541);
4. land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542);
5. land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548).

No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

As a resident of Shirley Oaks I am writing to object the proposals for housing development on the estate and surroundings. Having lived in Shirley all of my life I would be deeply disappointed to see it change unrecognisably. I envisage the property on Shirley Oaks Road will either be demolished or surrounded by high density housing. Either eventuality will be highly detrimental.

Objection to Site 128,

No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Jane & Paul Riley  
Object Soundness - Justified  
DM43.4  
128  
Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic. If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. 
No change  
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Peter Docherty  
Object Soundness - Justified  
DM43.4  
128  
I am writing to object to: 1. THE DESIGNATION of the following five pieces of land as Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and their proposed use as housing: 1.Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128; 2.Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504; 3.Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541; 4.Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and 5.Land to the rear of S-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548. There is only one narrow very winding road which runs through the village and this could not cope safely with any additional traffic. It is single file around bends as it is and the local road infrastructure would be over-burdened. These open spaces are collectively designated as Metropolitan Open Land and it would be unacceptable to lose a link to this chain. Additionally, this area is a flood plain and there is a sink pond to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens. There would be a detrimental effect and potential flooding of existing and planned properties. The land at Poppy Lane reference number 128 is a small parcel of land and behind it is the sink pond. If the sink pond overflows then there is a risk of flooding in any new and existing properties which include the BMI Shirley Oaks Hospital below it. 
No change  
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
I am writing to voice my full-throated objections to the above proposals because of the imparable damage it would do to the character of one of the leafier, more pleasant, parts of the borough. The council seeks de-designation of Metropolitan open land that, as a homeowner in Shirley Oaks Village, I own a share of, and it is protected by covenant. Such thoughtlessly destruction of our precious little green space (we were granted this Amenity Open Land in 1985 by the council due to our under-sized gardens) is obnoxious, ill-conceived and damaging to the value of our properties, as planning blight could linger for a decade. Myriad other neglected parts of the borough are far more appropriate for such massive development and would not stir up so much ire from the current residents, nor would they require the politically-expedient moving of goalposts regarding land use. Our village simply does not currently have the infrastructure nor the capacity to expand in order to cope with these proposals. There is barely enough parking space available in the village at present, so quite where up to 683 other families will park and seek recreation, I do not know. Quite how all the construction vehicles involved in such huge building works would access the proposed sites without further detriment to the quality of life of the residents is another issue I raise. We are served by one bus route that can only use small, single decker buses. The roads are too narrow for larger vehicles. How would this be overcome? Additionally, the fact that the council would seek to house the travelling community so close to the town centre, on land where in 2012 a group of them set up an illegal encampment and defecated in our woodland, beggars belief. If the council has an inexplicable legal obligation to designate land to travellers, then expand capacity at their existing sites in Beddington Lane and Featherbed Lane rather than dispersing them further across the borough into otherwise salubrious areas. I do hope that common sense prevails and that all five of the above proposals are quickly abandoned. I chose to live in this area precisely because it is not blighted by these hideous developments. I am sure that many other residents echo my sentiments.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
I object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in the vicinity of Shirley Oaks Road and Shirley Oaks Village. The land should be at least be designated as Local Green Space, for its protection from development. This open space provides a green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, and should be retained in its present form. I also object to the following specific proposals for the building of new homes on this site, as detailed in Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan, Detailed Policies & Proposals:

- Policy DM43, reference Site 128 to build new homes at Poppy Lane
- Policy DM43, reference Site 504 to build new homes at Stroud Green Pumping Station (including the conversion of the pumping station which is a locally-listed building)
- Policy DM43, reference Site 541 & 542 to build new homes on land to the East & West of Shirley Oaks Road
- Policy DM43, reference Site 548 to build new homes on land to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens

Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the local schools are over-subscribed as well as the already-stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Station (including the conversion of the pumping station which is a locally-listed building)
Policy DM43, reference Site 541 & 542 to build new homes on land to the East & West of Shirley Oaks Road
Policy DM43, reference Site 548 to build new homes on land to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens
Mr C Johnson

Object DM43.4

128

This land is owned by Shirley Oaks Management Limited (SOML). This is the management company for the estate whose shareholders are the home owning residents. SOML owns and manages the open spaces on behalf of and for the benefit of the residents for whom the land is ‘amenity open land’, i.e. communal, recreational space. The land was transferred to SOML’s ownership in 1985 whilst the estate was under development. I believe that the developer had infringed planning regulations by reducing the sizes of the gardens included with the dwellings that it was building in order to increase the density of the housing beyond that which had been agreed with the local planning authority. The open land, which is currently being scrutinised as part of the Council’s policy proposals review, was effectively a penalty levied on the developer whereby an amount of green space was given over to SOML to own and manage as redress and compensation to the residents for skimping on the sizes of individual gardens. I am assured by a Director of SOML that the company has documentary proof of all of the above points. The residents pay a service charge that, inter alia, covers the cost of managing and maintaining these open spaces. SOML is bound by its covenants with the residents that this land shall be managed and maintained as communal open areas for the collective enjoyment and benefit of residents as long as the estate should be in existence. Thus, there is no scope on SOML’s part for participating in any effort to develop these spaces and any attempt to develop them undermines the importance of those spaces in providing amenity open land, as previously ordered by the local Council.

David Hurst

Object DM43.4

128

I object to the use of the site for housing.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1904/01/02</td>
<td>Emma Smith</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of the following five sites for housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Land at poppy lane reference number 128</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Stroud green pumping station, 140 primrose lane reference number 504</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Land to the west of shirley oaks road and to the rear of beech house and ash house reference number 542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle gardens reference number 548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If the council will not keep them as metropolitan open land these five site should at least be designated as local green spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913/01/01</td>
<td>Andrea Swaby</td>
<td>I hereby would like to register my serious OBJECTION to the councils proposal to build 750 new homes in Shirley OAK road and 35 new homes on shrub lands estate to create gypsy traveller sites. As I live on Devonsire I also have serious object to allow 4 storeys in this area</td>
<td>No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918/01/02</td>
<td>Mr Gareth Champion</td>
<td>Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.</td>
<td>No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I have just read a letter from Mick Hewish, Resident Director of Shirley Oaks Management Ltd and I would like to object to the proposals for developing areas around Shirley Oaks. These are as follows: Ref: 541 Shirley Oaks Road East side; Ref: 542 Shirley Oaks Road West side; Ref: 548 Land rear of Honeysuckle Gardens; Ref: 128 Poppy Lane; Ref: 504 Water Board HQ Primrose Lane.

The high density of new homes would put considerable strain on the environment, including overcrowding, drainage, traffic and parking.

Objection to the allocation of site 128, Poppy Lane for proposed development as the high density of new homes would put considerable strain on the environment, including overcrowding, drainage, traffic and parking.

I strongly object to many of the proposed developments within the Shirley area. I believe that allowing low rise developments around Shirley library will alter the balance of properties in that area, which are mainly detached and semi detached. People have moved to this 'sought after area' precisely because of its current character. I also object to the intensive developments proposed on the Metropolitan open land around Shirley Oaks. We need open land to reduce carbon emissions, for wildlife and for our own well being. Both of the above developments would put a huge strain on the services in the area, schools, doctors, busses and the already congested road system. I urge you not to progress with these proposals.

I also think that the two proposed travellers site in Shirley are inappropriate as they would be on Green Belt land, which is against your own policy and would be a blight on one of the few areas that are beautiful and wildlife friendly within Croydon.

I am always defending Croydon to those that mock it, saying that we have some lovely open spaces in which to walk and enjoy the diversity of nature. They only see the high rise blocks and litter. If these proposals go ahead, Croydon will have nothing left to commend itself.
Site 128, Land at Poppy Lane, is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would totally change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Woodmere Avenue and Woodmere Gardens.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

1942/01/002/DM43.4/O Margaret West

Object DM43.4 128

Object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Land and proposed use for housing at sites 128 504 502 541 542 and 548. If development is allowed it will impact on the sense of community and have an adverse impact of trees and could be subject to flooding. It would also impact on access arrangements and the wildlife.

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

1954/04/01/DM43.4/O John Coppard

Object DM43.4 128

This land was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as “Amenity Open Land” because of our under-sized gardens & transferred to a Management Company, with each property owner as a shareholder in that company.

If the council will not keep it as Metropolitan Open Land it should at least be designated as Local Green Space.

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
1993/01/001/DM43.4/O Graham & Kate Marsden

Object

DM43.4

128

Shock at the scale of proposals for Shirley and will fundamentally change the nature of the area. Front gardens are an asset to the local street scene. The proposals for focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an areas local character under Policy DM31.4 put this stability at risk, and may have an impact on the services we all need from the Council. Object to the de-designation of MOL - at a minimum it should be designated as local green space. We object to this site being used for residential use as it would change the character of the area, overload the already difficult local road structure. It would damage the vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and reduce the habitat for wildlife.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

---

2022/01/004/DM43.4/O Joe Rowe

Shirley Hills Residents Association

Object

DM43.4

128

This land is designated as Metropolitan Open Land and there is no justification for re-designation. An increase of up to 741 homes on this land would put local services including schools, transport and already crowded roads under further pressure.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

---

2035/01/006/DM43.4/O Mrs Lorraine Cox

Object

DM43.4

128

I have just received a letter about proposals to Shirley Oaks Village open land being built upon. We have lived here happily for 15 years. We want to say we don't want houses or a gypsy site down the road. I will be writing to my local MP Gavin Barwell to defend our way of life in Shirley Oaks Village. Leave our open / green spaces alone.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

---
The proposal to build new houses in Poppy Lane does not fall within the Strategic Objectives because:

Objective 2: This development will not Foster an environment where existing enterprise can prosper, but will reduce enterprise.

Objective 4: This development will not reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation. It will not reduce unemployment, improve skills and education and improve environmental conditions, the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Objective 5: This development is not high quality and will not enhance the borough’s natural environment but will reduce the natural environment by turning a green area into housing.

Objective 7: This development will reduce the area as a safe, healthy and cohesive community but making the area overcrowded with residential property.

Objective 10: This development will reduce the quality and accessibility of green spaces and nature.

If this development is undertaken it will not deliver the strategic objective. This development will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

The development will change the outlook and community within the South Croydon area and future generation will suffer because of this.

This proposed development of new housing in Poppy Lane is not within keeping of the current development within this area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with housing in the area.

Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area and is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Building a travelers site will increase noise levels and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area.

Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

This development would diminish the area of green fields and recreational land within the area.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Site 128, Land at Poppy Lane, is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Woodmere Avenue and Woodmere Gardens.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Site 128, Land at Poppy Lane, is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Woodmere Avenue and Woodmere Gardens.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

I also object to the development on Shirley oaks, as a resident who used to live there on Shirley oaks, any more development on this land would over burden what is already a road system that can not cope with the buses and tight turns that have been made on the estate, it's would also ruin the feel of Shirley.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Site 128, Land at Poppy Lane, is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Woodmere Avenue and Woodmere Gardens.

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 128

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Object

DM43.4 128

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Object

DM43.4 128

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Mr Stewart Murray  
Greater London Authority

Object  
DM43.4  
128  
The de-designation of the MOL at Shirley Oaks Hospital could have significant implications for local character and the amenity of local residents.

No change  
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Alfred Lancaster

Object  
DM43.4  
128  
I and many residents in Shirley object to the following. 700 new homes to be built in Shirley oaks village with no provision for extra facilities like schools, doctors etc.

No change  
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Cllr Steve O'Connell AM

Object  
DM43.4  
128  
I object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land for the purpose of house building. My objection references MOL bearing the same protection from development as the Green Belt. If the Council will not agree to maintain the MOL status, designation as Local Green Space would lessen the negative impact on the local environment. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Woodmere Avenue and Woodmere Gardens.

The site should be at least designated as Local Green Space.

No change  
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
2131/01/001/DM43.4/O Ronald H. Street

Object DM43.4

I am emailing to object to the following proposal ref 128. If the Council will not keep the land as MOL it should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. I am particularly concerned about the effect of local roads that the suggested development will have as, when Heron Homes built the original development some years ago they were prevented by the local council form building the number of houses now proposed because of inadequate access roads onto the estate. Under present conditions the A232 Wickham Road is particularly subject to traffic delays especially in term time. Your proposed developments would also have a detrimental effect on our already crowded local schools and doctor's surgeries.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

2135/01/001/DM43.4/O Mrs Susan Lockyer

Object DM43.4

It is accepted that more housing is needed but this site could not be developed in addition to site 541 or 542. It would have to be one only. Some may be achievable but certainly not 107. The land is privately owned and houses were purchased in the knowledge that this was the case and cannot therefore be built on. The local management company maintains the green area, suitable for wild life. It is used by residents as the properties do not have private gardens. The road around the estate is already congested with private cars making the bus route difficult. It is not deliverable as planned and therefore it will not meet the present needs, let alone future needs. There will be transport issues, sprawl and social problems as a result.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

2145/02/002/DM43.4/O Paul Vernon & Natalie Payne

Object DM43.4

I am writing to object to: The de-designation of the five pieces of land as metropolitan open land and their proposed use of housing land at poppy lane reference number 128. I feel that building more houses on the green land would totally destroy the wildlife in the area and would ruin an area of beauty, and that the one road into the village wouldn't be able to cope with more traffic as its already busy.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2147/01/06/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Patrick Thomas</td>
<td>I am writing at this time to record my objections on the following basis - the use of this site, 128, for housing. No change. The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run-off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2185/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Jonathan E Miller</td>
<td>Object Site 128. I object to this. I am writing to you with regard to the recent changes in Planning policies by Croydon Council and their impact on the designation of grass areas in Shirley Oaks Village. These areas were formerly designated as Metropolitan Open Land and had protection from being built on. However, my understanding is that these areas may now be changed to no Metropolitan Land thus allowing their use for future housing developments. As a resident of Shirley, I would like to point out that our land was designated as 'Amenity Open Land' in 1985 by Croydon Council because of our undersized gardens and transferred to a Management Company, with each property owner as a shareholder of the Company. Whilst I fully accept the need for new housing in Croydon, in particular affordable housing for first-time owners, it is clear the sheer scale of the proposed development and the resultant destruction of a precious greenfield site in Shirley Oaks Village that I object to. I would have no issue with a much smaller scale development of the village, as part of an overall plan for Croydon where new housing was primarily targeted toward development of brownfield sites under the council's jurisdiction. I urge you to consideration of my suggestions in the weeks ahead and look forward to receiving feedback in due course. No change. The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run-off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2195/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Jane Smith</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2225/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr William Wright</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Breda Mohan</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2302/01/002/DM43.4/O Brenda Stratford

Object

The use of the following 5 sites for housing; ref no. 128, 504, 541, 542, 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as local green spaces

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

2371/01/003/DM43.4/O Christopher Palmer

Object

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

2429/02/010/DM43.4/O Mr & Mrs E Abdul-Nabi

Object

Soundness - Justified

Object to the use of this site for housing.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Site 128, Land at Poppy Lane, is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Woodmere Avenue and Woodmere Gardens.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

I thoroughly object to these proposals, the traffic has built up over time and I wouldn't even want to begin to imagine what Shirley Oaks would be like if another 600+ homes where to be built, that would be practically doubling the size of Shirley Oaks as it is at present.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

I will be objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I will also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 128</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2539/01/005/DM43.4/O Lydia Benady</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 128</td>
<td>We strongly object to the changes to designations of our grass areas. As a resident and shareholder I point out that our land was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as Amenity Open Land because of our under-sized gardens. This land is for our use. Not only would building be detrimental to our health and well being but also to the varied and protected wildlife that we have. There are plenty of rundown places in Croydon which should be regenerated and can be built on without impinging into our green spaces.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2540/01/001/DM43.4/O Mrs Sandra Cooper</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified DM43.4 128</td>
<td>I object to the designation of Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks enabling parts of this land to be used for housing and in particular site 548, with which I have an adjoining boundary. Should the Council not keep this land as Metropolitan Open Land these spaces should at the least be designated as Local Green Space.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2541/01/003/DM43.4/O Ms Susanne Million</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 128</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing. If the Council will not keep this site as MOL, it should at least be designated as Local Green Space.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sara Palmer

Object

DM43.4
128

I object to the use of the Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128 for housing:

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Miss Margaret A Williams

Object

DM43.4
128

I wish to register my objection to the proposed plans for the housing development on the green areas around the Shirley Oaks Estate.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Mrs Shirley M Kall

Object

DM43.4 128

Our Local Green Belt should remain as such and not be designated as Metropolitan Open Land which then could be used for new housing. Strongly object to this proposal.

Plans for residential development:

Ref. No. 128- the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51-107 homes.

Ref. No. 504- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26-68 homes.

Ref. No. 541- land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 26-68 homes.

Ref. No. 542- land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes.

Ref. No. 548- land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes.

Development on any of these sites would change the whole character of the area, and surely add to the congestion of local roads, which would increase the risk of accidents.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Ms Karen Fletcher

Object

DM43.4 128

We wish to register our objection to the proposals to change the policy map 43 in relation to Metropolitan Open Land at Shirley Oaks Village.

Like many residents we purchased our home on the understanding that the MOL was owned by the residents themselves and would not be developed. It was a strong factor in our decision to purchase our house. The land itself was transferred to the management company by a transfer dating 30 July 1991 made between Heron Homes Limited and Shirley Oaks Management Limited. The third schedule to this transfer contains restrictive covenants and I have attached the relevant clauses. These clauses that the land is to be used as open space so I do not understand how you can ignore this and grant planning permission to build houses.

We understand the need for more housing but feel that this is not the way forward. It would be far better to look at the buildings/land owned by the London Borough of Croydon first to see which could be used as residential properties. The old Ashburton Library in Ashburton Park is such a building that could be redeveloped and used for housing and I am sure there are many more.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document No.</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2566/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs S White</td>
<td>I object to the use of the Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128 for housing:</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2569/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr John Booroff</td>
<td>Please note that I wish to object to the proposals set out in reference numbers 504, 541, 542, 548 and 128, for the following reasons:</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- There has been insufficient notice of the consultation period, and the proposals are not clearly set out as pertaining to Shirley Oaks Village.
- This land is designated as Metropolitan Open Land, and I do not agree that it does not meet the criteria, as it does contribute to the physical structure of London, and there currently are open-air facilities, which serve significant parts of London.
- Increasing the housing density in this development will have a detrimental effect on the overall environment, and will decrease the value of these homes, as the development contains smaller gardens than those originally planned, and the surrounding green spaces were left vacant to compensate for the lack of adequate open space.
- Any change in the restrictions will adversely affect the accessibility to nature and wildlife of the area, which contains features of metropolitan importance.
- There is inadequate infrastructure in the locality to accommodate such an increase in population.
- There has not been a true 'fit for purpose' investigation of the brownfield sites, which already exist in the borough, or of other open land which could be used without.

In view of the above please register my objection to all five proposals, and please acknowledge receipt of this email.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Mr Keith Harris

Object DM43.4 128

Development Reference Numbers 541,542,548,128,504

This we cause dangerous increase traffic through Shirley Oaks Road & Primrose Lane, and also increase parking by the Synagogue which is bad at the best of times.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Mr Lewis Reynolds

Object DM43.4 128

I wish to object to planned proposals; ref:128. These planned proposals will not fit within the current aesthetics of the estate so please accept this email as an objection to the proposal.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Mr Tau Wey

Object DM43.4 128

I am concerned about this proposal. When I bought my house in Angelica Gardens, Shirley Oaks Village, it was my understanding that I would also become a communal owner of the surrounding Amenity Open Land. This was guaranteed by each freeholder in Shirley Oaks owning a share of the Shirley Oaks Management Limited, which in turn owns and manages the Amenity Open Land. Like many residents, I purchased my house partly due to the pleasant areas of green space available in my surroundings. I also think that the character of the current surrounding gives each property the value that it currently has. I would also object to attempts by Croydon Council or other agencies to attempt to purchase the land from Shirley Oaks Management Limited in the future.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
I am emailing to outline my objections to the planning notices in relation to the above reference numbers which concern land near to Shirley Oaks Road, Honeysuckle Gardens, Poppy Lane and Primrose Lane.

I object to these proposed developments for the following reasons:

1. The move to unravel the protection of Metropolitan open land from significant housing developments is a disappointing and avoidable move by Croydon Council. This sets an unnecessary precedent. This land should be protected by its designation and the council has sufficient options elsewhere in the borough on land that has no such designation.

2. Much of the land concerned was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as "Amenity Open Land" because of the under-sized gardens of many of the Shirley Oaks property. I live with a young family on Shirley Oaks with a very small garden and object to the loss of this open land which is regularly used by young families and residents of the area who do not have large gardens or any gardens at all in some instances.

3. Such proposals will unduly change the character and desirability of the local area which is defined by its open space. Shirley Oaks remains one of the few genuine peaceful residential areas within the borough and such thoughtless development will threaten this.

4. The roads leading to Shirley Oaks are roads not given to significant volumes of traffic. Increasing the density of the population within the immediate area as substantially as you are proposing creates challenges for traffic and parking. The scale of the developments will exponentially increase the volume of traffic and create challenges for parking.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2583/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Sue Ridenton</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>I would like to raise my objection to the proposed land changes for the Ref. 128 - Poppy Lane, up to 107 new homes. The land we are talking about above was designated by Croydon council in 1985 as Amenity Open Land, because of our undersized gardens and transferred to the Management Company - with each property owner as a shareholder in that company. No one in the village will want any more homes built the open space keeps the village unique and a nice place to live. Any more homes will not enhance the village at all and of course will lower our house prices and a GYPSY site what on earth are the council thinking!! No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2585/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms Rachel James</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>I object to the following proposal for Shirley Oaks Village. Ref. 541, Ref. 542, Ref. 548, Ref. 128, Ref. 504 I love my home currently on Shirley Oaks our gardens are considerably smaller than the small side and I daily take walks on to the land with have with my 2 children and husband. I feel this would deprecate the area and I wouldn't be happy with any of the above plans. No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2599/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Helen Armstrong</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>I am writing to register my household's objection to the proposed development. The projected number of homes will impact dramatically not only on the existing residents and the open feel of the site, but essentially on the transport infrastructure. Wickham Road is a major route, prone to congestion at peak hours and any significant increase in road users will have a dramatic knock on effect not for residents and also for commuters in all directions. The Trinity roundabout is a major junction with many bus routes passing through, this would grind to even more of a halt. The potential number of proposed properties is unacceptably high. Objection to proposed development of the site 128 No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, the five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces and not used for housing. The site should be Local Green Space. No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Object

The Society objects to the proposals to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and on land surrounding Shirley Oaks Village, in particular the proposals on page 68. This land is currently protected from development similar to protection of green belt land. The Society objects in principle to the decision of the council to de-designate land currently held as Metropolitan Open Land. Even if parts of the areas were designated as local green space, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, there would still be a huge loss of open space. If development were allowed in these areas it would be detrimental to the amenity value of the area for the benefit of the public.

Object

Having lived in Shirley for over 50 years I strongly object to Croydon Council plans to de-designate the Metropolitan open land so that most of this land will be used for new housing. At the moment it has the same Protection as Green Belt. Firstly, this would entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding area, changing the character of the area, more importantly the road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic. Try getting out to the Wickham Road from Orchard Avenue in rush hour.

Object

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>Object/DM43.4</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Object/DM43.4</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/09/2016</td>
<td>Paul Sandford</td>
<td>Bourne Society</td>
<td>Land at Poppy Lane, is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Woodmere Avenue and Woodmere Gardens</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/09/2016</td>
<td>Rebecca Pullinger</td>
<td>CPRE London</td>
<td>The more specific site allocations represent a large reduction in the amount of designated and non-designated open space. While we acknowledge the need to build new homes and associated infrastructure such as schools, Croydon’s growing population also needs quality open spaces for all the human amenity and ecosystem services which they provide. We object to the proposed development on green spaces, which are currently designated, and should remain designated, as part of the Shirley Oaks MOL. As mentioned as part of our response to SP7, we feel that most of the site still warrants its MOL designation. We object to the following site allocations as they will fragment the green space impacting on residents’ amenity and wildlife’s use of the area (both current and potential). Contrary to the council’s statement in the Draft Local Plan, this site meets criteria for MOL in terms of its ecological value including nature conservation and habitat interest, with its mature trees and biodiversity, and has potential to be enhanced as per the NPPF and London Plan for leisure and</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/09/2016</td>
<td>Mrs Y Sussey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Object to proposals at this site because of the increased risk of flooding and adverse impact on air quality. New Housing should be on brownfield sites</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms S Mawaziny

Object DM43.4 128

I object to the use of the Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128 for housing:

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Mr & Mrs Kellas

Object DM43.4 128

I would say to the Council Croydon is full and kindly leave our precious Shirley open spaces and attractive streets alone, we don’t need an odd assortment of blocks of flats amongst the semi-detached and small detached properties here, or in similar Croydon suburbs it would be an architectural disaster along the lines of the 1950s concrete jungle development of the centre of Croydon. And we don’t have the infrastructure to cope with more people, or the roads to cope with the traffic we already have.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Mr Beresford Walker

Object

DM43.4

128


I object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in the vicinity of Shirley Oaks Road and Shirley Oaks Village. The land should be at least be designated as Local Green Space, for its protection from development.

This open space provides a green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, and should be retained in its present form.

I also object to the following specific proposals for the building of new homes on this site, as detailed in Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan, Detailed Policies & Proposals:

Policy DM43, reference Site 128 to build new homes at Poppy Lane

Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the local schools are over-subscribed as well as the already stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.

For the reasons given above:

1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run-off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Mr & Mrs Panagakis Object to the use of land at Poppy Lane (reference number 128) for housing

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Mr & Mrs C P Smith

Object to this site as this land was designated to residents of Shirley Oaks village as amenity open land in 1985 because of the undersized gardens and transferred to the management company. The Land should remain Green Belt

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Mr A Zelisko

Object

I object to the use of this site for housing.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Mr & Mrs Hunt

I am writing to object to:

- Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504
- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

People buy property on Shirley Oaks Village because of the green open spaces, the peace and tranquility, the beautiful Oak Trees. You cannot suddenly take that away these surroundings: people have spent hard earned money to live on this Village. Residents also pay for maintaining these green open spaces. The service road will not take any more traffic: two buses can hardly pass, and indeed were not supposed to drive round the estate together because of the small service road. There is a hospital and ambulance station on the estate, and any increase in traffic will interfere with their services.

C Banks

We are writing to object to the use of the following five sites for housing:

- Land at Poppy Lane, reference number 128
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, ref no. 504
- Lane to the East of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541.
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, ref number 542.
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, ref number 548.

If Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these sites should at least be designated as green spaces.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
2740/01/003/DM43.4/O Mr Ian K White

Object

DM43.4 128

I object to the use of the Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128 for housing:

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable. Subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

2742/01/006/DM43.4/O Mr E Tilly

Object

DM43.4 128

Object to this site as building on it would lead to a loss of greenspace between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding area

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable. Subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

2745/01/002/DM43.4/O Mrs Frances Pearce

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 128

I am writing regarding the Council’s plans for a massive redevelopment in the Shirley area. More houses mean more traffic on our already crowded roads. I no longer go into Croydon because of the journey times. How long would it be before the Council considered bringing in a congestion charge? When you build all these properties do you consider the local amenities and the effect that more people would have on these. Where are the school places for all of these children? Regarding doctors. Unless it is an emergency I have to wait at least a week for an appointment. This waiting time can only increase if there are more patients. Is it the Council’s policy to build over green belt land to the detriment of locals? I sincerely hope not. I think you need to seriously reconsider these plans.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable. Subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land; it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Object Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

128

These open spaces are collectively designated as Metropolitan Open Land. It would be disastrous to lose a link in this chain. THE SHIRLEY GREEN CHAIN

The green open spaces of Shirley Oaks Village provide several links in the Shirley Green Chain. This chain starts at the South Norwood Country Park in the north and runs south through Ryland Fields, Long Lane Woods, Ashburton Playing Fields, the open spaces of Shirley Oaks Village, Trinity School playing fields, Shirley Park Golf Course and up to the Shirley Hills. From there the Green Chain continues through Heathfield, Bramley Bank Nature Reserve, Littleheath Woods and via Selsdon Park to Kings Wood at Hamsey Green. These open spaces are collectively designated as Metropolitan Open Land. It would be disastrous to lose a link in this chain. Planning Policy Guidance Note 9 -

This guidance stresses the importance of nature conservation, not only on nationally important sites, but also suggests that many urban sites for nature conservation have enhanced local importance as a consequence of the relative lack of wildlife sites in built up areas. Statutory and nonstatutory sites which provide wildlife corridors, links or stepping stones from one habitat site to another, all help to form a network necessary to endure the maintenance of the current range and diversity of our flora and fauna. The Green Spaces in Shirley Oaks were designated as Metropolitan Open Land and today still meet the criteria for this protection. The sites contain conservation and habitat interest of value at a metropolitan level and (2) forms part of the Shirley Green Chain. These are two of the criteria for Metropolitan Open Land. The Green Spaces in Shirley Oaks Village were designated as Metropolitan Open Land and today still meet the criteria for this protection. The sites contain conservation and habitat interest of value at a metropolitan level and (2) form part of the Shirley Green Chain. These are two of the criteria for Metropolitan Open Land. These sites possibly have a section 52 agreement, and are part ownerships shared by each of the Shirley Oaks Village residents.

Re-designation of MOL falls foul of the London Plan.

Existing dwellings to be retained or

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
demolished? If retained the Site Area should be adjusted to take account of the existing dwellings: The Lodge, Beech House & Ash House? On the East side And the Synagogue and the two house (can't read their names) on the West side.

Infrastructure not specified to support development.

Schools are oversubscribed; GP Surgeries oversubscribed

Road system could not cope with the increase in traffic during peak travel times

Area has high water table and is subject to flooding.

London Plan

POLICY 7.17 METROPOLITAN OPEN LAND

Strategic:
A The Mayor strongly supports the current extent of Metropolitan Open Land (MOL), its extension in appropriate circumstances and its protection from development having an adverse impact on the openness of MOL.

Planning decisions
B The strongest protection should be given to London's Metropolitan Open Land and inappropriate development refused, except in very special circumstances, giving the same level of protection as in the Green Belt. Essential ancillary facilities for appropriate uses will only be acceptable where they maintain the openness of MOL.

LDF preparation
C Any alterations to the boundary of MOL should be undertaken by Boroughs through the LDF process, in consultation with the Mayor and adjoining authorities.

D To designate land as MOL Boroughs need to establish that the land meets at least one of the following criteria:
   a) it contributes to the physical structure of London by being clearly distinguishable from the built up area
   b) it includes open air facilities, especially for leisure, recreation, sport, the arts and cultural activities, which serve either the whole or significant parts of London
   c) it contains features or landscapes (historic, recreational, biodiversity) of either national or metropolitan valued if forms part of a Green Chain or a link in the network of green infrastructure and meets one of the above criteria.

The London Plan 7.56
The policy guidance of paragraphs 79-
92 of the NPPF on Green Belts applies equally to Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). MOL has an important role to play as part of London’s multifunctional green infrastructure and the Mayor is keen to see improvements in its overall quality and accessibility. Such improvements are likely to help human health, biodiversity and quality of life. Development that involves the loss of MOL in return for the creation of new open space elsewhere will not be considered appropriate. Appropriate development should be limited to small scale structures to support outdoor open space uses and minimise any adverse impact on the openness of MOL. Green chains are important to London’s open space network, recreation and biodiversity. They consist of footpaths and the open spaces that they link, which are accessible to the public. The open spaces and links within a Green Chain should be designated as MOL due to their London-wide importance.

---

**Site 128, Land at Poppy Lane**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>DM43.4 128</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cllr Tim Pollard</strong></td>
<td><strong>London Borough of Croydon</strong></td>
<td>Site 128, Land at Poppy Lane, is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Woodmere Avenue and Woodmere Gardens.</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Site 128, Land at Poppy Lane**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>DM43.4 128</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cllr Helen Pollard</strong></td>
<td><strong>London Borough of Croydon</strong></td>
<td>Site 128, Land at Poppy Lane, is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Woodmere Avenue and Woodmere Gardens.</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3? No, the land is current Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land or otherwise designated green land and should not be built on. I disagree that it “does not contribute to the physical structure of London”. Just because it has no facilities does not mean that it is not an asset to the life of London. Yes, it is deliverable but should not be delivered on that land. No, it is not sustainable because it removes the need for green space for future generations.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Site 128, Land at Poppy Lane, is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Woodmere Avenue and Woodmere Gardens.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Site 128, Land at Poppy Lane, is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Woodmere Avenue and Woodmere Gardens.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Object Site 128, Land at Poppy Lane, is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Woodmere Avenue and Woodmere Gardens.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Object Soundness - Justified Site 128, Land at Poppy Lane, is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Woodmere Avenue and Woodmere Gardens.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Object Residential development on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and around Shirley Oaks Village (reference numbers 128, 504, 541, 542, 548 on Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals) This is Metropolitan Open Land which is accorded the same level of statutory protection as the Green Belt. Changing this designation in order to allow building amounts to an abuse of the planning process. The area is liable to localised flooding, which anyway makes it unsuitable for residential housing. There appears to be no provision for additional infrastructure which would support the building of up to 750 new homes. In particular, local roads are already inadequate; morning traffic queues are already common in this area, especially towards the town centre. The proposals cannot but fundamentally alter the character of this part of Shirley, again, for the worse.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author/Agent</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>DM43.4 128</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/01/01/DM43.4/S</td>
<td>Tim Gilkinson Gilkinson Holdings</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>DM43.4 128</td>
<td>The site is deliverable for housing and does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land. The site is deliverable within the next 5 years housing with trees being retained for public amenity and will help the Council in their delivery of a 5 year supply of housing. The owners is going to have a topographical survey of the land undertaken so that a masterplan can be prepared to ascertain the number of dwellings that can be delivered. Welcome support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/01/DM43.4/S</td>
<td>Tim Gilkinson Gilkinson Holdings</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>DM43.4 128</td>
<td>The site is available and developable having electricity, water and gas supplies to the site already. Mains drainage is available in the road. We will be undertaking a topographical survey of the site and preparing a masterplan so that if the site is preferred as an allocation the number of dwellings can be identified. Welcome support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01/02/DM43.4/C</td>
<td>Mr. Roy Saunders</td>
<td>Object to</td>
<td>DM43.4 128</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere. No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

02 September 2016 Page 1838 of 4384
2904/02/001/DM43.4/O Mrs C E Wilson

Object DM43.4

The highway access is owned by Shirley Oaks Management Limited Company. The site is currently protected as Metropolitan Open Land. The designation should remain. If the decision to de-designate remains, the site should be designated local green space. Development of the site would not be consistent with the NPPF, nor would it be sustainable development for the reasons set out and those identified in respect to the objection to SP7.

The highway is unadopted and is not suitable for use in relation to the potential development and is therefore inappropriate. The site is not deliverable because of the unadopted highway in private ownership. The highway network through Shirley oaks is already at saturation point and any proposed residential development would generate an unacceptable amount of traffic. The site has a high water table and the area is prone to flooding which affects properties in particular at the boundaries to the land. Any development is likely to worsen this situation for those surrounding properties.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

2905/03/001/DM43.4/O Mr S F A Wilson

Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4

The highway access to the site, Poppy Lane, is owned by the Shirley Oaks Management Limited (Company). It is also currently designated Metropolitan Open Land. This designation should remain or at least be replaced by Local Green Space.

The highway is unadopted and is not suitable for use in relation to development. The proposal is therefore inappropriate. The site is not deliverable because of the unadopted highway in private ownership.

The existing highway network in Shirley Oaks is at saturation point and new development would generate an unacceptable amount of traffic.

The site has a high water table and the area is prone to flooding which affects properties in particular at the boundaries to the land. Any development is likely to worsen this situation for those surrounding properties.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
I object to the use of the following five sites for housing:
• Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
• Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
• Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
• Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
• Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
I write concerning Croydon Council’s proposals contained in the consultation document of the Croydon Local Plan that includes the re-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in Shirley and specifically within the confines of Shirley Oaks. I consider these proposals and others listed above to be inappropriate as they would significantly change the character of the area in which I have lived all 61 years of my life and I wish to add my voice to those already expressing concerns and objections about these proposals.

I strongly object to the proposal to re-designate Metropolitan Open Land to facilitate the building of new homes on land in Shirley Oaks and the provision of temporary or permanent traveller/gypsy sites in areas that are acknowledged by the Council to be in the green belt at Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries in Conduit Lane.

These proposals are totally out of keeping with the character of the area which predominantly comprise owner-occupied semi and detached homes. Surely areas considered to be brownfield sites are more appropriate than the unacceptable use of Metropolitan Open Land?

The proposals affecting the area surrounding Shirley Library are also of concern as this would adversely change the character of the area and potentially result in the establishment of additional unsightly car-parking sites on the south side of Wickham Road, similar to that at the front of the Shirley Medical Centre at 370 Wickham Road.
Object

Mr Roohi F Khan

DM43.4 128

This area of land is privately owned. Previous planning applications have been rejected by Croydon Council as unsuitable for residential building, a garden of remembrance and a Nursing Home.

This area is prone to flooding and has a high water surface level. Adjacent residential properties both within the Shirley Oaks, Monks Orchard, the Shirley Oaks Hospital and the land within Addiscombe Woodside and Shirley leisure Gardens Ltd experience this. It is noted Croydon Council removed the Tree Protection Orders for many of the trees in this area, this has increased the high surface water level leading to further risk of flooding and drain collapse. Previous Environment Agency studies have been conducted. There is evidence of much wildlife including badger runs. The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

No change

Object

Mr John Newman

DM43.4 128

I object to the use of the site for housing. The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>DM43.4 128</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I raise strong objection to the allocation of this site for development. I am a shareholder in Shirley Oaks Management Company which owns the land and maintains it. I pay a quarterly charge towards its upkeep. The traffic is already too much for the road through the village. Please do not allow our village to be destroyed.</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>This development will not foster an environment where existing enterprise can prosper, but will reduce enterprise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>This development will not reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation. It will not reduce unemployment, improve skills and education and improve environmental conditions; the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>This development is not high quality and will not enhance the borough’s natural environment but will reduce the natural environment by turning a green area into housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>This development will reduce the area as a safe, healthy and cohesive community but making the area overcrowded with residential property.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>This development will reduce the quality and accessibility of green space and nature.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This proposed development of new housing in Poppy Lane is not within keeping of the current development within this area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with housing in the area. Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area and is not in keeping with the surrounding area. Building a travellers site will increase noise levels and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area. Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. This development would diminish the area of green fields and recreational land within the area.

The proposal to build new houses in Poppy Lane does not fall within the Strategic Objectives because:

- Objective 2: This development will not foster an environment where existing enterprise can prosper, but will reduce enterprise.
- Objective 4: This development will not reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation. It will not reduce unemployment, improve skills and education and improve environmental conditions; the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.
- Objective 5: This development is not high quality and will not enhance the borough’s natural environment but will reduce the natural environment by turning a green area into housing.
- Objective 7: This development will reduce the area as a safe, healthy and cohesive community but making the area overcrowded with residential property.
- Objective 10: This development will reduce the quality and accessibility of green space and nature.

This proposed development of new housing in Poppy Lane is not within keeping of the current development within this area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with housing in the area. Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area and is not in keeping with the surrounding area. Building a travellers site will increase noise levels and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area. Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. This development would diminish the area of green fields and recreational land within the area.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
2974/01/003/DM43.4/O Jane Bowden
Object Soundness - Justified
DM43.4 128
2) I understand that the Council are seeking to de-designate various pieces of land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and around Shirley Oaks village, so that it is no longer Metropolitan Open Land, with a view to potentially building between 304 and 751 new homes. (Reference numbers 128, 504, 541, 542 & 548). Open, green land is essential to maintain a pleasant living area, and to maintain the character of the area. In addition, this number of additional dwellings would seriously overwhelm the local infrastructure. In particular, the local road infrastructure could not cope with the additional traffic.

No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

3001/01/002/DM43.4/O Mr John Helen
Object DM43.4 128
First, the Council plans to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village (page 68, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals). Metropolitan Open Land has the same protection from development as the Green Belt. The Council is proposing to remove this designation so that most of this land can be used for new housing. The draft Local Plan identifies five sites: the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 128).

I will be objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I will also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

I am happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but I will be objecting to building on precious open space.

No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

3002/01/002/DM43.4/O Mr John Hitchcock
Object DM43.4 128
Our family has lived on Shirley Oaks Village approx 20 years ago and understood the village to be a Private estate and I am writing to object to the de-designation of the open land around the village and to the use of five sites for housing.

The land rightfully belongs to the residents, the area and roads will become congested and property values will decrease.

No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Mr John Roberts

Object

DM43.4

128

I am writing to object to:

The use of the Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, reference number 542, for housing:

If the Council will not keep these areas as Metropolitan Open Land, these 5 sites should at least be designated as Local Green Space.

My objections are based on the following:

i. The change in local designation and subsequent development would lead to a material reduction to an important green space and amenity within a basically urban area,

ii. The effect and congestion on the local infra-structure which would be caused by the building of more housing to an already densely developed site,

iii. The effect on existing property values of property to Shirley Oaks and surrounding areas caused by the reduced amenity and congestion.

I urge that the Council should take these and other objections in consideration and not continue with their plans to re-designate the areas described above.

Mr Joseph Rowe

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

128

Land currently designated as Metropolitan Open Land at Poppy Lane, Stroud Green Pumping Station, to the east of Shirley Oaks Road, to the west of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens has been identified as suitable for up to 741 homes (pages 446-446, 451-452, 453-454, 455-456, 457-458 Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Part 1 and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference numbers 128, 504, 541, 542 and 548).

I object to these proposals on the grounds that:

This land is designated as Metropolitan Open Land and there is no justification for re-designation. An increase of up to 741 homes on this land would put local services including schools, transport and already crowded roads under further pressure.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run-off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Once the area surrounding Shirley Oaks Village is redesignated the Council plans to build 751 homes on 5 separate sites. Supposing the average house is for 4 people, 3000 people in total will move to the area. The housing will attract families – potentially half being children. The Council mention no where in their 700 page document about the building of new schools (primary and secondary) nor the building of doctor surgeries, nor the expanding of the local shopping area let alone the already stretched local road infrastructure. Our local area can’t cope as it is – St John’s primary school has applied for an extension to cope with the current demand on its places. During rush hour buses frequently don’t stop at bus stops because they are full. Traffic is often diverted down our road, Shirley Church Road, if there is an accident on Wickham Road or Gravel Hill. The dual carriageway (Shirley Park) is crawling along during rush hour. The council are planning to add another 1000 plus cars to this equation. Shirley is often described according to estate agents as leafy, popular, excellent schools. By building 751 more homes the character of the area will change completely.

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including infrastructure servicing, ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Road. None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Objector/Group</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3029/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Paul Newton Addington Village Residents Assoc</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic. If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3041/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Sarah Minter</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I strongly object to the proposed development plans for the Shirley Area. I have lived here all my life and have seen a steady influx of people, and a massive reduction in the green space in the area. The roads are already far too congested and the social infrastructure is already struggling to cope with the number of residents. There are many areas in the Croydon borough much more suited to such large scale development. I am thinking particularly of areas around Purley Way. There are also many brown field sites in the borough that could be put to more effective use as housing without affecting the green areas. I guess the council prefers to redevelop the green areas rather than the brown field areas due to cost. As I said I do not want my local area turned into a concrete jungle where there is nowhere for people to relax in the open.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3045/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Stuart Marsh</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
I am writing to object to all the proposed changes and plans affecting the Shirley neighbourhood as advised to me by Gavin Barwell and the Executive Committee of Spring Park Residents Association.

1) I object strongly to any plans to change the definition of existing land and use.
2) When dealing with the further extension of Shirley Oaks site I am disturbed by the fact there are just two access points i.e., Shirley Road and Wickham Road the latter being onto the A232 which is very busy all day and particularly during rush hour periods, when traffic backs up westwards to the Shirley Road roundabout and beyond. 3) The proposals for Shirley Oaks, given to me indicate land being suitable for between 304 and 751 additional homes. As many properties nowadays have at least one car this will have a serious additional congestion to Shirley and Wickham Roads.
4) Additionally, development of this size would have a serious demand on existing schools (primary particularly), doctors and other local services.

I am writing to object to all the proposed changes and plans affecting the Shirley neighbourhood

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

I object to all the proposals set out for new housing and travellers sites in Shirley. I feel it will ruin the area by taking up all the open spaces.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
I am writing to express my objection to the proposals of development to the Shirley oaks estate, on website www.croydon.gov.uk/policiesmap on "Changes to the policy Map 43" those being:-

Ref:541. Shirley oaks road East side, up to 215 new homes!!
Ref:542. Shirley oaks road west side, up to 236 new homes!!
Ref:548. Land rear of honeysuckle gardens, up to 125 new homes!!
Ref:128. Poppy lane, up to 107 new homes!!
Ref:504. Up to 68 new homes or gypsy site at the water board HQ, primrose lane!!!!!!!!

I brought my home on 5 Flag Close, Shirley Oaks, Surrey, CR0 8XT as it was on a green and pleasant estate and on the understanding this land was designated to us as because of our undersized gardens. We were told this land would never be built on and each of the properties on the estate are shareholders of this land as it was designated "amenity open land" by the Croydon council and transferred to our management company.

We are forming groups and seeking legal advice and looking into the legal implications and small print to your proposals and will not take this laying

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Mr Paul Grosser

The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 128
I have friends who live in Shirley oaks village and I know them and myself along with many others all object to the proposals to build on the green areas. This grass area is used by many and would totally change the area if built on and we don’t want it. Part of the charm of this area is those green areas and it has something that you don’t find often in Croydon so please let us keep the green areas as we all object to them being built on.

No change

Mr Derrick Thurley

De-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village thus enabling the following sites to be built on.

a) Policy DM43, Reference 128 Land to build 51 to 107 homes in Poppy Lane
b) Policy DM43, Reference 504 Land to build 26 to 68 homes at Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane including conversion of the pumping station
c) Policy DM43, Reference 541 Land to build 80 to 215 homes to the east of Shirley road and rear of Beech House
d) Policy DM43, Reference 542 Land to build 88 to 236 homes to the west of Shirley Oaks Road
e) Policy DM43, Reference 548 Land to build 5 to 13 homes to the rear of 5 to 13 Honeysuckle Gardens

This entails loss of green space, changing the character of the area and local road infrastructure unable to cope.

No change

Mr Richard Horton

I wish to log my objection to the borough-wide planned changes Croydon Council are proposing to make in their Local Plans for 2016-2036. These proposals are 750 new homes in Shirley Oaks and 35 new homes on the Shrublands Estate. Also the proposed work to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Coombe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Coombe Road.

No change
Mr Dominic Quinn
A3 Architecture London LTD

Object DM43.4 128

Object to the dedesignation of MOL around Shirley Oaks Village as it will change the character of the area if they are not MOL they should at least be Local Open Land. Building Houses on them would lead to the loss of avital green corridor and set a precedent

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Mr Stuart Beaton

Object DM43.4 128

I am writing to lodge my objection to some of the proposals contained in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals.

In particular:

1. Shirley Oaks
   The proposal to re-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on Shirley Oaks Road and around Shirley Oaks Village so that it can be used for new housing (page 68, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals).

My main objections are:

   This would result in the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area. The local road network could not cope with the additional traffic. Insufficient local infrastructure to cope with the increased population.

Conclusion

   The proposals I have highlighted can only been viewed as negative. If adopted, they will increase the local population – and the density of that population – without providing any supporting infrastructure. The new residents from the planned apartment blocks and traveller sites will need additional public services such as schools, medical services and shops. Older residents will give way to young families who require greater social support, yet no additional resources are identified to help manage the changing demographic. Traffic congestion along already busy roads will increase, as will pollution and accident black-spots. The few remaining green spaces will disappear. Overall, the proposals signal a reduction in the quality of life for both the existing residents and the newcomer.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
I am writing to object to:
1. The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:
   • Coombe Lodge Nurseries (site ref 661)
   • Coombe Farm off Oaks Road (site ref 502)
   • Poppy Lane (site ref 128)
   • Stroud Green Pumping Station (site ref 504)
   • Shirley Oaks Road/Beech House (site ref 541)
   • Shirley Oaks Road (site ref 542)
   • Honeysuckle Gardens (site ref 548)
   • Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Cottage (site ref 755)

   All areas provide vital green space in already densely populated areas, and there is insufficient infrastructure to cope with the additional traffic/population. Some of these areas are in the Green Belt, others are in Metropolitan Open Land. They would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3145/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr David Harwood</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>(1) I object to residential development at the following sites &amp; to the policy of de-designate of metropolitan open land at the following. Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128. No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3161/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Jim Cowan</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified. I have read Gavin Barwell’s assessment of policies and proposals in the Croydon Local Plan and totally agree that if implemented would destroy the character of Shirley. The infrastructure in Shirley is already stretched to the limit and can not withstand any further burdens. No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3190/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Sonya Millen</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I am also objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic. No change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Stan Minter

Object

DM43.4

128

I have major concerns over the planned development of the Shirley Area. This is currently one of the nicest areas of Croydon and you plan to swamp it with a number of housing developments and some travellers sites. This will be very detrimental to the whole area.

I understand that nationally we need to have more accommodation for families. We need to achieve this with ought destroying the whole fabric of our society. This scale of development will transform the whole area into a old fashioned “Estate”.

There are not sufficient services in the wider area to support such an influx of families.

The road infrastructure already struggles at time and these developments will make the whole situation much worse.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Mr Steve Hopkins

Object

DM43.4

128

As a resident of Shirley Oaks from Day one, I totally oppose any new buildings to be approved or built on my private estate.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Mr Stephen Smith

Object

DM43.4

128

1. I am writing to object to re-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and the intention to build on open sites at Poppy Lane (ref 128), Primrose Lane (ref 504), Shirley Oaks Road (refs 541 + 542) and Honeysuckle Gardens (ref 548).

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
I am therefore writing to formally object to:

1. The de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;

2. The use of the following five sites for housing:
   - Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   - Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   - Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
   - Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

We bought our property at the original building phase in Shirley Oaks many years ago and were informed that there would be no further development in this area and that all grassed areas were to remain undeveloped and were for the use of residents and local people at leisure. Further to this we have paid yearly a maintenance cost to ensure these areas were kept up for this use. This is the main reason we invested in this property. The grassed areas are in constant use and development of these areas would change the natural village atmosphere that exists here and is one of the few areas of Croydon that there is an abundance of wildlife close to an urban area. The proposed development and designation of our grass areas is unacceptable and would infringe our rights as in our original contracts with Heron homes who built the site.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Mr Peter Kenny

Object

I am writing to object to The use of the following sites for housing:
- Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane Reference number 504
- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541
- Land to the West of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548

If the council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should be at least designated as Local Green Spaces.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The area of Shirley Oaks Village and its adjacent road infrastructure is already at breaking point. Any slight build up of traffic seriously hinders movement for residents. The 2 main arterial routes into Croydon or towards Bromley (being Wickham Road & Lower Addiscombe Road) are extremely busy with traffic and often lead to extended journey times for those of us who wish to head in to one of these town centres or further afield in to London for work. As proven only yesterday when a traffic accident in the Shirley area led to a 3 hour journey home from Bromley back to Shirley. The road network around here is poor. The interlink between Shirley Oaks village and its surrounding area is poor. To add hundreds of houses within this area will only lead to increased volume of traffic on the surrounding roads and leave Shirley itself in an almost permanent state of gridlock. Shirley Oaks Road is always busy with vehicles parked up. This is due to a number of reasons; The excessive traffic on Wickham Road leading to people abandoning their vehicles to try and walk nearer to Croydon to catch a tram or bus. The unreliable 367 bus route which is often hindered by traffic or accidents outside of Shirley Oaks Village leading to people driving closer to other bus routes. The use of the local synagogue. Combine these issues above with the additional housing being proposed and the vehicles that come with them, Shirley Oaks will become even cut off than it already is. There are many elderly residents in this area that rely on carers (friends etc) being able to visit them. They often complain about the issues I have raised above and I can only see this getting worse should the proposals for Shirley go ahead. Croydon is a massive borough so there must be other areas that these proposals could be met.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 128</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Terrence McCarthy</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing. If the Council will not designate it as Metropolitan Open Land, it should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on it would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Lewin</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To help you identify my specific objections, the five proposals mentioned so far and to which I wish to object as being detrimental to the character of the area are:

- the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 128);
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 504);
- land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 541);
- land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542); and
- land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548).

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3337/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Roger Williams</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM43.4 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3354/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Dr Bob Wenn</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3356/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Rishi Gohill</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic. If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3356/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr John Mullis</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>In response to your notices for the development of the greenfield sites on Shirley Oaks Village and the intention to change the status of this land, I make the following observations: In 1985 Croydon Council designated land within Shirley Oaks Village as &quot;Amenity Open Land&quot; because our gardens were small due to the layout and construction of the area by Heron Homes. This amenity land is owned collectively by the property owners who own 1 share each. The shares are held by the current trust company - First Port, who also maintain this estate. Is compulsory purchase envisaged? If a total of some 700 homes the village would need vast changes to its infrastructure to accommodate these properties. The present main road - Primrose Lane/Shirley Oaks Road is barely able to cope now - with just a single decker bus allied to a growing number of cars. There is a regular flooding problem during heavy downpours - particularly from Primrose Lane into Laburnum Gardens. The loss of a wildlife conservation area is surely against wider interests including many present owners.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Joy Harris

Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 128

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Claire Rutland

Object DM43.4 128

As a shareholder of the open space in Shirley Oaks I would like to object to the proposals made in Policy Map 43.

One of the reason I bought the property was for the nice open spaces that surround the houses.

Building unnecessarily on this land will change the whole look and feel of the community of Shirley Oaks Village. We have one road in and out of the village and cramping in 700+ homes onto our lovely open space will also create congestion on the one road. Shirley Oaks is privately owned and we take pride in our village and how it looks and will fight against these proposals.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Claire Corper

Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 128

To whom this may concern

Ref:541
Ref:542
Ref:548
Ref:128
Ref:504

I strongly object to these plans as a resident of hazel close I am a shareholder of Shirley oaks management and feel strongly that the land be left as it is as we have very small gardens and pay for these open land areas to be kept and maintained for our use and enjoyment. Also these plans especially the ref 504 will devalue my property immensely and will downgrade the area dramatically

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
One of the requirements of the Pitt review of 2007 was for the Environment Agency to provide some warning for surface water flooding, as was already the practise for river and coastal flooding. The result was the LIDAR returns which are provided on the Environment Agency’s website under ‘what’s in my backyard’. This shows clearly how the lie of the land amongst the Shirley Oaks Estate causes surface water to run from South to North joining another stream which runs in from the SW from Shirley road into Primrose Lane. On numerous occasions over recent wet winters we have had a constant stream of water running across the kerb into Primrose Lane which has on occasion caused substantial amounts of ice to form. No doubt your winter maintenance department could confirm this is an area where they have to regularly do spot treatments of rock salt- since they do Primrose lane as it is a bus route, when other parts of the network are totally dry and do not require treatment.

From the Pitt Review of 2007, RECOMMENDATION 7: There should be a presumption against building in high flood risk areas, in accordance with PPS25, including giving consideration to all sources of flood risk, and ensuring that developers make a full contribution to the costs both of building and maintaining any necessary defences.

Section 5.14 of the report reiterates that PPS25 applies to all sources of flood risk. This states that an SFRA (surface flooding risk assessment) should assess surface water flood risk and identify critical drainage areas. Good information is therefore needed from sewerage undertakers and other sources, including local knowledge, historic flooding and risk modelling. Local authorities should ensure that SFRAs carried out on their behalf adequately address this type of flooding. I find it difficult to believe this has been done as otherwise there would have never been a suggestion of using the remaining green parts of the estate in this way.

Any increase in the built up area around the estate would thus exacerbate the already on occasion saturated surface. Having investigated in detail the benefits in the reduction of flooding by the provision of trees, I have found that Oak trees can use up to 50 gallons a day and some trees on a hot day will utilise 150-200 gallons (wiki-answers.com). Trees admittedly are most effective when we are in the dry season.
growing season at excess water removal, but that is also when we tend to have the most extreme rainfall events. Having looked at ‘Heavy falls in a day’ and ‘Heavy falls in short Periods’ both produced in part for British Rainfall by the Met Office (my employer), I have found that invariably the most extreme rainfall happens in SE England between June and September. This is just when a tree is in full leaf so not only intercepts falling rain by the size of its canopy, but also as it is growing, that rain which reaches the soil is quickly extracted for use in the tree’s transpiration. Preliminary research results from the University of Manchester indicate that trees can reduce runoff by as much as 80% compared to asphalt. Thus the best way to alleviate summer extreme rainfall surface water flooding is not to remove trees.

The soil on which Shirley Oaks is located is of a clay type and is therefore impervious: another reason why it reacts to surface water flooding the way it does. The large area of grassland is ideal for ‘making room for water’ as a water storage area, thus to remove this pooling facility will mean the rain will have to find somewhere else to go, which would inevitably mean flooding for Shirley Oaks residents. Also I have learned, from Meteorological Office memorandum No 80—the properties of soils in NW Europe, that the root system of grassland provides a channel through which some rainfall does manage to slowly percolate through beneath the surface even with clay soils. However, without the grassland root system the water just tends to form bodies of water lying on the surface. This effect of our grassland is very helpful in alleviating the surface water flooding in winter, which occurs when prolonged rainfall totally saturates the area, and the trees are no longer as effective at its removal.

So in conclusion:
- We need trees to mitigate effects of extreme rainfall in summer, something which will become increasingly frequent with global warming.
- We need open grassland for water to accumulate in winter when trees are less effective at water removal from the system, whilst in addition their root systems help to aid percolation beneath the soil reducing surface flooding. Over the last 40 years winter rainfall has been increasing throughout the UK.
- Soil behaviours also dictate risk of flooding. We have issues because:
1) We are on a clay soil type so low permeability and heavy rain does not soak in but floods.
2) We are on sloping ground with tendency for run off to flow south to north across the site.
3) We, also because of having a clay soil, have a high water table, so in winter many areas of the site are wet and all parts stay damp throughout. Thus water-logging very quickly occurs and there would with the proposed building work be less and less places for the water to flow to.

Object

DM43.4
128

I am writing to you to object to the councils planned proposals Ref:541 Ref:542 Ref:548 Ref:128 Ref:504

I moved to the area with the understanding that the grass areas had protection from being built upon and I strongly object to the council proposing the new developments as referenced above. This will make the area I live in with my family crowded and I bought my property with the understanding that the grass areas would not be built on.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
First, the Council plans to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village (page 68, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals). Metropolitan Open Land has the same protection from development as the Green Belt. The Council is proposing to remove this designation so that most of this land can be used for new housing. The draft Local Plan identifies five sites:

- the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 128);
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 504);
- land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 541);
- land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542); and
- land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548).

I will be objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Mr Daniel James
Object
DM43.4
128
I am writing to object to the council’s proposition to allow the development at the following sites: Ref: 541, 542, 548, 128 and 504 in Shirley Oaks Village.

I have only lived on Shirley Oaks for 5 years, but one of the things I love the most is walking my children over to the grass areas so they can play. As you probably already know, our gardens are quite small so it’s really nice to have space to take full advantage of. Another thing that disappoints me, is that one of the selling points of our house, is the fact that all the land around the estate is protected from building on. I strongly disagree with any of your plans to build upon this land, and along with other Shirley Oaks residents will do my best to get our voices heard.

No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface runoff from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Ms Aileen Deeney
Object
DM43.4
128
As a resident of Shirley Oaks Village, I wish to register my objection to the above proposals to allow the development of new homes on the designated Amenity Open Land which is available for my use and that of my fellow residents. This use was allowed by Croydon Council because of the undersized gardens which is a negative feature of the current development and which hinders enjoyment and comfort of my property. For example, it is not possible for children to play with footballs/other toys noisily without disturbing the adjoining and physically very close neighbours. You are no doubt aware that there are no nearby children’s parks. Also my garden can easily be overlooked by at least 4 sets of neighbours and which I believe is typical of the other gardens on the development. Having the Amenity Open Land available is some compensation for the above lack of privacy and if it was to be withdrawn it would have a detrimental impact on

No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface runoff from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Ms A Pavon-Lopez

**Object**

DM43.4 128

I object to the use of the site for housing.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

---

Mr & Mrs Cyril Nazareth

**Object**

DM43.4 128

As a resident of Croydon Borough and in particular Shirley Oaks, I am contacting you to voice my objection to the following development proposals: Ref: 128 Poppy Lane

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

---

Mr Daniel Nuthall

**Object**

DM43.4 128

I would like to object to the following Metropolitan open land proposals - Poppy Lane - Ref 128 - Stroud Green Pumping Station - Ref 504 - Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House - ref 541 - Land to the west of Shirley Road ref 542 - Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens ref 548. The Metropolitan land provide several links in the Shirley Garden Chain. Under the Planning Policy Guidance Note 9 the importance of nature conservation is stressed. This combined with the extra traffic seems unacceptable.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Mr Donald Speakman

Site 128, Land at Poppy Lane, is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would totally change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Woodmere Avenue and Woodmere Gardens.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

---

Mr David Wilson

We wish to object in the strongest terms to the plans being discussed regarding the proposed development of land for new housing in the Shirley area, specifically the building of Gypsy/Traveller sites on our doorstep, and the inherent increase in crime and anti-social behaviour that always follows, and can be seen in many examples nationally.

Not only this, but the whole ‘Village’ feel of the area will be completely obliterated, and the very things that attracted us to move to Shirley (off Orchard Ave) will be no more. Of course people need a place to live and raise families, but time and again we have seen the resultant decline of neighbourhoods, with rubbish, noise and theft frequent occurrences. We urge you to think again and take heed of Gavin Barwells very real concerns, and those of what I’m sure are many of his constituents, and other Shirley dwellers. We are particularly concerned that you should take into account the fears of ordinary hard working people like us, who want to enjoy life (we’re not ‘oldies’) in a pleasant community, and think again about the following proposals; the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 128).

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document No.</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>DM43.4 128</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3438/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr D Lane</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the use of Land at Poppy Lane for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3445/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr E King OBE</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic. If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3449/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs E Thomas</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I wish to log my objection to the borough-wide planned changes Croydon Council are proposing to make in their Local Plans for 2016-2036. These proposals are 750 new homes in Shirley Oaks and 35 new homes on the Shrublands Estate. Also the proposed work to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Coombe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Coombe Road.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr & Mrs Proctor

Object DM43.4

We are writing to object most strongly to the Croydon Council's Local Plan for housing on Green Belt land, with particular reference to Shirley.

Our Green Belt should be protected at all costs and brown field sites must be targeted. In this respect, we support our MP Gavin Barwell’s objections, which you will doubtless have received.

No change

Mr F Kurum

Object DM43.4

I am writing to object to the use of the following five sites for housing:

- land at poppy lane (128)
- Stroud Green pumping station, 140 Primrose Lane (504)
- land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House (541)
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks road (542)
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens (938)

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Space.

No change

Mr & Mrs Hobbs

Object DM43.4

I am writing to you to object to the use of the following sites for housing development.

- The land at Poppy Lane. Ref. No. 128
- Stroudwick Green Pumping Station. Ref. No. 504
- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and rear of Beech and Ash House. Ref no. 541
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road. Ref no. 542
- Land to rear of part of Honey Suckle Gardens. Ref no. 548

No change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>3473/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Dave Brown</td>
<td>DM43.4 128</td>
<td></td>
<td>I object to these proposals to build on the land ref 128, the land should be left as it is. No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>3482/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Sheila Desmond</td>
<td>DM43.4 128</td>
<td>Ref 541 Ref 542 Ref 548 Ref 128 Ref 504</td>
<td>I wish to lodge a serious objection to the proposals for the building of houses on Shirley Oaks Village. That name speaks for itself. I have lived on Shirley Oaks Village for 30 years and during that time I have paid the management company a contribution to maintain the amenity open land. The residents each own a share of the Land and over the years the open areas have been enjoyed by families for games walking and enjoying the lovely trees not to mention the wildlife. When the land was sold by Lambeth in 1984 the intention was to create a village. Has any thought been given to the effect on the infrastructure by adding 751 properties? the pressures on the roads in particular. The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposal to build new houses in Poppy Lane does not fall within the Strategic Objectives because:

Objective 2: This development will not Foster an environment where existing enterprise can prosper, but will reduce enterprise

Objective 4: This development will not reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation. It will not reduce unemployment, improve skills and education and improve environmental conditions, the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Objective 5: This development is not high quality and will not enhance the borough’s natural environment but will reduce the natural environment by turning a green area into housing

Objective 7: This development will reduce the area as a safe, healthy and cohesive community but making the area overcrowded with residential property

Objective 10: This development will reduce the quality and accessibility of green space and nature. This development will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The development will change the outlook and community within the South Croydon area and future generation will suffer because of this. This proposed development of new housing in Poppy Lane is not within keeping of the current development within this area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with housing in the area. Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area and is not in keeping with the surrounding area. Building a travelers site will increase noise levels and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area.

Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. This development would diminish the area of green fields and recreational land within the area.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Message</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3486/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Gary Stewart</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Re the above proposals with Ref nos 541, 542, 548, 504, and 128 I wish to object in the possible strongest sense. This land was not designated for this use and hence our homes all have very small gardens to protect this open space. We already have problems with the road through the estate and it cannot possibly take any more traffic. The allowed parking on this road particularly on the curves gives cause for real concern. I have avoided two accidents only by making an emergency stop. If the council goes ahead with these proposals then we will fight and please note we are depending on support from local councillors and our MP. Think again please.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3492/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Helen Silk</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the plans to build gypsy/traveller sites in the area of Shirley and the building of anything on any area of green belt land, green spaces or back gardens</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3498/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Ian Marsh</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I wish to object strongly to the proposed developments at Shirley Oaks - Ref 128 Poppy Lane - 107 new homes</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>3501/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Gaynor Lawrence</td>
<td>Please see this email as my objection to the proposed housing. This is ridiculous. The village is small and the road going through the village would NOT suffice the extra traffic! I pay a maintenance charge and moved here as it is a quiet location. I have been burgled a couple years back due I believe to the travellers that squatted on the land here and I do not want that fear again. Please rethink this crazy idea and let me know how I can further stop this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr John Albert

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 128

As a long term resident and shareholder residing in Shirley Oaks Village, I and my partner object to the proposals to Changes to the Policy Map 43 - REF's 541, 542, 548, 128 & S04. These areas have metropolitan open land and had protection from being built on!

Our land was designated by Croydon Council in 1985, as Amenity Open Land because of our under sized gardens and transferred to the management company whom we our shareholders of and this land is for our use and want it to stay this way!! Having lived here for 20 years we do not want it further condensed by more homes and totally not fit for purpose!

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Katrina Neal

Object: DM43.4 128

As a long term resident of Shirley/West Wickham and one who has seen many changes over the years, I am strongly objecting to Poppy Lane - ref 128 for housing use. If these are not kept as MOL then at least keep them as Local Green Spaces.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Jenny Hayden

Object

DM43.4 128

The proposals for Shirley will have a huge impact on the area, the current infrastructure is already at bursting point and the building of new homes on green spaces will add further stress to the current situation.

Ref nos, 128,504,541,542, 548... these relate to the building of additional homes. From the information available in the Council's documentation, this could be up to 800 new homes. I would like to know what sort of homes these are likely to be... social, housing associations or private... I doubt that any of them would be affordable homes for first time buyers. How will the local roads cope with the extra traffic. There will be a need for more schools, doctors' surgeries etc to support the intended increase to the local population. I would therefore like to object to the Council's decision to use these five sites for future residential development. Apart from putting extra burden on the local roads, it would also mean losing valuable green spaces. I believe any new residential development should be on brownfield sites. The addition of so many extra homes would have an adverse affect on the character of Shirley, in my opinion.

Rhodri Flower

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 128

I write with reference to your document 'Changes to the Policies Map (Policy DM43)'; and in specific reference to sites 541, 542, 548, 128 and 504. These sites are all open space surrounding the development known as Shirley Oaks Village.

I wish to object to the proposals to reclassify the land and make it eligible for planning permission and the building of homes. In my opinion it is essential to preserve the open space for the use of local residents. It is well used for recreation, dog walking etc. It is also an important part of the character of Shirley Oaks Village and would change the nature of that development.

I bought a house on Primrose Lane in June 2015 and a large factor in my decision to buy was the amount of open space available locally. I understand that Croydon Council designated this land as 'Amenity Open Land' in 1985 because of under-sized gardens in Shirley Oaks Village and transferred it to the Shirley Oaks Management Company, which has maintained it ever since. As a house owner I am a shareholder in that company.

I strongly object to your proposals.
I refer to the proposed changes to the planning policies to allow Croydon Council to build new homes on the Amenity Open Land at the above. The Amenity Open Land was granted in part, due to the extremely small rear gardens. Also I and other people in the village for many years here contributed to its upkeep at no cost to Croydon Council. To lose this land will greatly impact on the peaceful enjoyment that I and my neighbours have in using this land as well as the general impact on the area of high density building, changing the character of our village forever.

No doubt this development will result in many trees and flowers being sacrificed which help to sustain the urban wildlife such as various birds, bats, foxes, badgers and bees etc. There seems to be little consideration for this urban oasis!

Whilst I understand central government's drive for more houses, I find it hard to believe that Croydon Council needs this land in order to fulfil its housing quota, given the Westfield and other developments proposed in Croydon. There are also other lands, such as those owned by the local NHS hospital that would be suitable for development and at the same time give ready money to the NHS.

Furthermore, the existing main roads are already inadequate to service the village without adding a further 751 homes along with the years of road works that will be associated with upgrading the utilities, make travelling through the village more difficult and dangerous. I urge you to reconsider your plans.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Mr Mark Hawkins

Object: Kindly note that as a homeowner (and shareholder) of Shirley Oaks Village, resident here for over 25 years, I am deeply concerned that Croydon Council seems to think it has the right to change the nature of the estate from being protected Metropolitan land to being unprotected land ripe for excessive building.

Not only is the green space around the current estate, a much loved feature, it also provides a sanctuary for wildlife and allows for nice walks for local people. The road was built to be narrow and already there are problems with passing places for traffic to the hospital and synagogue.

Last year the council allowed a resident to build a fence which obstructs drivers vision when turning out of Cornflower Lane and has caused several minor incidents. Simply put, the roads here were not built for traffic!

The idea of ruining my neighbourhood by cramming more housing onto unsuitable roads, lacking shops and facilities whilst depriving me of the green spaces I love and part own makes me sick to my stomach.

There are so many brownfield sites that could be built on and provide more suitable housing in and around Croydon that I feel that this attack on Shirley is politically motivated.

I formally ask the council to reconsider the proposals.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

---

Mr I Fuell

Object: Soundness - Justified

I am writing to object to:

3. The use of the following 5 sites for housing:

- Land at Poppy Lane: reference number 128;
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane: reference number 504;
- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House; reference number 541;
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road; reference number 542; and
- Land to the rear of 5 – 13 Honeysuckle Gardens; reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these 5 sites should at least be designated as local green spaces.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Kalpana Patel Object DM43.4 128 We have got objection for above proposal. We are not happy, it would cause lots of traffic and not ideal for residents. No change

Karen Warwick Object DM43.4 128 I would like to raise my objection to the proposed land changes for the following references: Ref. 128 - Poppy Lane, up to 107 new homes. The land was designated by Croydon council in 1985 as “Amenity Open Land”, because of our under-sized gardens and transferred to the Management Company - with each property owner as a shareholder in that company. As for looking at a Gypsy site, you should have seen what a mess they made when they camped illegally at Shirley Oaks just over a year ago - it was disgusting! No change

Maureen Wilcox Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 128 Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic. If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. No change
Mr Mike Jones

Object DM43.4

The designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village in particular such as the use of the following for housing:-

- land at Poppy Lane
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane
- land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House
- land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road
- land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens

Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. There is a lot of history around here and the loss of the Shirley Lodge in the late 1990s was a big mistake. Generally in Croydon there is no room for more traffic that new building will generate and judging from what I have seen around Croydon squeezed housing units with small garages not fit to store cars and little or no off street parking will only add to stress and problems in the future.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Mr Peter Newsham

Object DM43.4

I wish to register my objection in the strongest possible terms to the proposal for new housing, (ref:128), in these areas of Metropolitan Open Land, which is essential for recreational purposes in an already overcrowded place. The proposed re-designation of the land so that it can be used for high-density urban development will find no local support, but instead, a huge and vocal opposition.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Mr Michael Hewish

Object DM43.4

Please see my objections to your proposals as detailed below.

Ref: 128 Land at Poppy Lane. Poppy Lane is a private road with restricted access and is owned by Shirley Oaks Management Limited. Many previous planning applications have been refused due to the conservation value of the site. Drainage is a major problem locally, hence the Thames Water Board's Balancing Pond in the next field.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run-off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

3580/02/002/DM43.4/D Mr Michael Hewish

Object

The designation as MOL should remain. If it is decided de-designation proceeds, the Site should be designated as local Green Space.

The proposed development of the Site in the event that the present designation remains or that re-designation takes pace as Local Green Space would not be consistent with national policy under the NPPF and such a proposal would be incompatible. The proposed approach is not appropriate nor would it enable sustainable development for the reasons set out above and those identified in respect to the objection to Policy SP7.

The highway is unadopted and is not suitable for use in relation to potential development. The proposal is therefore inappropriate. The Site is not deliverable because of the unadopted highway ownership. The highway network through Shirley Oaks is already saturated point and in any event any proposed residential development would generate an unacceptable amount of traffic.

The Site has a high water table and the area is prone to flooding which affects properties in particular at the boundaries to the land. Any development is likely to worsen this situation for those surrounding properties.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run-off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

3591/01/003/DM43.4/D Mr Nick Barnes

Object

Soundness - Justified

Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up to four storeys along Wickham Road.

None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.
I am objecting to the proposal for de-designation of this area as Metropolitan Open Land. The council has consistently denied planning permission to successive owners of this land since The London Borough of Lambeth abandoned it as their tree nursery, because of damage to mature trees and the high water table. I can see no reason to change this. It forms a vital wildlife link between Ashburton Playing Fields via the back gardens of Woodmere Avenue behind Shirley Oaks hospital to the other green spaces around Shirley Oaks. This can be clearly seen from satellite photographs.

No change  The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Site 128, Land at Poppy Lane, is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Woodmere Avenue and Woodmere Gardens.

No change  The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

I object to the Councils proposal to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land of Shirley Oaks Road and Shirley Oaks Village as the local infrastructure could not cope.

No change  The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Ms J Stokes

Object

DM43.4

I object to the proposals to completely change Shirley Oaks Road which is a green lung for that part of the Borough. The amount of car ownership will rise significantly as the bus service is infrequent. The traffic will clog up the Wickham Road even more than now. St. John’s school has already plans for more classrooms and the intake will rise in all the local schools. Also pulling down established houses and putting up more flats is detrimental to the character of the area. We had a once in a lifetime chance to improve the look of Croydon, on a human scale. Instead of which we are building hideous tower blocks, while in other parts of the country they are pulling them down. Nobody should have to raise a family in a block 44 stories high. They will eventually become the slums of the future.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Jenny Tighe

Object

DM43.4

Development of these sites will have a negative impact on the local area by changing the character of Shirley, and well as being a loss of green space, wildlife habitat and a vital green corridor.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Mrs J Middleton

Object

DM43.4

I object to the site for use for housing.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
3726/01/001/DM43.4/O Miss Amanda Smithers  
**Object**  
DM43.4  
128

I am emailing to object to the following proposal ref 128. My partner is a resident of Betony close Shirley oaks village and we definitely do not want the surrounding areas to be built on.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

3733/01/004/DM43.4/O Ms Jennifer Addis  
**Object**  
DM43.4  
128

I strongly object to the development proposals by the council for the above areas on Shirley Oaks Village. All the gardens on our houses are tiny so this green land which was designated as 'Amenity Open Land' was supposed to be for the use of the residents. There are enough houses on this area already! This will have a huge detrimental effect on all the residents in the area.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

3735/01/002/DM43.4/O Mr Tim Duce  
**Object**  
Soundness - Justified  
DM43.4  
128

I strongly object to any plan to build on Metropolitan Open Land. There are plenty of brown field sites available in Croyton and the MOL should be re-designated as Local Green Space.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3737/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr J Patel</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I am writing to record my objection to various planning as follows. Your Ref No 128.504.541.542.548 and 938. I don't think it will be good for the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3744/02/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Diane Simpson</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic. If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3769/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr K George</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I am also concerned that you consider there is space for up to 751 houses in the Shirley Oaks Road area. References 128.504.541.542 548. This would lead to the elimination of green space in that area and therefore I think at least 3 of these areas should be Local Green Spaces if not Metropolitan open land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RE: LAND ON EITHER SIDE OF SHIRLEY OAKS ROAD, SHIRLEY OAKS VILLAGE, POPPY LANE, STROUD GREEN PUMPING STATION, COOMBE FARM, COOMBE LODGE NURSERIES off Conduit Lane, land west of Shirley Oaks Road, rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens OBJECTION TO DE-DESIGNATION GREEN BELT ; SHIRLEY, NEW ADDINGTON, FOREST HILL

We have lived in the Borough of Croydon for 30 years and value its vibrancy and diversity.

As Croydon ratepayers we object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land generally, especially land detailed above, which will change forever Croydon's character.

We would ask you to encourage policies/development to:

1. Build new housing on brown field sites by means AND preserve invaluable green space for the benefit of the community of Croydon; 2. Protect green belt land and preserve the green corridors we desperately vital for wildlife and biodiversity; 3. Amend the tall buildings policy and keep the tallest building zone where it is suited in the centre of town; 4. Utilise brownfield sites for new low-level housing only where it can be developed alongside new GP surgeries, schools and improved public transport; 5. Traveller sites are not appropriate in the green belt and is a clear breach of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. When travellers camped on Addington Playing Fields in 2012/13 they left rubbish, debris, waste, and deterioration to a local green space. Sadly true of most traveller sites.

"Nowadays people know the price of everything and the value of nothing", Green Belt is vital and precious. Once lost for future generations and will not be replaced by developers.

We understand the need for housing, schools, hospitals and infrastructure. Are the Developers investing these also alongside their building investments?

Please protect our few remaining green spaces on the borough map, by making better use of brown field sites.

No change
Mr & Mrs Barnes

Object

We are also writing to object to Croydon Council’s plans to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village, changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan:

We are objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council will not keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. We are also objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development.

Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure could not cope with the additional traffic.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land. It has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
I am writing this email to voice my deep concern about the planned development in the private estate that I have lived in for many years, namely:

Ref 541, Ref 542, Ref 548, Ref 128 and Ref 504 – all on Shirley Oaks Village private estate.

Firstly, it would have been nice to be informed about any planning ideas in writing rather than see small notices pinned to lamp post around the estate. I would also like to draw your attention that our land was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as ‘Amenity Open Land’ for the residents and for which we pay a quarterly fee for maintenance of the green open land, but more importantly can I bring to your notice that this land was transferred to the Shirley Oaks Management Company, with each property owner as a shareholder in that company. This land is for our use and not for developing a concrete jungle on every single green inch of land in Croydon.

The Shirley Oaks estate has a great community spirit and has become a real sought after location for families to live due to the community nature and the lovely open land that we have, by developing on this land you will be taking away all of the good that has been built up over the years by the many residents we have as well as making the village overcrowded, bringing in more traffic thus resulting in more danger on the main Primrose Lane for people crossing and driving, congestion for parking and so on. I can also bring to your attention that we have already had a couple of fatalities on that main road that runs through the village and this will make it worse for the safety of our kids.

I am sure you have now had many hundreds of emails from residents like myself voicing the same concerns with your planning proposals!

This land belongs to us as residents so I feel its harsh to take this away and start your own developments.
3785/01/006/DM43.4/O Jenny Greenland  
Object  
DM43.4  
I object to the de-designation of the site in Shirley as MOL. If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I enjoy this space every weekend and meet many like minded people. I also be object to the site being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic so it struggles now. I am happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but I object to building on open space.  
No change  
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

3789/01/002/DM43.4/O Mr Paul Slaughter  
Object  
DM43.4  
Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic. If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.  
No change  
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

3792/01/005/DM43.4/O Mr Simon Bradley  
Object  
DM43.4  
To save you looking it up, and to help you identify my specific objections, the five sites mentioned so far and to which I wish to object as being detrimental to the character of the area are:  
•the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 128);  
No change  
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Second, the Council plans to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village (page 68, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals). Metropolitan Open Land has the same protection from development as the Green Belt. The Council is proposing to remove this designation so that most of this land can be used for new housing. The draft Local Plan identifies five sites: - the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 128).

I object to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I also object to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

I object to the use of the Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128 for housing:

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Site Location</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM43.4 128</td>
<td>Land at Poppy Lane</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site 128, Land at Poppy Lane, is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would totally change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Woodmere Avenue and Woodmere Gardens.
I write to you with my objections to the proposed Croydon Local Plan, specifically on the points below.

• the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 128);

• Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 504);

• land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 541);

• land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 541);

• land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542);

and

• land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548).

I object to the decision to designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I also be object to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 128</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>DM43.4 128</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3809/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Ian Leonard</td>
<td>The land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 128). I object to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council will not keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I also object to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, thereby disastrously changing the character of the area, additionally, the local road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional traffic.</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3820/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs &amp; Mrs Linter</td>
<td>I object to the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 128).</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3823/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Ross Aitken</td>
<td>I would like to object to these proposals: Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 128</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3825/01/002/DM43.4/S</td>
<td>Yasmaen Hanifa</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>I write to you having received this email from Gavin Barwell MP, the tone of which I find inflammatory and discriminatory towards the Gypsy and Traveller communities, and smacks of &quot;not in my backyard&quot;. I write as a resident of Addiscombe who recognises the huge problem of lack of affordable housing to buy and to rent in London promulgated by this Conservative government and the previous coalition government. I fully support Croydon Council’s proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3826/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms L Pinkney</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>I object to site 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3827/01/002/DM43.4/C</td>
<td>Ms L Sasankan</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>I am resident at 35 Primrose Lane, Shirley Oaks Village, along with 4 other members of my family. I am writing to express my objection/disagreement to the following: 1. de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village 2. The use of the following five sites for housing: Land at Poppy Lane ref 128 Stroud Green Pumping Station, ref 504 land to east of Shirley Oaks Roaf and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, ref 541 Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, ref 542 Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, ref 548 No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3844/01/002/DM43.4/O Lee Kirby-Walker

Object DM43.4 128

I am writing to object to:
The use of the following five sites for housing:
- Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504
- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated a Local Green Spaces.

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

3845/01/002/DM43.4/O Mr M Foster

Object DM43.4 128

I wish to lodge an objection to all five sites where the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open space land and to build housing open them, not only would we be losing vital open space and change the very character of the area, I believe the local road infrastructure would not cope with any more traffic, why must the council continual to try and ruin areas that people like.
At the moment this area as a rural feel to it, nice green spaces and a open aspect which we would loose if these plans were to go ahead.
I would ask the council to think very hard before implementing these plans before we have another area that people want to move out of instead of to, these plans will not improve the area quite the reverse, where at the moment people like to live here.

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Miss Rebecca Thomas

I email to express my formal concern and objection to the proposal to build additional housing in the green areas of Shirley Oaks Village. I currently reside in Beckenham, 1 Hamilton House, Orchard Way, BR33ER, on the Shirley border and was previously a resident of Shirley for 30 years. The addition of these houses will not only bring down the areas reputation, spoil views from current properties but also cause additional congestion to an already busy area. We should be looking to preserve our green areas, and Shirley Oaks Village should remain just that, a village! I believe that the Wickham Road has already been flagged as one of the busiest roads in the area, with a fatal road accident occurring both this year and last. Additional housing/congestion will only add to this danger. This proposal will cause residents of the local area to be driven from their homes unfairly, I am sure that they did not purchase properties to be overlooked and to lose the view of the land that they have been paying to maintain for, in most cases, a number of years. I am contactable on my home address/phone should wish me to validate my views further.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Ms M Torres Ward

I am writing to express my objection to the planning proposals in the Shirley Oaks area. The land has been set aside for our use as we have very undersized gardens on the estate and we have also paid to keep those areas in a well maintained condition. The road around Shirley Oaks only has 2 exits as well, so would make it very congested as there are only 2 options for traffic to leave and enter and there are already a lot of problems at the Wickham Road end as people drive in and out.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3858/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Nicholas Barnes</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DM43.4 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Road. None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3860/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr M Lockeyear</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I wish to register my objection to these proposals for the following reasons: I purchased my property on the understanding that all the open grassed land surrounding the village was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as &quot;Amenity Open Land&quot; because of our under-sized gardens and transferred to the Management Company, with each property owner as a shareholder in that company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
With regard to the ‘very scant’ notices that have been posted on Shirley Oaks Village in places that are not in visible of all residents, I must object VERY STRONGLY to these plans. 

1. The land is owned by the residents with a covenant on it. Our houses are condensed with tiny gardens, the compensation for which is the open ground (owned by all residents) that we are able to use. My understanding is that the original development was curtailed by the then council because of the density of housing/population on Shirley Oaks.

2. Drainage on Shirley Oaks is very poor. I am given to understand that the water table is very high and indeed during the winter months the open spaces are sodden, holding water which could probably present a flooding problem. It is so bad in some places that the ducks move in!

3. Could the services (sewerage etc) really support the number of properties proposed? There have already problems from time to time, especially down Shirley Oaks Road.

4. Realistically, whatever type of property would be built, you could expect an average of two cars per dwelling. Shirley Oaks Road/Primrose Lane are extremely hazardous and would not be able to sustain another probably 500/1000 cars. Where would people park.

5. Planning permission has been refused for the plot in Poppy Lane (128) a number of times. The area was declared as a nature reserve some time back and I was unaware that this had changed. Part of the reason for the last planning application was the high water table, so how come there has been a change of mind?

No change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3876/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Edwina Morris</td>
<td>Object DM43.4 128</td>
<td>I object to the use of the Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128 for housing:</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3885/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Barbara Cumming</td>
<td>Object DM43.4 128</td>
<td>I strongly object the planned sites being used for residential development in Shirley, Croydon:</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3892/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms M Bailey</td>
<td>Object DM43.4 128</td>
<td>The Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks and all around Shirley Oaks Village should not be de-designated, but designated as Local Green space:</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jan Payne

Object

DM43.4

128

I object to the use of the site for housing.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Mr & Mrs Asfahani

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

128

Every year we get proposals and consultations for building more homes or structures on Shirley Oaks green land. But must admit the above proposal is the worst and the most ridiculous so far. From what we read, the proposal suggests to build around 750 new homes on what’s left of green patches in the village.

The village is already over crowded with Shirley Oaks road and Primrose road looking like a huge PARKING LOT throughout the day. One cannot begin to imagine what it would like with more residents and obviously with at least double the number of cars to that of the number of the new homes proposed.

We bought our property back in 1989, paying above market value at the time, for the sole purpose that the village is quiet and has some green land. Our home was one of the last phases of any buildings to be erected in the village, or so we were promised and confirmed in writing. Since then, a synagogue was built, bus 367 goes through the narrow winding road, every year for the last few years we get proposals to use our green land for one suggestion or another and now this proposal.

We completely oppose this proposal and hope that the council will appreciate that it’s not all about the money and just building more houses, but quality of life matters just the same. On one hand the government and councils encourage and push people to plant more trees, grow their veg, recycle etc... Yet on the other hand come up with proposals to use every last green patch to build more structures and homes. Doesn’t make any sense.
3897/01/03/DM43.4/O Cllr M Neal

Object DM43.4 128

Site 128, Land at Poppy Lane, is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would totally change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Woodmere Avenue and Woodmere Gardens.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

3899/02/003/DM43.4/O Ms E Rudduck

Object DM43.4 128

I object to the use of the Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128 for housing:

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

3901/01/002/DM43.4/O Mr & Mrs Frederick Banjo

Object DM43.4 128

As property owners/Residents and shareholders in the company that manages Shirley Oaks Village, we are writing to state our objection to the above mentioned proposal.

The land/s in question is designated as 'Amenity open Land' for the use of the property owners and residents of Shirley Oaks Village and must not be built upon.

The proposal to build on these lands will simply destroy the peace & tranquility of the village. The enjoyment of the open land by residents will be lost not to mentioned the increased traffic situation amongst other things.

We strongly object to these proposals to build upon these lands.

Objection to development of site 128

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere. Any development proposals that come forward will need to comply with all the policies of the Local Plan which included providing transport assessments for major development.
### Ms A Smithers

**Object**

I am emailing to object to the following proposal ref 128. I object to this as Shirley oaks village and surrounding areas are lovely and people go there for their green space to walk their dogs and have a nice time. This would ruin the whole area and what it currently stands for and I amongst many will be upset if the green areas are built on.

**No change**

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

### Mr & Mrs Peter & Brenda Mullings

**Object**

We object to the proposals for this site.

**No change**

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

### Mr & Mrs Thacker

**Object**

I object to the use of the site for housing.

**No change**

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>Page 1905 of 4384</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3942/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Scott Hunter</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3943/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Steve Murray</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3948/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr C Rudduck</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.
I object to the use of the Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128 for housing:

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

I am a resident of Shirley and strongly object to the current proposals to build on green belt land on the Shirley Oaks and surrounding areas.

There are plenty of brown sites that are unoccupied and could fulfil the purpose of providing new homes. Shirley is already tight for school places. St John’s, in Spring Park Road, is increasing to 2 form entry already with the number of children living locally requiring education. The 367 bus serving the Shirley Oaks Village is infrequent and much more transport will be required. Parking is already a nightmare and with the lack of parking contemplated with the new build supply the problem will only get worse. There will be an incredible build up of traffic on the already congested Wickham Road and other local roads.

I believe this proposed building of traveller's sites and homes will change the whole ethos of Shirley and cause resentment and the lowering of living standards. This is a particular area of standard housing and should not be changed by the building of blocks of houses. Garden land should not be built on and this is an inappropriate development and should not be allowed to go ahead. Metropolitan Open Land has the same protection as the Green Belt and the rules should be followed accordingly.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>Page 1907 of 4384</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>3954/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs L McLoughlin</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>3968/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms M D Chandler</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr N Oratis

Object

DM43.4

128

I object to the decision to de-designate this land as metropolitan open land for the use of residential development for the following reasons. These areas are also being used every day and regularly by myself, family members, neighbours, friends and many visitors wanting to take there dog for a walk or spending time with family and kids. Ref 548, 542, 541, and 128 are owned by Shirley oaks management. 488 residents are shareholders in this company. There was a decision in 1985 for this land to be open for use by the local residents because the gardens of all homes were considered small. I would also like to mention the increase in road traffic and pollution due to the development. So for those reasons I would once again like to object to building on this land.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Ms S Ilpa

Object

DM43.4

128

The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Patricia Wood

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

128

I am writing to object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village; in particular to the use of the following five sites for housing:

i) land at Poppy Lane reference number 128

ii)Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504

iii)land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541

iv)land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542

v) land to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548

If the Council cannot keep this land as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should be at least designated as Local Green Spaces.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Mr P Andrews

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

I wholly disagree with the plans to develop the land on Shirley Oaks Village.

This is metropolitan land and will not be built on.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Mr P Fitzpatrick

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

I am therefore writing to formally object to:

1. de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;

2. the use of the following five sites for housing:

   - land at Poppy Lane REFERENCE NO. 128,
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane REFERENCE NUMBER 504;
   - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House REFERENCE NUMBER 541;
   - land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road REFERENCE NUMBER 542, and
   - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens REFERENCE NUMBER 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building houses on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built upon. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Objecter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4002/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Turner</td>
<td>DM43.4 128</td>
<td>We are writing to object to the following sites for housing and traveller sites. Reference number's (128) No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4007/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr R Horton</td>
<td>DM43.4 128</td>
<td>I wish to log my objection to the borough-wide planned changes Croydon Council are proposing to make in their Local Plans for 2016-2036. These proposals are 750 new homes in Shirley Oaks and 35 new homes on the Shrublands Estate. Also the proposed work to the two large gypsyp/ travellers site in Coombe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Coombe Road. No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4008/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr R Kiley</td>
<td>DM43.4 128</td>
<td>I am writing this email to register my objection to the misuse of building on green belt land in Shirley, and elsewhere. All our lives are stressful now and we need these green belt areas to maintain our quality of life. I am objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I will also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic. No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4010/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr R Morley-Smith</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4022/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Ewin</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4033/01/003/DM43.4/C</td>
<td>Ms L Sasankan</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am a resident at 35 Primrose Lane, Shirley Oaks Village, along with 4 other members of my family. I am writing to express my objection/disagreement to the following:

Object to the de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and in particular to the use of the following five sites for housing:

- Land at Poppy Lane ref 128
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, ref 504
- Land to east of Shirley Oaks Roaf and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, ref 541
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, ref 542
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, ref 548

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

---

Object

I am writing to express my objection/disagreement to the following:

2. The use of the following five sites for housing:

- Land at Poppy Lane ref 128
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, ref 504
- Land to east of Shirley Oaks Roaf and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, ref 541
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, ref 542
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, ref 548

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

---

Object

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Mrs S Smithers  

**Object**  

DM43.4  

**128**  

I am emailing to object to the following proposal ref 128. We don't want building on the green areas in Shirley Oaks people live there because they have choose a quiet place with green areas good for their mental and physical well being. This is a place for others to enjoy as well as residents there is no where else the same as this in Croydon.

---

Mrs S Smithers  

**Object**  

DM43.4  

**128**  

I object to the proposals for site 128 Shirley Oaks Village is lovely I go walking round the green areas there and this is such a lovely area. We do not want houses built here and to loose our land that we really like to use.

---

Mrs S Hilu Abdo  

**Object**  

DM43.4  

**128**  

Ref: 541, 542, 548, 128 and 504 in Shirley Oaks Village I was shocked to learn about the changes proposed to our grass areas. These changes, if implemented, will change the very nature of our village. It will not only deprive the residents of very essential open green areas, but it will make the whole place very crowded, much more polluted and quite uglier. This would rob us of essential attractions that made us come to this village in the first place. I strongly object to any of these changes and trust that every resident on this estate feels the way I feel. I did not speak to everyone, but the many I spoke with feel as strongly as I do towards this unfair proposal. I have been living in this village with my family since 1985, I would like to see the Croydon Council improve it rather than ruin it. I hope the Council will reconsider its plans.
I am grateful to the Council for consulting on the detailed policies and proposals that will make up the Croydon Local Plan. There is much in the document that I agree with, but some of the proposals would, in my opinion, change the character of parts of Croydon very much for the worse. I hope you will forgive me if I focus on these areas of contention. I am therefore writing to formally object to:

1. de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;

2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   - land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   - land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
   - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

3. the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:
   - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502;
   - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; and
   - Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 756.

As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site...
of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

“Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is);

4. Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too;

5. Policy DM2 on development on garden land, which is too subjective and therefore too weak. There should be a much stronger presumption against development on garden land;

6. Policy DM28, which should allow higher levels of parking in developments of low public transport accessibility. Restricting parking spaces in such areas doesn’t lead to fewer people owning their own car; it just leads to greater competition for existing spaces.
Mr Matt Knight

Object

DM43.4

128

I object to the use of the site for housing.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Mr S Sasankan

DM43.4

128

I am resident at 35 Primrose Lane, Shirley Oaks Village, along with 4 other members of my family.

I am writing to express my objection/disagreement to the following:

Object to de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village

2. The use of the following five sites for housing:
- Land at Poppy Lane ref 128
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, ref 504
- Land to east of Shirley Oaks Roaf and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, ref 541
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, ref 542
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, ref 548

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Mrs Mary Gray

Object

DM43.4

128

I object to the use of the site for housing.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Shirley Lidbury</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4069/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4062/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Keith &amp; Susan Hobbs</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
As residents whose small rear garden backs onto part of the Shirley Oaks Metropolitan Open Land, we know full well what impact proposals 128, 504, 541, 542 and 548 would have to the area.

There would be an increase in noise from 1) the building work, 2) increased traffic.

There would be a substantial impact on the road system. Wickham Road already gets gridlocked at rush hours and school start/end times. The roads into Shirley Oaks are already too narrow for cars to pass if there are any cars parked, which there are always many of since the majority of driveways are too short to accommodate reasonable size car parking for many.

Shirley Road also has a problem with queuing traffic towards Long Lane which will also be compounded by these proposals.

These developments would increase the drainage issues this area suffers from. The whole area is built on London clay and regularly these areas suffer standing water which has gone through our property in the past. Increasing the density of building in Shirley Oaks will increase this problem too.

The lands around Shirley Oaks remain because of the compact nature of the village, whose properties, as well as our own, have small garden areas and as such these areas are used daily for sports activities, exercise and dog walking.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Dr Chandra Pawa

Object DM43.4 128

the use of land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128 for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area;

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Mrs Marilyn Loader

Object DM43.4 128

I object to the use of the site for housing.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Mr S Soundararajan

Object DM43.4 128

I am writing to object to strongly the De-designation of the following five pieces of land as Metropolitan Open Land and their proposed use as housing. - Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128. Your proposal will lead to a huge set of issues for the local residents. I strongly object to the plan and proposal

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Given the existing levels of brownfield sites in the area, these should be exhausted before encroaching on areas that would significantly alter the character of the area.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

I object to the use of the site for housing. If the Council will not keep them as MOL these 5 sites should be Local Green Spaces.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Object: Mr Reuben Gata-Aura

DM43.4 128

The use of the following five sites for housing:
- land at Poppy Lane - Ref 128
- Stroud Green Pumping Stn - Ref 504
- land to east of Shirley Oaks Road - Ref 541
- land to west of Shirley Oaks Road - Ref 542
- land to rear of Honeysuckle Gdns - Ref 548

If the Council will not keep them as MOP - these 5 sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Object: Victoria Moore

DM43.4 128

The land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 128).

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Object: Mr Vince Hemment

DM43.4 128

I am therefore writing to formally object to:
- de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village; the use of the following five sites for housing:
  - land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
  - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
  - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
  - land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
  - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4104/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Terrence &amp; Jacqueline Spriggs</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 128</td>
<td>Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4112/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms V Cruickshank</td>
<td>Object DM43.4 128</td>
<td>I object to the use of the following five sites for housing: Land at Poppy Lane: reference number 128; Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane: reference number 504; Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House; reference number 541; Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road; reference number 542; and Land to the rear of 5 – 13 Honeysuckle Gardens; reference number 548.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4117/01/033/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Cllr S Brew</td>
<td>Object DM43.4 128</td>
<td>Site 128, Land at Poppy Lane, is identified as suitable for 91 to 107 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Woodmere Avenue and Woodmere Gardens.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4117/01/052/DM43.4/O  Cllr S Brew  Object  DM43.4 128  I object to the de-designation of land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village as Metropolitan Open Land, page 68 of the Policies Map.  No change  The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

4125/01/040/DM43.4/O  Councillor M Fisher  Object  Soundness - Justified  DM43.4 128  Site 128, Land at Poppy Lane, is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Woodmere Avenue and Woodmere Gardens.  No change  The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

4126/01/001/DM43.4/O  Mr Christopher Swan  Object  DM43.4 128  The land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 128).  No change  The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Mr Edward Swan
Object DM43.4
128
I would like to strongly object to the planned five sites being used for residential development in Shirley, Croydon:
the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 128);
Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional traffic.

Mrs S Rudduck
Object DM43.4
128
I object to the use of the Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128 for housing:
If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.
Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.
I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

Ms S Rao
Object DM43.4
128
The use of the land at Poppy Lane (site ref 128) for housing

No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>128</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mr & Mrs Andrews | I am grateful to the Council for consulting on the detailed policies and proposals that will make up the Croydon Local Plan. There is much in the document that I agree with, but some of the proposals would, in my opinion, change the character of parts of Croydon very much for the worse. I hope you will forgive me if I focus on these areas of contention. I am therefore writing to formally object to:  
2. the use of the following five sites for housing:  
• land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;  
• Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;  
• land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;  
• land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and  
• land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548. |
|  | If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way? |
|  | No change |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>128</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Carpenter</td>
<td>These proposals to build up to 750 homes on land (assuming it is de-designated) will mean the loss of vital open spaces and will place burdens on local transport, roads, schools and medical facilities which are already under pressure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land status on Shirley Oak will be vigorously opposed. I can see no reasoned explanation in the planning document for such a course of action nor is there any evidence of the thinking of the Council in the previous plan or 2012 Inspector's Report to explain how MOL status has been revisited with the conclusion that MOL designation be withdrawn. It also seems to have escaped the planning process that Shirley Oaks is governed by a Section 52 Agreement under the 1971 Town and Country Planning Act controlling development of the 'amenity lands' on Shirley Oaks. Further, the land is owned by the 488 Shirley Oaks resident property owners as shareholders of Shirley Oaks Management Ltd that owns the land. There is, therefore, no likelihood of the land ever being sold voluntarily. In summary, this part of the proposed Local Plan is undeliverable.
We are writing to object to the proposals to:
1. De-designate the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village.
2. The use of the following sites for housing:
   - Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   - Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   - Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542;
   - Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548;

The Shirley Oaks Village site currently provides a balance of high density housing offset by areas of green space. The proposals for de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land and additional housing on the areas of green space would disrupt that balance and greatly increase the density of housing to an unacceptable level. Access to the Shirley Oaks site is by way of Poppy Lane and Shirley Oaks Road which feed into Shirley Road and Wickham Road respectively. Both Shirley Road and Wickham Road are used heavily throughout the day and subject of long delays particularly at peak times. This has resulted in Poppy Lane and Shirley Oaks Road experiencing heavier traffic flows than they were designed for as commuters cut through between Shirley Road and Wickham Road. Public transport within the Shirley Oaks site is limited to a small single decker bus due to the road infrastructure and road system. Whilst there are bus services which serve Shirley Road and Wickham Road these are already oversubscribed and subject to delay due to existing traffic congestion.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Mr Trevor Watkins: The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

Carol Holmes: I object to both the de-designation and also to the subsequent house-building at the following sites:

- Land at Poppy Lane (reference number 128);
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane (reference number 504);
- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House (reference number 541);
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road (reference number 542);
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens (reference number 548).

The very minimum designation for the proposed sites should be as Local Green Spaces, in order to give some protection against over-development.

Mr B Williams: I object to the de-designation of the land as Metropolitan Open Land and its proposed use for housing. The open spaces are collectively designated as Metropolitan Open Land and provide several links in the Shirley Green Chain. They help to form the sort of network necessary to ensure the maintenance of the current range and diversity of our flora and fauna. In addition this is a floodplain. There is a sink pond to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens and if this overflows any properties would be flooded. There is also the potential for flooding of future planned properties. The one road through Shirley Oaks Village could not cope with the additional traffic and its exit on to the A232 would cause yet another bottleneck on this already congested road.
I am writing to object to the following matters in this document:

2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   a) Ref No. 128 — land at Poppy Lane
   b) Ref No. 504 — Stroud Green Pumping station
   c) Ref No. 541 — land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Ash House and Beech House
   d) Ref No. 542 — land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road
   e) Ref No. 548 — land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens

If the Council do not keep these sites as Metropolitan Open Land, then at least these five sites should be designated as Local Green Spaces.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Mr & Mrs King

Object

DM43.4

128

3. Proposed Policy DM43 De-designation of Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village. I object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in the vicinity of Shirley Oaks Road and Shirley Oaks Village. The land should be at least be designated as Local Green Space, for its protection from development.

This open space provides a green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, and should be retained in its present form.

I also object to the following specific proposals for the building of new homes on this site, as detailed in Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan, Detailed Policies & Proposals:

Policy DM43, reference Site 128 to build new homes at Poppy Lane

Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the local schools are over-subscribed as well as the already stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance am given much wider publicity.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Object DM43.4


I object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in the vicinity of Shirley Oaks Road and Shirley Oaks Village. The land should be at least be designated as Local Green Space, for its protection from development.

This open space provides a green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, and should be retained in its present form.

I also object to the following specific proposals for the building of new homes on this site, as detailed in Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan, Detailed Policies & Proposals:

Policy DM43, reference Site 128 to build new homes at Poppy Lane

Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local mad infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the local schools are over-subscribed as well as the already stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.

For the reasons given above:

1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4218/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Ms Morgan &amp; Mason</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4223/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Mary Lane</td>
<td>I object to the site for use as housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4228/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Sheila Newman</td>
<td>The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object DM43.4

128


I object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in the vicinity of Shirley Oaks Road and Shirley Oaks Village. The land should be at least be designated as Local Green Space, for its protection from development.

This open space provides a green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, and should be retained in its present form.

I also object to the following specific proposals for the building of new homes on this site, as detailed in Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan, Detailed Policies & Proposals:

Policy DM43, reference Site 128 to build new homes at Poppy Lane

Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the local schools are over-subscribed as well as the already stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land. It has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name of Objects</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4244/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Kellty</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4245/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Maguire</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4268/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr D Nesterovitch</td>
<td>The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4268/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr D Nesterovitch</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If the Council will not keep the site as MOL, the site should at least be designated as Local Green Space. Building on this site will not only mean the loss of vital green space it will over burden local services and road infrastructure.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Object DM43.4

3. Proposed Policy DM43 De-designation of Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village. I object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in the vicinity of Shirley Oaks Road and Shirley Oaks Village. The land should be at least be designated as Local Green Space, for its protection from development.

This open space provides a green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, and should be retained in its present form.

I also object to the following specific proposals for the building of new homes on this site, as detailed in Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan, Detailed Policies & Proposals:

Policy DM43, reference Site 128 to build new homes at Poppy Lane

Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the local schools are over-subscribed as well as the already stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.

For the reasons given above:

1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4308/01/02/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Kathleen Swan</td>
<td>I would like to strongly object to the planned five sites being used for residential development in Shirley, Croydon: the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 128); Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional traffic.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4309/01/03/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Rita Evans</td>
<td>The proposal to de-designate Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and use it for five housing sites surely flies in the face of current recommendations to preserve Green Belt equivalent land as a vital amenity and ecological asset?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4312/01/03/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Doreen Jansen</td>
<td>Objection to site. Schools in the area are already over-subscribed, so the number of homes proposed will increase the problem.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am writing to object to the following matters in this document:–

2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   a) Ref No. 128 — land at Poppy Lane
   b) Ref No. 504 — Stroud Green Pumping station
   c) Ref No. 541 — land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Ash House and Beech House
   d) Ref No. 542 — land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road
   e) Ref No. 548 — land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens

If the Council do not keep these sites as Metropolitan Open Land, then at least these five sites should be designated as Local Green Spaces.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
The Judge Family

Object DM43.4 128

3. Proposed Policy DM43 De-designation of Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village. We object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in the vicinity of Shirley Oaks Road and Shirley Oaks Village. The land should be at least be designated as Local Green Space, for its protection from development.

This open space provides a green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, and should be retained in its present form.

We also object to the following specific proposals for the building of new homes on this site, as detailed in Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan, Detailed Policies & Proposals:

Policy DM43, reference Site 128 to build new homes at Poppy Lane

Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the local schools are over-subscribed as well as the already stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.

For the reasons given above:

1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
I object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in the vicinity of Shirley Oaks Road and Shirley Oaks Village. The land should be at least be designated as Local Green Space, for its protection from development.

This open space provides a green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, and should be retained in its present form.

I also object to the following specific proposals for the building of new homes on this site, as detailed in Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan, Detailed Policies & Proposals:

Policy DM43, reference Site 128 to build new homes at Poppy Lane

Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the local schools are over-subscribed as well as the already stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.
I object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in the vicinity of Shirley Oaks Road and Shirley Oaks Village. The land should be at least be designated as Local Green Space, for its protection from development. This open space provides a green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, and should be retained in its present form.

I also object to the following specific proposals for the building of new homes on this site, as detailed in Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the the Croydon Local Plan; Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan, Detailed Policies & Proposals:

- Policy DM43, reference 128 to build new homes at Poppy Lane
- Policy DM43, reference 504 to build new homes at Stroud Green Pumping Station (including the conversion of the pumping station which is a locally-listed building)
- Policy DM43, reference 542 to build new homes on land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road
- Policy DM43, reference 548 to build new homes on land to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens

Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the already-stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.

For the reasons given above:

1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
I object to the use of the land at Poppy Lane reference number 128 for housing:

-land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128;
-Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504;
-land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541;
-land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and
-land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548;

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces;
I object to the use of the following five sites for housing - land at Poppy Lane reference number 128; Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504; land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541; land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548; If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. The Council should focus on developing other land in the Croydon borough such as unused office blocks, derelict corporate buildings/factories/warehouses which have not been occupied for years instead of attacking the green areas which are enjoyed by the residents in their respective areas. The proposals to build circa 700 houses in such a small area will cause the following detrimental effects to the local residents: depreciation of the value of the houses purchased in the relevant areas, too much strain on the water and sewerage systems in the locality where there is already a high water table. This could result in undue flooding and drainage problems, structural problems in years to come as the land is not fit for such intensive building, increase in traffic on Shirley Road, Wickham Road, Lower Addiscombe and Addiscombe which is already congested. This will unduly increase pollution levels which are already toxic. This will undoubtedly cause an increase in the health problems of the people in the locality such as lung cancer and other respiratory illnesses which will in turn place greater stress on the NHS services, cause more people to take sick days which will result in lower incomes obtained and eventually less tax revenue generated. This will have a knock on effect on the economy which is to say at the very least, bleak, the three green spaces in the Shirley Oaks Village are owned by the 488 Freeholders. Each Freeholder owns one share in the nominee company, Shirley Oaks Management Limited which owns the land on behalf of its shareholders. Building upon this land would serious undermine the value of the land purchased by the Freeholders and reduce quality of life. If the residents wanted to move, it would prove near impossible because of the resulting lower sale prices of their respective houses imposed by the Council's building plans. This would appear to be unfair for the Council to impose
such hardship on the residents. I would urge the council to build upon land in the Croydon borough which is derelict and contains buildings which have not been used for years. These buildings can be knocked down to build the much needed housing for generations to come. These unused or derelict buildings serve no purpose to the local residents and are of no value to the residents. The Council should endeavour to create value where it is needed. This will in turn improve the condition of the abandoned areas. This will also prevent squatting and other unlawful uses of such buildings. I witnessed one example last year where the old post office building next to East Croydon Station was used as a rave containing over 1,000 people. This posed a risk to the safety of the passers by and the increase in crime. The Council’s redevelopment of such spaces could be highly beneficial to the area. The green spaces are however of great importance to the local residents. The residents enjoy these spaces for walking their dogs, recreational and outdoor activities, space for children to play, piece of mind for the resident who works in the city and comes home to a peaceful environment and it provides space for those residents who already have very small back gardens.

7284/01/003/DM43.4/0 Dr I Jayamanne

Object    Soundness - Justified
DM43.4 128

I wish to protest vehemently about your plans to destroy Shirley which is a village by building hundred of homes and setting up a Gypsy and Traveller site. You will destroy the Green Belt and increase the traffic in the area thus polluting the environment and the air we breathe.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
The use of the following five sites for housing:

- Land at Poppy Lane (ref number 128)
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane (ref number 504)
- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House (ref number 541)
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road (ref number 542) and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens (ref number 548)

When the London Borough of Lambeth closed the children’s home, known as Shirley Oaks, Croydon Council determined to keep the building redevelopment of the site broadly in line with the building density that had existed for most of the previous hundred years and subsequent applications by the then developer for increased housing density were rejected. There were a number of reasons for maintaining the original policy amongst which were the need to maintain the established green corridor, retain the character of the area and to maintain the surrounding traffic volumes at a manageable level. The decision to designate the land as Metropolitan Open Land was to ensure that in future further building on the land could not take place thus re-affirming the principles established by the original policy decisions. Nothing has changed in the ensuing years to justify any variation to that policy.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
I am dismayed at the consideration being given to the above, particularly concerning that proposed in the Shirley area.

I have been a Shirley resident for almost 30 years and to date have enjoyed what the area does offer both for the community and with regard to open green spaces, which are precious to the health and wellbeing of all ages. Why should future generations be unable to continue to benefit from an outdoor environment as hitherto?

I strongly object to de-designation of the current Metropolitan Open Land and would hope that at least it could be protected as Local Green Space with regard to future development.

This is particularly pertinent with regard to the proposals being considered for the Shirley Oaks area. The present road infrastructure through the estate leaves a lot to be desired and any more traffic will be a great cause for concern, to say nothing of the loss of wildlife and spacious living. If we had wanted to live in a highly densely populated area, we would not have chosen the Shirley area to relocate into, rather the centre of the town. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is more acceptable and there must be many of these in the Croydon area to develop without encroaching on valued green spaces.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
I wish to formally object to:

1. All the proposed policies relation to the re-designation of land to allow building development at Shirley Oaks Road and land around Shirley Oaks Village.
2. The land at Poppy Lane (reference 128)
3. Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane including the conversion of the locally listed pumping station (reference 504)
4. Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House (reference 541)
5. Land to the West of Shirley Oaks Road (reference 542)
6. Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens (reference 548)

These proposals are NOT appropriate for Croydon to meet its Strategic Objectives. Additionally the proposals are NOT DELIVERABLE or SUSTAINABLE as:

- Croydon have already announced that it is not necessary to deliberately destroy MOL to reach their housing requirements.
- National and London Plans do NOT require or expect Local Authorities to degrade MOL to generate additional housing.
- The loss of this MOL will entail the LOSS of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks through to Ashburton Playing fields, across to South Norwood Park and surrounding Areas.
- The above areas are vital to sustain the drainage of surrounding flood areas.
- The above mentioned areas are referred to the "lungs of Croydon" as they sustain carbon dioxide capture (photosynthesis), oxygen release (photosynthesis) and biodiversity. Local wildlife includes badgers and bats.
- Green areas increase the character, desirability and amenity of residential areas.
- Green areas have a strong positive impact of the character of surrounding residential areas.
- The proposed increase in housing will put an additional burden on public transport, roadways and street parking and other services. The additional volume of traffic will create additional road hazards.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Mr John Carley

Object: Soundness - Justified

I object to the de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village, reference Numbers 128, 504, 541, 542 and 548. This is currently Green Space and provides vital green recreational area and buffer between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding area.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Mr Steve Westray

Object: DM43.4

The de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and either side of Shirley Oaks Road. At present I understand that Metropolitan Open Land has the same protection as the Green Belt and I believe that it is vitally important to retain the controls around our green spaces in Shirley. If any additional homes were to be considered for this area then they should be restricted in number and carefully planned in order to retain the character of this area. The idea of building up to 750 new homes is totally out of keeping with this objective and would be considerable strain on local infrastructure and resources. New housing on this scale would lead to a significant increase in traffic along the Wickham Road which is already extremely busy not only servicing the residents of Shirley but as an important thoroughfare into Croydon.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Mrs Ann Sebire

Object: DM43.4

I am writing to object to;
2. The use of the following five sites for housing
a) Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128
b) Stroud Green Pumping Station reference Number 504
c) Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541
d) Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 and
e) Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference numbers 543

I just hope that there has been enough consideration about the fact that Shirley is built on springs and Heron Homes and Wren both had problems with flooding the area down at Woodmere Avenue.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Mrs Olive Garton

Object DM43.4 128

Use of formerly open land for housing (references 128, 504, 541, 542 and 548): Again, this open land should not be lost. Furthermore, there is no infrastructure in place to support the huge increase in population density that such development would represent. Development of the site of the former pumping station (reference 504): It was established at the time the Shirley Oaks village was built that this land could not be built on, as there is an Artisan well on the land and any development would risk polluting the water source. Furthermore, a 'travellers’ site would be inappropriate on this site.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Mrs M Davies

Object DM43.4 128

I am writing to object to the proposed use of:
- the land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road (541)
- the land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road (542)
- the land at Poppy Lane, Shirley Road (128)
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane (504)
- Land to the rear of honeysuckle gardens (548)
- Open space land at shrublands estate (938)

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.

Mr & Mrs K Davenport

Object DM43.4 456

Soundness - Justified

I am horrified at the proposals regarding Shirley. There may be a need for more housing but there are alternatives and it is up to the Council to find these rather than making it easier and more profitable for builders which is what is now happening.

Change

The site is unlikely to be deliverable during the Plan period due to there being long leasehold flats on the site and as such will not be carried forward.

Mrs M Davies

Object DM43.4 128

I am writing to object to the proposed use of:
- the land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road (541)
- the land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road (542)
- the land at Poppy Lane, Shirley Road (128)
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane (504)
- Land to the rear of honeysuckle gardens (548)
- Open space land at shrublands estate (938)

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.
Object  DM43.4  456

I was horrified to learn that Shirley Garden Centre is a proposed building site for the council. First of all there is very little room for the number of flats that is being proposed. If you were to build on the actual centre itself it would completely block the light to my flat and those next to me. We already know how gloomy winter can be and this would not help with anxiety and depression. There is a greater risk of flooding with that many more flats, not to mention (I am not sure if you are aware) that there are 6 flats on top of the garden centre already. Do you plan to knock these down? If not and you plan to build in the car park this brings yet ANOTHER issue as to parking, there is already a parking problem with 30 flats on the Cranwell Court site not least if you bring in more flats. I think this is a terrible idea and surely somewhere else would be more feasible.

Change

The site is unlikely to be deliverable during the Plan period due to there being long leasehold flats on the site and as such will not be carried forward.

Object  Soundness - Effective  DM43.4  456

1. Currently the flats from 13-24 Cranwell Court will have their light blocked as there is currently no buildings in that area.
2. Risk of flooding - with all the building on this site and Shirley Oaks can all the drains cope?
3. Harm to wildlife
4. This is a busy red route area and the increased housing can only put more strain on the already busy Wickham Road.

Change

The site is unlikely to be deliverable during the Plan period due to there being long leasehold flats on the site and as such will not be carried forward.

Comment  Soundness - Effective  DM43.4  456

Our house was originally part of the garden centre and the home of the garden centre owner. The deeds to the house state that the land is transferred “Together with the right of way for all purposes and at all times over the roadway leading from the garage at the rear of the property into 104 Wickham Road”. The plans for intensification of residential development (elsewhere in Shirley) are unacceptable and will change the character of the area and also overburden the already problematic local road infrastructure. However the additional residential proposals for the garden centre will not only add to these issues but directly affect us, our access from our property to Wickham Road, and blight our home unreasonably.

Change

The site is unlikely to be deliverable during the Plan period due to there being long leasehold flats on the site and as such will not be carried forward.

Object  DM43.4  456

I object to this site.

Change

The site is unlikely to be deliverable during the Plan period due to there being long leasehold flats on the site and as such will not be carried forward.
Mr & Mrs Uprichard

We are residents of Cranwell Court and strongly object to the site of Shirley Garden Centre being redeveloped into 15-39 semi-detached houses for reasons listed below:

1) houses sites to the rear of Cranwell Court at the site of the current nursery will obstruct the natural daylight into the flats of Cranwell Court, causing further problems with dampness
2) concern with losing current parking and an increase in the number of cars in the surrounding roads making parking very difficult
3) increase in traffic from Wickham Road and increased difficulty in entering and exiting Cranwell Court from Wickham Road due to traffic
4) reduction in the value of Cranwell Court properties due to close proximity of other houses, lack of natural daylight into our homes, reduced parking and increase in noise disturbance from close proximity of houses
5) heightened risk of flooding
6) a loss of local buildings will be detrimental to the area. The garden centre employs many young local people and Shirley is an area known for its large gardens which the garden centre serves year-round. There has been a garden centre and nursery on this site for decades and generations of families still use it.

The site should remain as a garden centre.

The site is unlikely to be deliverable during the Plan period due to there being long leasehold flats on the site and as such will not be carried forward.
Mr & Mrs Uprichard

Object

We are residents of Cranwell Court and strongly object to the site of Shirley Garden Centre being redeveloped into 15-39 semi-detached houses for reasons listed below:
1) houses sites to the rear of Cranwell Court at the site of the current nursery will obstruct the natural daylight into the flats of Cranwell Court, causing further problems with dampness
2) concern with losing current parking and an increase in the number of cars in the surrounding roads making parking very difficult
3) increase in traffic from Wickham Road and increased difficulty in entering and exiting Cranwell Court from Wickham Road due to traffic
4) reduction in the value of Cranwell Court properties due to close proximity of other houses, lack of natural daylight into our homes, reduced parking and increase in noise disturbance from close proximity of houses
5) heightend risk of flooding
6) a loss of local buildings will be detrimental to the area. The garden centre employs many young local people and Shirley is an area known for its large gardens which the garden centre serves year-round. There has been a garden centre and nursery on this site for decades and generations of families still use it.

The site should remain as a garden centre.

Change

The site is unlikely to be deliverable during the Plan period due to there being long leasehold flats on the site and as such will not be carried forward.

Mrs Frances Pearce

Object

I am writing regarding the Council’s plans for a massive redevelopment in the Shirley Area. More houses mean more traffic on our already crowded roads. I no longer go into Croydon because of the journey times. How long would it be before the Council considered bringing in a congestion charge. When you build all these properties do you consider the local amenities and the effect that more people would have on these. Where are the school places for all of these children? Regarding doctors. Unless it is an emergency I have to wait at least a week for an appointment. This waiting time can only increase if there are more patients. Is it the Council’s policy to build over green belt land to the detriment of locals? I sincerely hope not. I think you need to seriously reconsider these plans.

The site is unlikely to be deliverable during the Plan period due to there being long leasehold flats on the site and as such will not be carried forward.
2767/01/001/DM43.4/O Mr Stuart Ford

Object DM43.4 456

I'd like to register a comment and with a view to making a potential objection on Local Planning Application Ref 456 - Shirley Garden Centre, Cranwell Court, 60 Wickham Road, which has been earmarked for the proposed use of "Residential Development". My father owns one of the other Cranwell Court flats that currently overlooks the Garden Centre & I am concerned that the proposed change of use could have a detrimental affect on the area concerned & also the surrounding area, including my fathers outlook/view. The proposed use of "Residential Development" is somewhat vague, hence at this stage this is not an objection, BUT I am seeking clarification on what exactly is being proposed on the land in question.

The proposed residential use should not impact on the surrounding area and current occupiers.

Change

The site is unlikely to be deliverable during the Plan period due to there being long leasehold flats on the site and as such will not be carried forward.

2943/01/001/DM43.4/O Wyeval Garden Centres Ltd

Object DM43.4 456

Within the above document, Croydon Garden Centre is identified as a suitable site for a secondary school. As stated in our correspondence dated 14th September 2015, our client does not support the allocation of Croydon Garden Centre for development as a secondary school within the emerging Croydon Local Plan, as they are not satisfied that it would be economically viable to develop the site for educational purposes. Shirley Garden Centre is identified as a potential housing allocation for 15 – 39 units. Our client advises that the site is unlikely to be deliverable within the Plan period due to the presence of a number of long-leasehold flats on the site.

Change

The site is unlikely to be deliverable during the Plan period due to there being long leasehold flats on the site and as such will not be carried forward.

3072/01/003/DM43.4/O Christine McCarthy

Object DM43.4 456

I object to all the proposals set out for new housing and travellers sites in Shirley. I feel it will ruin the area by taking up all the open spaces.

Change

The site is unlikely to be deliverable during the Plan period due to there being long leasehold flats on the site and as such will not be carried forward.

3161/01/003/DM43.4/O Mr Jim Cowan

Object DM43.4 456

I have read Gavin Barwell’s assessment of policies and proposals in the Croydon Local Plan and totally agree that if implemented would destroy the character of Shirley. The infrastructure in Shirley is already stretched to the limit and cannot withstand any further burdens.

Change

The site is unlikely to be deliverable during the Plan period due to there being long leasehold flats on the site and as such will not be carried forward.
I have major concerns over the planned development of the Shirley Area. This is currently one of the nicest areas of Croydon and you plan to swamp it with a number of housing developments and some travellers sites. This will be very detrimental to the whole area.

I understand that nationally we need to have more accommodation for families. We need to achieve this with ougth destroying the whole fabric of our society. This scale of development will transform the whole area into a old fashioned “Estate”.

There are not sufficient services in the wider area to support such an influx of families.

The road infrastructure already struggles at time and these developments will make the whole situation much worse.

The site is unlikely to be deliverable during the Plan period due to there being long leasehold flats on the site and as such will not be carried forward.
If you demolish the Garden Centre where would you propose to put the people you make homeless in the existing flats above the Garden Centre? Do you actually know how many people currently live there? And who pays to re-house them? And where? Are you proposing to compulsory purchase the existing flats / garden centre?

How many people do you make unemployed by closing the Garden Centre? I was under the impression that local jobs were important to Croydon Council, has this policy changed? By closing the Garden Centre you may well also create additional unemployment with their suppliers?

I would imagine this Garden Centre Company pays local business rates? Is this not a valuable source of income that you will lose? This is a very popular facility with local people, do you consider local people needs/wants when you draw up your plans?

This is NOT A good way to improve morale amongst existing Garden Centre staff, and if now makes it more difficult to recruit new staff because they now know you plan to close it and knock it down, long term prospects zero!!! congratulations, job well done!!!

If the proposal went ahead, have you modelled for the additional car parking which is already a problem in this area. By keep concreting over open land areas are you going to create a future flooding issue? This is a busy area/road/ted route will you not be creating traffic congestion if you turn this into a construction site for X number of Months. By keep looking to increase the local population density have you calculated the impact on local services, Doctor Surgery, Dentist, Schools etc?? Why do you even consider sites such as this when you must have other brown field sites in the Borough that would be more suitable for your valuable time/attention? Have you got any well paid jobs vacant in the Planning Department because I know a candidate that will be ideally suited and come up with better plans than the majority that I have recently seen issued by this Department?
My initial comments to your proposed plan would be:-
If you demolish the Garden Centre where would you propose to put the people you make homeless in the existing flats above the Garden Centre?
Do you actually know how many people currently live there? And who pays to re-house them?
Are you proposing to compulsory purchase the existing flats / garden centre?
How many people do you make unemployed by closing the Garden Centre?
I was under the impression that local jobs were important to Croydon Council, has this policy changed?
By closing the Garden Centre you may well also create additional unemployment with their suppliers?
I would imagine this Garden Centre Company pays local business rates? Is this not a valuable source of income that you will lose?
This is a very popular facility with local people, do you consider local people needs/wants when you draw up your plans?
This is NOT A good way to improve morale amongst existing Garden Centre staff, and it now makes it more difficult to recruit new staff because they now know you plan to close it and knock it down, long term prospects zero!!!
Congratulations, job well done!!!
If the proposal went ahead, have you modelled for the additional car parking which is already a problem in this area.
By keep concreting over open land areas are you going to create a future flooding issue?
This is a busy area/a road/ted route will you not be creating traffic congestion if you turn this into a construction site for X number of Months?
By keep looking to increase the local population density have you calculated the impact on local services, Doctor Surgery, Dentist, Schools etc? I already find it very difficult to get a Doctors appointment when I need it, there is no point the overstretched Doctor seeing me in a months time when I am either feeling better or Dead, is it?
Why do you even consider sites such as this when you must have other brown field sites in the Borough that would be more suitable for your valuable time/attention?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM33.4</th>
<th>456</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7284/01/004/DM33.4/O</td>
<td>Dr I Jayamanne</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM33.4</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3793/01/002/DM33.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Stephen Barnes</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM33.4</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4246/01/002/DM33.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Maguire</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM33.4</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you got any well paid jobs vacant in the Planning Department because I know a candidate that will be ideally suited and come up with better plans than the majority that I have recently seen issued by this Department?

---

I am writing to object against the following as they will change the character of our area very much for the worse. First, the land for Shirley Garden Centre is identified as suitable for 15-39 homes including medium rise blocks and semi-detached houses, reference number 456. I very strongly object to this as my property backs onto this land and the planned development will drastically block out the natural light into the gardens of properties along this housing row. It could also have a significant impact on changing the character and reducing the value of properties in this area.

The site is unlikely to be deliverable during the Plan period due to there being long leasehold flats on the site and as such will not be carried forward.

I object to the use of the site for housing.

The site is unlikely to be deliverable during the Plan period due to there being long leasehold flats on the site and as such will not be carried forward.

I wish to protest vehemently about your plans to destroy Shirley which is a village by building hundred of homes and setting up a Gypsy and Traveller site. You will destroy the Green Belt and increase the traffic in the area thus polluting the environment and the air we breathe.

The site is unlikely to be deliverable during the Plan period due to there being long leasehold flats on the site and as such will not be carried forward.
Hidden in the depths of the documents without any detailed maps and no backing documentation are plans to allocate Traveller sites: Addington, Shirley, South Croydon

Ref no  Site name  Proposed use
755  Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane Gypsy and traveller site
502  Coombe Farm, Oaks Road Gypsy and traveller site
661  Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane Gypsy and traveller site

There is no reference to any national mechanism for rating such sites, so has Croydon invented a scoring regime without any accreditation? There should be a review including increased weighting for needs for transport, education and health facilities for all sites suitable for 15+ pitches with site area greater than 4.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Site Area</th>
<th>Nos of pitches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kent Gateway Lane,Featherbed Lane,Selsdon,CR0 1AR</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>15+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536</td>
<td>Land of former Croydon Airport runway- south of Imperial Way,Purley Way,Waddon,CR0 4RR</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>15+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553</td>
<td>By Pavilion, Playing Fields,Purley Way, Waddon, CR0 1RR</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>15+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>Land south of Threehalfpenny Woods, Kent Gate Way, Birdla Way, Addington, CR0 5AL</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>15+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635</td>
<td>Land adjoining Kent Gateway East of Addington Village Roundabout, Kent Gateway, Lodge Lane,Addington,CR0 5AR</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>15+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>Land west of Timbridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane,Elmside, Addington CR00QA</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>15+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>Land south of Heathfield,Riesco Drive, Selsdon, CR0 5RS</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>15+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>661</td>
<td>Coombe Lodge Nursery (Central Nursery), Conduit Lane ,Coombe Road, South Croydon, CR0 SRQ</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>15+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

DM43.4
502
As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Croydon has very few green places that are actually loved and residents are proud of so they need to be left as they are or enhanced. The proposal to place travellers site is not acceptable. These sites are stated by the Council to be in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. Also these sites are far from schools and shops therefore not suitable for the proposed change of use.

The site should not be allocated as gypsy and traveller site.
Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA

Object Soundness - Consistent with National DM43.4 502

3. the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:
• Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502;
• Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; and
• Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 755;

As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

“Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is);

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object We note the council comment “should not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the biodiversity of the borough. In spite of this we feel that the 3 sites that are being offered will have a biodiversity impact. I have received many comments on the wrong choice of sites, but do understand that the choice is limited. Any chance of a review?”

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I am emailing to formally object to your worrying proposals to build 3 gypsy traveller sites in Croydon on Green Belt sites, and your proposals to build housing on some of our precious green spaces and back gardens. We have to protect our green belt at all costs, and we feel that as residents that we are under constant attack having to protect land which is sacrosanct. You can't just keep changing the goal posts to suit your purposes. I have lived in the area all my life and have never been so alarmed about council proposals. It is hugely stressful for residents, who use and appreciate the green spaces, to be threatened with your proposals. I fully support and agree with the objections raised by my MP Gavin Barwell, and ask you to reconsider your plans to prevent irreversible damage to Croydon and its green spaces.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Complete total eternal objection. Green space is exactly that. Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge have the peaceful rural names that they do. Existing residents have the right to the peaceable enjoyment of their land and everyone can at different times enjoy the countryside and low density this is only healthy both physically and mentally. It is vital to preserve these unbuilt areas which are the nearest lungs we can escape to. Government Green belt Polly E has deemed any development inappropriate and Croydon Council must obey as the most important vote of the electorate was for the Conservative Government.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Complete total eternal objection. Green space is exactly that. Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge have the peaceful rural names that they do. Existing residents have the right to the peaceable enjoyment of their land and everyone can at different times enjoy the countryside and low density this is only healthy both physically and mentally. It is vital to preserve these unbuilt areas which are the nearest lungs we can escape to. Government Green belt Polly E has deemed any development inappropriate and Croydon Council must obey as the most important vote of the electorate was for the Conservative Government.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>502</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

When Gypsies and Travellers set up an unauthorised encampment near Coombe Lane tramstop the Council had to clear up 85 pieces of used toilet paper with faeces on it that were blowing around into people's gardens. It was a health hazard.

A Gypsy and Traveller site will also ruin the countryside. Green space is exactly that. Leave it alone.

Therefore I object to a Gypsy and Traveller site at Coombe Farm.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the landowners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Proposals in General:
Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land ensure that areas close to high density building, and in particular house, were maintained such that people who lived and worked nearby could benefit from open green space to exercise, relax and maintain a balanced lifestyle. By de-designating the space, not only is a very valuable facility being removed, but the population density that need to benefit from the space is being increase. The proposals fail to identify what alternative facilities of equivalent benefit would be made available and how many people will be affected by the loss of these facilities.

Proposal Ref 502:
I specifically object to this proposal as they are contraty to Policy E of the Planning Policy for Travellers Sites "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". If the land is misguidedly de-designated it makes no difference in that the site has not changed, nor have the environment or the reason for it being designated in the first instance. Hence the reasoning for deeming it inappropriate for travellers still stands.

Notwithstanding the reasons for maintaining the current use of the areas in question, the occupation of these areas raises significant security issues for both travellers or any other new inhabitants, and those enjoying the adjacent areas. Access to both Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries have very poor sight lines onto Oaks Road and Coombe Road presenting a traffic hazard to both pedestrians and goods vehicles turning in and out.

The lack of local transport infrastructure in the area and the lack of pedestrian pavements and other walkways would result in a significant increase in vehicle movement.

Notwithstanding the reasons for maintaining the current use of the areas in question, the occupation of these areas raises significant security issues for both travellers or any other new inhabitants.
Object Gypsy/traveler sites

Croydon has very few green places that are actually loved and residents are proud of so they need to be left as they are or enhanced. The proposal to place travelers site is not acceptable. Also, these sites are far from schools and shops therefore not suitable.

Reference 502: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road – within Lloyds Park
Reference 661: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane – with Coombe Tea Room
Reference 755: Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane;

These sites are stated by the Council to be in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development".

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
A few years ago we had travellers in the car park at the top of my road, Sandilands. They remained there for some time as they arrived just before a bank holiday. For over a week they ran a fleet of lorries up and down our roads dumping waste on the site - the police were unable to stop this. I have pictures showing the devastation they caused. After they were eventually removed, Croydon council had to foot a hefty bill for the toxic waste that was left behind although it was in a private car park. In the meantime people in my road were subjected to stones being thrown and intimidation from both children and adults. The sports club at the top of the road could not function.

Now I see that Croydon Council is proposing to put travellers and gypsies on what is in effect all greenbelt land at the end of my road i.e. Lloyd park specifically and also Coombe Lodge Nurseries. Although it is recognised that permanent sites do not carry the same level of mess, dumping, and intimidation, these sites are designated as combined, so passing itinerants would not presumably have the same degree of responsibility for the area.

Given the nature of the proposal i.e. in Lloyd Park, a place where children, schools, playing fields, dog walkers and women feel safe, it does not seem like a good idea to put gypsies/travellers alongside these groups without facing up to the fact that they might no longer feel safe in what is an open space/greenbelt land. This proposal borders on the obscene.

I understand from sources that the Council feel they have 'no choice' that they are under pressure from Westminster but I would say to you that if this was a Conservative council they would be fighting this pressure and putting travellers in a place where the general public are not put at risk. I speak from experience not prejudice, and we all know that when a site is concreted and permanent it can never be reclaimed however bad it gets. Please think again.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness -</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/10/14</td>
<td>Mr Mathew Frith</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>502</td>
<td></td>
<td>This area is designated as Green Belt but not shown or assessed as such in the Gypsy and Traveller site selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Wildlife Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/10/15</td>
<td>Mr Mathew Frith</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>502</td>
<td></td>
<td>Whilst we welcome the approach to meeting these two Vision elements: A Sustainable City: A place that sets the pace amongst London boroughs on promoting environmental sustainability and where the natural environment forms the arteries and veins of the city A Caring City: A place noted for its safety, openness and community spirit where all people are welcome to live and work and where individuals and communities feel empowered to deliver solutions for themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Wildlife Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/10/17</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs K Davenport</td>
<td>Consistent with National</td>
<td>502</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am appalled by the proposal to create traveller sites on Green Belt land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Policies laid out by the Mayor London- London Assembly website, without a doubt, states that the Mayor’s office really supports the safety of Metropolitan Open Land and claims that “the strongest protection should be given to London’s MOL and inappropriate development refused”. I therefore vigorously object to any interference to MOL and in particular if the neighbourhood is simply going to be used differently with little or no consultation with the local residents and businesses.

The site should not be used for a Gypsy and Traveller site.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I am writing to strongly object to the Travellers site proposed for Coombe Farm which is on Green Belt Land contrary to National Guidelines. The site has no safe walking route to schools, shops, doctors etc.. Along Oaks Lane of Oaks Road. The access road (Oaks Lane) is far too narrow especially as large aggregate lorries already use this poorly lit lane. The national guide lines state that the site should not overwhelm the next nearest settlement along Oaks Land & Oaks Road which it will. This will be a private site which can easily expand into its Green Belt surroundings in Dcoombe Dfarm and Lloyds Park.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

The Council are proposing in total 45 permanent pitches. Both sites are some distance from public services. They should consider instead the expanding the existing site off the Purley Way. More importantly the Council are in breach of policy E Planning Policy for Traveller Sites published by the Government in August which clearly states: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". The Council have acknowledged both sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

object to the travellers sites in Shirley as it is against government policy and inappropriate development in area which attracts many visitors.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I have been a resident and homeowner in South Croydon for over 40 years. I was attracted to the area because of the green belt within its boundaries as well as very good railway connections to Central London. I am dismayed to learn that Croydon Council have identified three locations where they propose to set up permanent Gypsy and Traveller sites. I am particularly concerned with the proposed sites on Conduit Lane and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road. Both these are on green belt and in an area of natural beauty that I would have thought our elected council would go out of its way to preserve. How can this be when The Department for Communities and Local Government's Planning policy for traveller sites dated August 2015 states under Policy E: Local Government's Planning policy for traveller sites dated August 2015 states under Policy E: Local Government's Planning policy for traveller sites dated August 2015 that Traveller sites in Green Belt paragraph 16 that “Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. Subject to the best interests of the child, personal circumstances and unmet need are unlikely to clearly outweigh harm to the Green Belt and any other harm so as to establish very special circumstances”?

What are the very special circumstances that make your proposals “appropriate”? How can you go against current Government Policy so blatantly when surely in Croydon, with its many industrial estates, brownfield sites and urban sprawl, there are far more suitable sites for such developments. The Government policy/guideline is to have new sites near to existing developments. Clearly this would not be the case with this recommendation.

These proposals are clearly harmful for the Green Belt and would have a negative impact on the environment and wildlife in Coombe Wood, Shirley Hills and Lloyd Park. It would create a precedent for further erosion of our valuable local amenity. Coombe Road and Coombe Lane are already very busy roads and one of the main arteries into the town centre. The additional traffic emanating from these two sites, without significant road improvements, would exacerbate the traffic congestion, not to mention the additional pressure on the already stretched local services such as schooling and general health centres, schools and other local amenities. The traveller community favour smaller sites to avoid risk of inter-family tensions. These sites go against this.

Does not comply with Government policy of new sites near existing development, is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and very special circumstances are not explained. Croydon has many industrial, brownfield sites and urban sprawl where there must be more appropriate sites for such developments. Sites 661 and 502 will have a negative impact on the environment and wildlife, and impact on traffic congestion, add to an already dangerous junction of Coombe Road and Oaks Road and Conduit Lane. Road improvements would be needed. Will add pressure on local schools and general practitioners. The two sites will not meet the needs of the Traveller community not within walking distance of shops, health centres, schools and other local amenities. The traveller community favour smaller sites to avoid risk of inter-family tensions. These sites go against this.
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I have been a resident and homeowner in South Croydon for over 40 years. I was attracted to the area because of the green belt within its boundaries as well as very good railway connections to Central London. I am dismayed to learn that Croydon Council have identified three locations where they propose to set up permanent Gypsy and Traveller sites. I am particularly concerned with the proposed sites on Conduit Lane and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road. Both these are on green belt and in an area of natural beauty that I would have thought our elected council would go out of its way to preserve. How can this be when The Department for Communities and Local Government's Planning policy for traveller sites dated August 2015 states under Policy E: Local Government's Planning policy for traveller sites dated August 2015 that Traveller sites in Green Belt paragraph 16 that “Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. Subject to the best interests of the child, personal circumstances and unmet need are unlikely to clearly outweigh harm to the Green Belt and any other harm so as to establish very special circumstances”?

What are the very special circumstances that make your proposals “appropriate”? How can you go against current Government Policy so blatantly when surely in Croydon, with its many industrial estates, brownfield sites and urban sprawl, there are far more suitable sites for such developments. The Government policy/guideline is to have new sites near to existing developments. Clearly this would not be the case with this recommendation.

These proposals are clearly harmful for the Green Belt and would have a negative impact on the environment and wildlife in Coombe Wood, Shirley Hills and Lloyd Park. It would create a precedent for further erosion of our valuable local amenity. Coombe Road and Coombe Lane are already very busy roads and one of the main arteries into the town centre. The additional traffic emanating from these two sites, without significant road improvements, would exacerbate the traffic congestion, not to mention the additional pressure on the already stretched local services such as schooling and general health centres, schools and other local amenities. The traveller community favour smaller sites to avoid risk of inter-family tensions. These sites go against this.
practitioners. The access roads to these proposed sites are clearly unsuitable for the larger vehicles that this community use as part of their livelihood and way of life. The junctions at Coombe Road, Oaks Road and Conduit Lane are already dangerous for vehicles and this area has the potential with this proposal to become a major accident black spot without significant very costly improvements to the local road network.

In summary not only do I feel that these proposed sites are very unsuitable for the area but also they would not meet the needs of the traveller community. Neither of the proposed sites are within walking distance of shops, health centres, schools and other local amenities which I believe is their preference. The Traveller Community favour smaller sites as there is less likelihood of inter-family tensions. These plans clearly go against this.

I would urge you to give more thought to and reconsider this planning application as it is my strong opinion that it neither suits the Traveller Community nor the local residents.

| 1727/01/006/DM43.4/D | Anthony Barber | Object | DM43.4.502 | I am writing to object to:
1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b
2. the additional traffic at the junctions of Coombe Road of Oaks Road and Conduit Lane that this proposal will generate. These junctions are already dangerous for vehicles and this area has the potential with this proposal to become a major accident black spot without significant very costly improvements to the local road network.

| Change | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use. |
This is Green Belt land which is inappropriate for traveller sites. Our community does not wish to lose any of its green belt land. We don't want the start of development in green belt leading to a precedent and subsequent further loss. Also there would be a negative effect on the environment, wildlife etc to lose any green belt land. The site does not meet anyone's needs. It would be detrimental to one local community. Also, it doesn't meet the needs requested by gypsy and traveller communities. They prefer smaller family sites. They require good access to roads, especially for their large vehicles. They do not request public transport, which was stated as a benefit, but it is not relevant to these communities. There are not any shops or amenities near by. These community groups request that too. On every level these sites do not fit traveller needs and they would create a negative impact on the local community's needs. This site is unsuitable to develop. There are not adequate roads, schools, shops, health facilities etc to cope with such development. The cost to put this infrastructure in place is huge. I think that overwhelming costs would outweigh any benefits. The site has local, environmental, conservation, historical and natural significance. It is too important to lose. I think that the area doesn't suit the needs of any travellers. As stated there is no infrastructure to cope with these numbers. Our local area would be compromised. It is most likely there will be an adverse reaction on local businesses. The areas (e.g. Coombe Woods, Coombe Lodge Nurseries) would be negatively impacted by the plans.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I have lived at my address for nearly 30 years and am writing to object to the use of land at Coombe Farm, off Oaks Road (site reference 502) on the following grounds:

The site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

The site is located within the Green Belt considered to be inappropriate for development as ‘traveler sites’, Planning Policy for Traveler Sites, DCLG, August 2015.

Selection of the site should have a bias towards ‘brownfield or industrial land’ not Green Belt.

Insufficient local infrastructure to accommodate the plans

Lack of necessary amenities in the vicinity

Imbalance across the Croydon Borough with two proposed sites [Sites 661 and 502] being in South Croydon in close proximity to each other.

It would be detrimental to the rights of adjoining owners.

Could I respectfully suggest that alternative sites such as Pear Tree Farm, Featherbed Lane or that at Lathams Way, Beddington Farm Road, would be much less detrimental to the environment.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

With regards to ref 502 converting green belt areas to a Traveller site.

Both myself and my family (5 no adults) are very very strongly against both of these proposals.

In every regard to the environment, local communities, progress towards the regeneration of Croydon, security and property values, schools we completely disagree with any local areas being made available to travelers on a permanent or temporary basis.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I wish to place on record my objection to the above proposal with is contrary to Government policy (Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites ) which state “Traveller Sites ( temporary or Permanent ) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development” I assume that you are aware of Government Policy.

Croydon Council tell me that money is tight and they are cancelling the Green Waste collection, I am therefore at a loss to understand why you are wasting time and money considering this proposal in an area that is not near any schools or shop.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Alan and Anne Pearson

My wife and I wish to object strongly to the proposal for two traveller sites in our local area. As a couple keen on wildlife, we moved to Melville Avenue mainly for its green location and quick access to unspoilt lanes and open areas in what we were led to believe were green belt. Now these are under threat.

We have had a fair bit of experience with travellers in the local area in the past, encamped on the Coombe Lodge Playing Fields, in Lloyd Park and on Addington Hills and in all cases have been dismayed by their lack of conscience. They have taken down fences and burnt them as bonfires, destroyed turf on pitches, disturbed our neighbours’ beehives, and left considerable amounts of rubbish scattered behind, making no effort even to tidy it into one spot. You will see why then we are less than enthusiastic about the proposals.

Both Conduit Lane and Oaks Lane are tranquil places, very good for wildlife which we enjoy watching. There are few such places within easy access of Croydon and we feel very strongly they should be.

Ann Kellaway

I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Barbara Wilkins

I would like to register my opposition to allowing gypsy sites on Coombe Farm. Croydon is a densely populated and built-up area. To allow gypsy sites on these two areas of precious Green Belt is totally inappropriate and I understand contrary to Government planning policy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1759/01/001/DM43.4/C</td>
<td>Billy Stagg</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am writing to you as I wish to oppose the traveller site that is possibly going to be built in the Shirley area. We have been residents for over five years and there is a great community spirit. There is a lot of green space which makes Shirley different to other places in Croydon. I feel by building on this you will be demolishing the greenbelt and that is not acceptable. As I say I oppose this very strongly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Brian Parnell</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I have been made aware of your intentions with regard to travellers sites in Coombe Road and neighbouring Coombe Farm. Please accept this e-mail as my strong objection. As you will be aware, travellers have gained access to the ground at the rear of Shirley Park Golf Course on several occasions and each time have wreaked havoc, abusing golfers, stealing golf accessories and causing general disruption to the surrounding houses. Permanent sites would ruin the area. I assume that neither you or your counterparts live anywhere near this area! Please do not underestimate the strong feeling within the adjacent community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a resident of Shirley residing very near Lloyd Park we are writing to object to:

1. The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:
   - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661
   - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502

   as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

   As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

   "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development".

   The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
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Please note that my family and I are absolutely against a site being set up. We had trouble with 'travellers' very recently and are very aware of the trouble they cause.
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502

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1782/01/09/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Angus &amp; Olivia Bloom</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>As a resident of Shirley Oaks I am writing to object the proposals for housing development on the estate and surroundings. Having lived in Shirley all of my life I would be deeply disappointed to see it change unrecognisably. I envisage the property on Shirley Oaks Road will either be demolished or surrounded by high density housing. Either eventuality will be highly detrimental. I have viewed the Detail Policies and Proposals on Croydon Council's website and object the following plans, references - Ref 128 Ref 504 Ref 541 Ref 542 Ref 548 Ref 938 Ref 502 Ref 661 Object to Site 502 Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Miss Fiona Mant</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>MOL around Shirley Oaks Road and Shirley Village is what gives the areas its character and beauty. Residential use will take away the beautiful green spaces. Traveller sites on green belt or areas of nature conservation is despicable and in breach of Policy E - Planning for Traveller Sites. The respondent finds it hard to believe that there are not more suitable areas that can be developed in the borough and strongly objects to the proposals. Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Georgina Berry - Lamb Home Inspectors</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>In response to details of The Croydon Local Plan, I am objecting to the suggested plans to change the current Green Belt land at Coombe Farm AND AT Coombe Lodge Nurseries into temporary or permanent areas for Traveller/Gypsy sites. The reason being in my opinion it will drastically change the character of our area very much for the worse. We desperately need new housing, but it should be built on brownfield sites not our remaining precious green spaces, particularly in this area. Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I wish to notify you of my objections to some of the Council’s proposals in the Croydon Local Plan, which has recently been brought to my attention. As I understand from Gavin Barwell MP (Croydon Central) there are plans to build three gypsy/traveller camps in the Green Belt (eg Coombe Farm), and to allow large housing developments on some of our precious green spaces. Once gone these are gone forever. The character of parts of the Borough could be dramatically changed for the worse and this might discourage people from living, working, shopping and investing in the area. Whilst I acknowledge that there is a need for more accommodation in Croydon it is preferable to utilise effectively those brownfield sites which I am given to understand do exist in the area. More brownfield sites might become available in the future and I should like to think that the Council is establishing and/or maintaining and updating a list of suitable locations.

Whilst I acknowledge that there is a need for more accommodation in Croydon it is preferable to utilise effectively those brownfield sites which I am given to understand do exist in the area. More brownfield sites might become available in the future and I should like to think that the Council is establishing and/or maintaining and updating a list of suitable locations.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
particularly concerned with the proposed sites on Conduit Lane and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road. Both these are on green belt and in an area of natural beauty that I would have thought our elected council would go out of its way to preserve. How can this be when The Department for Communities and Local Government's Planning policy for traveller sites dated August 2015 states under Policy E: Traveller sites in Green Belt paragraph 16 that "Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. Subject to the best interests of the child, personal circumstances and unmet need are unlikely to clearly outweigh harm to the Green Belt and any other harm so as to establish very special circumstances"?

What are the very special circumstances that make your proposals "appropriate"? How can you go against current Government Policy so blatantly when surely in Croydon, with its many industrial estates, brownfield sites and urban sprawl, there are far more suitable sites for such developments. The Government policy/guideline is to have new sites near to to existing developments. Clearly this would not be the case with this recommendation.

These proposals are clearly harmful for the Green Belt and would have a negative impact on the environment and wildlife in Coombe Wood, Shirley Hills and Lloyd Park. It would create a precedent for further erosion of our valuable local amenity. Coombe Road and Coombe Lane are already very busy roads and one of the main arteries into the town centre. The additional traffic emanating from these two sites, without significant road improvements would exacerbate the traffic congestion, not to mention the additional pressure on the already stretched local services such as schooling and general practitioners. The access roads to these proposed sites are clearly unsuitable for the larger vehicles that this community use as part of their livelihood and way of life. The junctions at Coombe Road, Oaks Road and Conduit Lane are already dangerous for vehicles and this area has the potential with this proposal to become a major accident black spot without significant very costly improvements to the local road.
network.

In summary not only do I feel that these proposed sites are very unsuitable for the area but also they would not meet the needs of the traveller community. Neither of the proposed sites are within walking distance of shops, health centres, schools and other local amenities which I believe is their preference. The Traveller Community favour smaller sites as there is less likelihood of inter-family tensions. These plans clearly go against this.*

Whilst I personally oppose the idea of gentrification, the above sites are a heritage of South Croydon and surrounding areas, but are also a wildlife sanctuary that needs protection. I do not see how gypsy and travelers sites will have wildlife protection in their best interests and thus would destroy a beautiful area that is part of the Greenbelt.

It is my strong opinion that the planning application will neither suit the traveller community nor local residents. I strongly urge you to give more thought to and reconsider this planning application.

1821/01/002/DM43.4/O Hina Shavadia

Object: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

DM43.4 502

Soundness - Justified

To object to:

Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

1827/01/007/DM43.4/O Jane & Paul Riley

Object: Happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but will be objecting to building on precious open space.

DM43.4 502

Soundness - Justified

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but will be objecting to building on precious open space.

Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.

If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should lock elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
We are opposed to the green belt land being used for the above uses because there are not amenities in the area. There are no shops, post office, schools, libraries, or public transport i.e. bus route and therefore this area is not suitable. We will oppose any plans of this nature.

This location is in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Travellers Sites published by the government in August say very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of this policy.

We strongly object to the following: The use of the following as gypsy/traveller sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502

I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

I am writing to object to: 1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b;

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Policy DM3, reference Site 502 Coombe Farm reference Site 661 Coombe Lodge Nurseries and reference Site 755 Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage. I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and Coombe Farm is on a site of an Archaeological Priority Zone and contains an area of Nature Conservation Importance. Such development is in breach of Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that “Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites by 2017, and 39 by 2036 is extremely excessive and will have a significant adverse impact on the borough.

I have restricted my objections to those plans that primarily affect our area of Shirley in which I live, but the same objections apply to other proposals in other parts of the borough.
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Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502; As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is);
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 502</th>
<th>I am writing to state my total objection to the building of the proposed gypsy/traveller site at Coomba Farm off Oakes Road. It is a totally inappropriate site for such a use of Green Belt land when there are plenty of other places in Croydon for such a development, for example Purley way on the unused ex industrial site.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am writing to register my objections for the following proposed sites for Gypsy and Travellers Sites:

- Coombe Farm, Oaks Road - Reference 502

The Policies laid out on the Mayor of London - London Assembly website, and Policy 7.17 clearly states that the Mayor’s office truly supports the protection of Metropolitan Open Land, and indeed states that “The strongest protection should be given to London’s MOL and inappropriate development refused”. The Policy lays out what needs to be established to designate an area as MOL, but does not make it clear how a Council can re-designate an area. I therefore object to any permanent Traveller site being constructed on MOL and especially if the area is simply going to be re-designated without any consultation with the local residents and businesses.

I object strongly that Croydon Council can re-designate Metropolitan Open Land or Green Belt land to suit their needs to accommodate a permanent pitch. I cannot see any Planning justification to change the designation, nor for the intrusion into the lives of the residents of Oaks Road and surrounding area. This will massively affect the urban attractiveness of the area and have both emotional and financial repercussions on many lives.

Policy 7.18 relating to Protection of Open Spaces clearly states that open spaces in London must be protected, and any loss must be resisted. I cannot believe the Council would want to go against both of these policies laid down by The London Assembly.

This Club not only provides sport and social activities to over 700 members in the local vicinity, but also provides an important ecological role in the area. The proposed site of Coombe Farm as a site for Gypsies and Travellers has come as a shock to everyone in the area, as borne out by the recent press coverage and attendance at the Consultation Meetings.

The history of unauthorised "pitches" in this area over the past few years has left a bitter resentment, especially in view of the residual
mess and threatening behaviour that has always accompanied their trespass. On each occasion that Gypsies/Travellers have been in the area, the club members here have been threatened with physical and verbal abuse. This behaviour is totally unacceptable and despite the subsequent eviction of the Travellers on each occasion, the residual psychological effect on taxpayers and constituents’ lives cannot be trivialised. We also have a large Junior Section and children play the course during holidays as well as weekends. They are often unaccompanied and the parents need to know they are in a safe environment. This would certainly not be the case in the parents’ minds if there was any chance of aggressive behaviour, as previously experienced, towards these children. I am certain that you would not wish to be responsible for putting children in any sort of potentially dangerous situation.

Surely these detailed real issues must be taken into account when determining any permanent site.

I understand that the proposed sites are not within the required distance to both schooling and medical needs, therefore I also object on that basis. The land is in private ownership at Coombe Farm, and any funds spent on “compulsory or otherwise” purchase could surely be spent more wisely on behalf of the population of Croydon. No doubt Central Grants will be available, but Council owned land in an area that will not radically impact on established residents’ lives would be a sensible and prudent choice.
Object

DM43.4
502

We want to object to the locating of three traveller sites in and around South Croydon. The building of these sites on green land is wrong and will change significantly the area we live in. We live in Gravel Hill between Featherbed Lane and Coombe Lodge Nurseries and we will therefore be impacted by two if not all three of these sites. As the Council acknowledges this site is in the Green Belt. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development" and the Council’s approach is clearly a breach of this policy.

Gypsy and Traveller sites should not be located in the Green Belt.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I am writing to register my objections for the following proposed sites for Gypsy and Travellers Site:

Coombe Farm, Oaks Road - Reference 502

The Policies laid out on the Mayor of London - London Assembly website, and Policy 7.17 clearly states that the Mayor’s office truly supports the protection of Metropolitan Open Land, and indeed states that “The strongest protection should be given to London’s MOL and inappropriate development refused”. The Policy lays out what needs to be established to designate an area as MOL, but does not make it clear how a Council can re-designate an area. I therefore object to any permanent Traveller site being constructed on MOL and especially if the area is simply going to be re-designated without any consultation with the local residents and businesses.

I object strongly that Croydon Council can re-designate Metropolitan Open Land or Green Belt land to suit their needs to accommodate a permanent pitch. I cannot see any Planning justification to change the designation, nor for the intrusion into the lives of the residents of Oaks Road and surrounding area. This will massively affect the urban attractiveness of the area and have both emotional and financial repercussions on many lives.

Policy 7.18 relating to Protection of Open Spaces clearly states that open spaces in London must be protected, and any loss must be resisted. I cannot believe the Council would want to go against both of these policies laid down by The London Assembly.

This Club not only provides sport and social activities to over 700 members in the local vicinity, but also provides an important ecological role in the area. The proposed site of Coombe Farm as a site for Gypsies and Travellers has come as a shock to everyone in the area, as borne out by the recent press coverage and attendance at the Consultation Meetings.

The history of unauthorised “pitches” in this area over the past few years has left a bitter resentment, especially in view of the residual mess and threatening behaviour that has always accompanied their trespass. On each occasion that Gypsies/Travellers have been in the area, the club members here have
been threatened with physical and verbal abuse. This behaviour is totally unacceptable and despite the subsequent eviction of the Travellers on each occasion, the residual psychological effect on tax payers and constituents' lives cannot be trivialised. We also have a large Junior Section and children play the course during holidays as well as weekends. They are often unaccompanied and the parents need to know they are in a safe environment. This would certainly not be the case in the parents' minds if there was any chance of aggressive behaviour, as previously experienced, towards these children. I am certain that you would not wish to be responsible for putting children in any sort of potentially dangerous situation.

Surely these detailed real issues must be taken into account when determining any permanent site.

I understand that the proposed sites are not within the required distance to both schooling and medical needs, therefore I also object on that basis. The land is in private ownership at Coombe Farm, and any funds spent on "compulsory or otherwise" purchase could surely be spent more wisely on behalf of the population of Croydon. No doubt Central Grants will be available, but Council owned land in an area that will not radically impact on established residents' lives would be a sensible and prudent choice.

1896/01/002/DM43.4/O Divya Kumar Object DM43.4 502 I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

1904/01/007/DM43.4/O Emma Smith Object DM43.4 502 I object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
These Gypsy and Traveller sites are being situated in Green Belt areas which goes against Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites issued by the Government. The sites also do not match the criteria described in Paragraph 4.17 in that the location of new pitches do not enable the residents to access services including schools and health facilities in the same way that residents of new houses need to be able to access community facilities. Both sites by any stretch of the imagination give Gypsy and Traveller sites good access to the road network. Indeed both or accessed by single track roads. For reasons stated above I do not believe this approach is deliverable and also will alienate existing Croydon residents to building these sites in Green Belt areas. The approach does not enable sustainable development as it compromises areas of outstanding beauty with vehicles which are the opposite. The main tenet of this proposal is Strategic Objective 10: Improve the quality and accessibility of green space and nature, whilst protecting and enhancing biodiversity.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I object to the use of Coombe Farm as a gypsy and traveller site. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development according to Government guidelines. Gypsy and Traveller sites should not be proposed in the Green Belt.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.

If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough – which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
We are writing to say that we strongly object to the proposed plans in regards to two locations in Croydon becoming traveller sites.

i) Coombe Farm off Oaks Road
ii) Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be 6. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
1927/01/001/DM43.4/O Ron Lamb
Object DM43.4 502

I am e-mailing you to register total opposition regarding your proposal to put traveller’s sites in Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge. I am and have been a resident of Oaks Road for 20 years and apart from myself being strongly against such an idea, I do not know of one neighbour that is in agreement with this proposal. Apart from there not being adequate amenities in these areas, there is insufficient transport, road ways, schools to support such a venture. Why would you want to put caravans in these areas, surely in this modern day and age people should live in houses? Also, both these areas are a natural area of beauty with wild life, birds etc… travellers would lower the whole tone of this and bring mess and litter, such as in the past when we had illegal “visits” before they were moved on. I am also informed that these areas are “green belt” and that no such proposal would or should be allowed. I state once again that I am totally against these potential destructive proposals that would spoil a very beautiful part of Croydon if you go ahead with this scheme, or perhaps this is your plan as this is one of the other Conservative Wards that you are targeting to make your changes?

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

1929/02/002/DM43.4/O Mr Charles Marriott
Object DM43.4 502

objection to extremely worrying proposals to build 3 gypsy traveller sites in Croydon on Green Belt sites.

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object Writing to object to the proposed sites for Gypsy and Travellers at Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, Reference 661. The Policies laid out on the Mayor of London-London Assembly website and Policy 7.17 clearly state that the Mayor's office truly supports the protection of Metropolitan Open Land and states the strongest protection should be given and inappropriate development refused. The Policy does not make it clear how a Council can de-designate an area. I object to any permanent Traveller site being constructed on MOL and especially if the area is simply going to be de-designated without any consultation with the local residents and businesses.

I object strongly that Croydon council can de-designate Metropolitan Open Land or Green Belt land to suit their needs to accommodate a permanent pitch. I cannot see any Planning justification to change the designation, nor for the intrusion into the lives of residents of Oaks Road and surrounding area. This will massively affect the urban attractiveness of the area and have both emotional and financial repercussions on many lives. Policy 7.18 relating to the Protecting of Open Spaces clearly states that open spaces in London must be protected, and any loss must be resisted. I cannot believe the Council would want to go against both of these policies laid down by the London Assembly.

In relation to Shirley Park golf course and 700 members, the club provides sport and social activities and also provides an important ecological role in the area. The proposed site of Coombe Farm as a site for Gypsy and Travellers has come as a shock to everyone in the area, as borne out by the recent press coverage and attendance at the Consultation Meetings. The history of unauthorised ‘pitches’ in this area over the past few years has left a bitter resentment, especially in view of the residual mess and threatening behaviour that has always accompanied their trespass. On each occasion that Gypsy /Travellers have been in the area, the club members here have been threatened with physical and verbal abuse. This behaviour is totally unacceptable and despite the subsequent eviction of the Travellers on each occasion, the residual effect on tax payers and constituents’ lives cannot be trivialised. We also have a large Junior section and children play the course during holidays as well as weekends. They are often unaccompanied and the parents...
need to know they are in a safe environment. This would certainly not be the case in the parent's minds if there was any chance of aggressive behaviour as previously experienced, towards these children. I am certain that you would not wish to be responsible for putting children in any sort of potentially dangerous situation. Surely these detailed real issues must be taken into account when determining a permanent site. I understand that the proposed sites are not within the required distance to both schooling and medical needs, therefore I also object on that basis. The land is in private ownership at Coombe Farm and any funds spent on 'compulsory or otherwise' purchase could surely be spent more wisely on behalf of the population of Croydon. No doubt central grants will be available, but Council owned land in an area that will not radically impact on established residents' lives would be a sensible and prudent choice.

Surely these detailed real issues must be taken into account when determining a permanent site. I understand that the proposed sites are not within the required distance to both schooling and medical needs, therefore I also object on that basis. The land is in private ownership at Coombe Farm and any funds spent on 'compulsory or otherwise' purchase could surely be spent more wisely on behalf of the population of Croydon. No doubt central grants will be available, but Council owned land in an area that will not radically impact on established residents' lives would be a sensible and prudent choice.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I am writing to object to: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502 for use as a gypsy and traveller site, as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b; or with Policy E of "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites" published by Government in August which states "Traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development".

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Strongly objects to the proposals for permanent encampments on the grounds of safety of the people who use the area, expenditure and environmental damage. The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
1957/01/002/DM43.4/O Charlotte Varrow
Object DM43.4 502 The site has no safe walking route to schools, shops, doctors etc. along Oaks Lane or part of Oaks Road. This is not a suitable site for a Gypsy and Traveller site. Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

1957/01/004/DM43.4/O Charlotte Varrow
Object DM43.4 502 The national guide lines state the site should not overwhelm the nearest settlement along Oaks Lane and Oaks Road which it will. This is not a suitable site for a Gypsy and Traveller site. Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

1957/01/003/DM43.4/O Charlotte Varrow
Object DM43.4 502 The access road (Oaks Lane) is far too narrow especially as large aggregate Lorries already use this poorly lit lane. This is not a suitable site for a Gypsy and Traveller site. Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

1957/01/001/DM43.4/O Charlotte Varrow
Object DM43.4 502 I strongly object to the Travellers site proposed for Coombe Farm which is on Green Belt land contrary to National Guidelines. Gypsy and Traveller sites should not be in the Green Belt. Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

1957/01/005/DM43.4/O Charlotte Varrow
Object DM43.4 502 This will be a private site which can easily expand into its Green Belt surroundings in Coombe Farm and Lloyds Park. This is not a suitable site for a Gypsy and Traveller site. Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>Inappropriate development at Coombe Farm, Oaks Road - as a member of Shirley Park Golf Course for over 50 years, I wish to express by support for their objections to this development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970/01/02</td>
<td>Derek Mezo</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980/01/02</td>
<td>Dr Kevin Barber</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>Site 502, Coome Farm is in the middle of Lloyd Park. This is Green Belt land given by the Lloyd family to the people of Croydon for recreation. People walk here enjoying the peace and beauty. Joggers, dog walkers, whole families go there and in one area sports are played. In another there is a cafe for people to sit and relax and enjoy the ambience and clean air in relative safety. Site 661 Coombe Lodge Nursery is next to the popular beautiful gardens with lovely tea room, of Coombe Wood with its wooded area. And many enjoy the peace and beauty and space, joggers, dog walkers and families. It is an inappropriate location for a gypsy and traveller site. A few years ago a group of travellers pitched up at the end of Grimwade Avenue at the top of Sandilands. The camp was quite unsightly and when they were persuaded to move on a pile of mess remained which Croydon Council, and in turn Croydon residents had to pay to clear up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982/10/02</td>
<td>E McNally</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502 as gypsy and traveller site as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986/01/00</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs E Soper</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>Object because: inappropriate use of Green Belt and against Govt advice (DCLG, 20115) selection of sites should be biased towards brownfield or industrial sites detrimental to amenity of residents lack of infrastructure to accommodate the demands and other sites should be considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986/01/00</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs E Soper</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
1987/02/001/DM43.4/O Frances & Mark Monaghan Object DM43.4 502 My wife and I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the Council's proposal to create gypsy/traveller sites on Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries. Both of these sites are in the green belt and one borders a site of nature conversation interest. It is my understanding that to create a Traveller site in such locations would contravene recent Government Guidance on such matters. This is a semi-rural area with no public services or shops nearby - it is inappropriate for both the Travellers and the local environment. To create a Gypsy/Traveller site in such locations would send out a very important message to Croydon Residents about how little the current Council cares for the areas of Croydon that are worth preserving and we have so few of them!

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

1989/01/006/DM43.4/O S R Samuel Object DM43.4 502 I am writing to object to:
1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

1990/01/002/DM43.4/O Douglas & Linda Oram Object DM43.4 502 I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

1993/01/007/DM43.4/O Graham & Kate Marsden Object DM43.4 502 We object to the use of this site as a gypsy and traveller site as it is in the green belt and the development would be in contravention of Government Policy where it says that sites (temporary or permanent) in green belt are inappropriate development. One of the gypsy and traveller sites bounds a Site of Nature Conservation Interest and all gypsy and traveller sites are some distance from public services such as shops, schools and public transport.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005/01/02/DM43.4/0</td>
<td>J. M Lewis</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/01/02/DM43.4/0</td>
<td>Mrs Jeanne F. Wells</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502 as gypsy and traveller site as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/01/02/DM43.4/0</td>
<td>Mrs Jane M. Smith</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 502

Object to the proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Coombe Farm (site 502).

The London Plan in Policy 7.17 supports the protection of Metropolitan Open Land and inappropriate development should be refused. This policy sets out the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land but does not make it clear how a Council can re-designate an area. I object to any permanent Traveller site being constructed on MOL.

I cannot see any planning justification to change the designation, nor for the intrusion into the lives of residents of Oaks Road and surrounding area. This will massively affect the urban attractiveness of the area and have both emotional and financial repercussions on many lives.

Policy 7.18 of the London Plan relating to open spaces clearly states that open spaces in London must be protected and any loss must be resisted. I cannot believe the Council would want to go against both Policy 7.17 and Policy 7.18 laid down by the London Assembly.

The history of unauthorised pitches in the area over the past few years has left a bitter resentment, especially in view of the residual mess and threatening behaviour that has been accompanied by their trespass. On each occasion that Gypsies and Travellers have been in the area the club members of Shirley Park Golf Club have been threatened with physical and verbal abuse. This behaviour is totally unacceptable and despite the subsequent eviction of the Travellers on each occasion, the residual psychological effect on people’s lives cannot be trivialised. The golf club has a large junior section and children play the course during holidays as well as weekends. They are often unaccompanied and parents need to know they are in a safe environment. This would certainly not be the case in the parent’s mind if there were any chance of aggressive behaviour as previously experienced towards the children.

Surely these detailed real issues must be taken into account when determining any permanent site.

I understand that the proposed site is not within the required distance to both schooling and medical needs, therefore I object on that basis. The land is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Coombe Farm, and any funds spent on compulsory purchase or otherwise could surely be spent more wisely on behalf of the population of Croydon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2022/01/005/DM43.4/O</th>
<th>Joe Rowe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Hills Residents Association</td>
<td>Object DM43.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This land is designated as Metropolitan Open Land and there is no justification for re-designation. An increase of up to 741 homes on this land would put local services including schools, transport and already crowded roads under further pressure.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object

I object to the proposal as Coombe Farm is Green Belt Land. Policy E of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August states very clearly that "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". Previous use does not mitigate this policy. The proximity of this site to the Coombe Lodge Nurseries site, also proposed, would mean a total of up to 45 pitches on 2 sites within a very small area of the Borough. Paragraph 4.19 refers to the need for good access to roads, stating that Gypsies and Travellers "often need to move larger vehicles as part of their livelihood and way of life". Coombe Road junctions with Oaks Road and Conduit Lane are busy and potentially hazardous intersections and are unsuitable for increased, safe movement and manoeuvring of larger vehicles, especially entering and exiting these sites. Oaks Road itself is a narrow rural road with a number of blind bends and an adjacent bridle way, making it unsuitable for large vehicles. The Local Plan has not taken sufficient account of the potential increased danger for motorists and pedestrians, horses and riders.

The close proximity of the proposed sites to one another has not been taken into account. All three sites are proposed for a small area in the South of the Borough when there seems to be a successful site in Purley Way which could be expanded. None of these sites proposed has good access to schools, shops and other services. The consequent need for private transport goes against environment and climate initiatives. Government Guidelines ask that local planning authorities policies ensure that children can attend school on a regular basis. These three sites are well away from schools, particularly primary schools and clearly do not reflect the aims of Guidelines or facilitate regular school attendance.

The number of Gypsy/Traveller sites in Croydon is to increase from 1 to 4 when our recent experience locally is of travellers responsible for damage, parking illegally, leaving piles of rubbish behind when they are moved on an even engaged in firearms confrontation with the police.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr John Webster

I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502 as gypsy and traveller site as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
The site is Green Belt. The proposal would exceed the current built on area and therefore the Green Belt would be lost. The Combe Farmhouse is also noted in many historical books of Croydon. It is my understanding that the current owner has lodged numerous planning applications over the years which had been denied by the Council. Please can the Council clearly describe why they are now prepared to change the use of the land for the gain of fulfilling their Traveller/Gypsy site quota? The site is also currently privately owned. In order for the Council to proceed with their plans they will need to purchase the site. I challenge this use of Croydon’s finance budget as, with all compulsory purchases; the Council should review the return of the investment on any such cost for the benefit of their tax paying community. Increase risk and detrimental impact to the local wildlife such as deer, badgers, newts, toads, hedgehogs, numerous bird life including woodpackers, owls, hens, etc. The range of flora and fauna including protected trees such as the large oaks all of which form the beautiful unique Addington Hills Public Open Space and adjoining Green Belt area. The site is also situated near open land which has previously been victim to unauthorised Traveller and Gypsy encampments. A thorough review and statement regarding how the Council and Police propose to exercise control over any additional families encamping on unauthorised land surrounding the site must be produced. Through past experience it has been a difficult and lengthy process for the Police, Council and Local Residents. The general public have been denied safe access to public open land or intimidated when using the Tram or Bus stop during these encampment periods. The Council have to pay the legal and policing costs of the unauthorised encampment removal, the environmental cost to clean up the rubbish, the consideration of the impact to wildlife and the continued safety of the public to relax and enjoy the open countryside and public services. The site proposes a detrimental impact to local business revenue. Oaks farm is an established countryside wedding venue. It would have an increase in traffic at the dangerous junction joining Oaks road and Conduit Lane.
The site is Green Belt. The proposal would exceed the current built on area and therefore the Green Belt would be lost. The Combe Farmhouse is also noted in many historical books of Croydon. It is my understanding that the current owner has lodged numerous planning applications over the years which had been denied by the Council. Please can the Council clearly describe why they are now prepared to change the use of the land for the gain of fulfilling their Traveller/Gypsy site quota? The site is also currently privately owned. In order for the Council to proceed with their plans they will need to purchase the site. I challenge this use of Croydon’s finance budget as, with all compulsory purchases, the Council should review the return of the investment on any such cost for the benefit of their tax paying community. Increase risk and detrimental impact to the local wildlife such as deer, badgers, newts, toads, hedgehogs, numerous bird life including woodpeckers, owls, herrons, etc. The range of flora and fauna including protected trees such as the large oaks all of which form the beautiful unique Addington Hills Public Open Space and adjoining Green Belt area. The site is also situated near open land which has previously been victim to unauthorised Traveller and Gypsy encampments. A thorough review and statement regarding how the Council and Police propose to exercise control over any additional families encamping on unauthorised land surrounding the site must be produced. Through past experience it has been a difficult and lengthy process for the Police, Council and Local Residents. The general public have been denied safe access to public open land or intimidated when using the Tram or Bus stop during these encampment periods. The Council have to pay the legal and policing costs of the unauthorised encampment removal, the environmental cost to clean up the rubbish, the consideration of the impact to wildlife and the continued safety of the public to relax and enjoy the open countryside and public services. The site proposes a detrimental impact to local business revenue. Oaks farm is an established countryside wedding venue. It would have an increase in traffic at the dangerous junction joining Oaks road and Conduit Lane.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
The proposal to develop Coombe Farm, Oak Road as a residential development for a Gypsy and travelers site does not fall within the Strategic Objectives. This proposed development of a travelers site within the Shirley area is not in keeping with the current development within this area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with our housing in the area. Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area. Building a travelers site will increase noise levels, and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area. Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. This development would diminish the striking view of the area of Addington Hills and Coombe Farm area.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I object to the use of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site 502, as a gypsy and traveller site as it would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites. I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political…consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 502

All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Stephen Baker
Object
DM43.4 502

I also strongly object to building of traveler camps in Shirley. One, these would be built on green belt land or Mob land against current legislation as. Understand, two, if they are 'travellers' why do they need homes? Surely they just move on in there caravans? If they do need homes, the. Why are they not added to current council housing schemes! Also publish national stats show that most traveler sites are in the south of England, yet the regulations should be to place them evenly through out the country, therefore the south would have over its required quota and ten north needs to provide more and as they are travellers they can easily relocate to these areas. Why over burden an increasingly overpopulated south London area? Also, as shown with the traveler homes in woodmanstern, there is the potential for an increase in fly tipping, and local crime leading to further costs to the council to clean up and provide policy support, yet I have just had a letter from the council saying you have had £90 million cut from central government, and we will have to pay for our own garden waste collecting now as wont be included in our council tax, so plea answer me how you can afford to pay for these developments, and not at the direct or indirect expense of the tax payer in Shirley or Croydon borough. Please show me your business model that shows how this will be funded.

DM43.4
502

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 502

All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria.

Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>DM43.4 502</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2078/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Nivaj Sawant</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 502 (Coombe Farm)</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsies and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2078/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Nivaj Sawant</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsies and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2087/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Phillipa Howard</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>The Club with Junior section not only provides sport and social activities to over 700 members in the local vicinity, but also provides an important ecological role in the area. The proposed site of Coombe Farm as a site for Gypsies and Travellers will massively affect the urban attractiveness of the area and have both emotional and financial repercussions on many lives. The history of unauthorised &quot;pitches&quot; in this area over the past few years has left a bitter resentment, especially in view of the residual mess and threatening behaviour that has always accompanied their trespass. On each occasion that Gypsies and Travellers have been in the area, the club members here have been threatened with physical and verbal abuse. This behaviour is totally unacceptable and despite the subsequent eviction of the Travellers on each occasion, the residual psychological effect on tax payers and constituents' lives cannot be trivialized. The proposed sites are not within the required distance to both schooling and medical needs, therefore I also object on that basis. The land is in private ownership at Coombe Farm, and any funds spent on &quot;compulsory or otherwise&quot; purchase could surely be spent more wisely on behalf of the population of Croydon.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsies and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2089/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Phillipa Carey</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>502 DM43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2096/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Alfred Lancaster</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2103/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Miss DC Smith</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.1 Object to use of Coombe Farm as stated in Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015 that `Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development`. Previous use does not mitigate against this policy.

1.2 The site is too close to the Coombe Lodge Nurseries Site also proposed and would mean a total of up to 45 pitches on 2 sites in a very small area of the Borough.

1.3 The Croydon Local Plan paragraph 4.19 (CLP1.1) refers to the need for good access to roads. Coombe Road junctions with Oaks Road and Conduit Lane are busy and potentially hazardous intersections and are unsuitable for increased safe movement and manoeuvring of larger vehicles, especially entering and exiting these sites. Travellers `often need to move larger vehicles as part of their livelihood and way of life`.

1.4 Oaks Road is a narrow rural road with a number of blind bends and adjacent bridleway making it unsuitable for large vehicles. The Local Plan has not taken sufficient account of the potential increased danger for motorists, pedestrians, horses and riders. None of the three sites have good access to schools, shops and other services. The consequent need for private transport goes against environment and transport initiatives. Government Guidelines ask that local planning authorities` policies ensure that children can attend school on a regular basis. These three sites are well away from schools, particularly primary schools and clearly do not reflect the aims of the Guidelines or facilitate regular school attendance. None of the three sites take into account the need for good access to roads as in CLP1.1 Para 4.19. Oaks Road, Coombe Road, Conduit Lane and Featherbed Lane are unsuitable for safe increased movement and manoeuvring of larger vehicles, especially entering and exiting these sites.

Object to location as issues with busy, potentially hazardous roads for larger vehicles the travellers need and junctions and entrance and exit from both sites 502 and 661. Oaks Road is narrow, no account taken of potential increased danger for motorists, pedestrians, horses and riders. None of the three sites have good access to schools, shops and other services. The consequent need for private transport goes against environment and transport initiatives. Government Guidelines ask that local planning authorities` policies ensure that children can attend school on a regular basis. These three sites are well away from schools, particularly primary schools and clearly do not reflect the aims of the Guidelines or facilitate regular school attendance. None of the three sites take into account the need for good access to roads as in CLP1.1 Para 4.19. Oaks Road, Coombe Road, Conduit Lane and Featherbed Lane are unsuitable for safe increased movement and manoeuvring of larger vehicles, especially entering and exiting these sites.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
The site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites', published by the Government in August, states very clearly that 'Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development'. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites. I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the 'Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers'. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of 'extensive political...consultation'. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

The site should not be allocated as a Gypsy and Traveller site.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I object to the planned new sites for travellers, why not expand the site they have at present, on the same basis as the expansion of the housing that is being mooted for estates such as Forestdale and New Addington. I object to Travellers being treated differently. Why should they be given new private prime sites?

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object Number</th>
<th>Message</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2141/01/002/DM43.4</td>
<td>P Graham</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I am writing to object to: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502 for use as a gypsy and traveller site, as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b; or with Policy E of &quot;Planning Policy for Traveller Sites&quot; published by Government in August which states &quot;Traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development&quot;;</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2144/01/001/DM43.4</td>
<td>P Busby</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2147/01/007/DM43.4</td>
<td>Patrick Thomas</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I am writing at this time to record my objections on the following basis - the use of this site, 502, for a gypsy and traveller site.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2150/01/002/DM43.4</td>
<td>R. V. Lewis</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2152/01/002/DM43.4</td>
<td>David Moulton</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation, because both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b;</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The council have chosen two sites within approx 1/2 mile of one another. Both sites are an area of greenbelt and would not comply with policy SP1.7a and SP2.7G. However, I have no objection to the building of a secondary school on the site of Coombe Wood playing field, as it does bring benefit to future generations.

We already know that a travellers site will result in higher crime, flytipping and vandalism in the area, as we have recently recorded evidence, when travellers pitched up in both Conduit Lane and Coombe Wood Playing fields on two separate occasions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM43.4 502</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Travellers sites at Coombe Lodge and Combe Farm are both inappropriate in the Green Belt as both are in the Green Belt and one is close to a SNCI. This is contrary to Government guidance on Travellers sites and both are some distance from public services.

The Council should look towards the existing site at Purley Way for any future need.

It would also compromise the ability of future generations to enjoy these green spaces.

Given the redevelopment in Central Croydon there will be more people who need to make use of these "green lungs". This would reduce employment opportunities and the need for businesses to consider environmental factors when locating in Croydon.

Sites 502 and 661 would be contrary to the Green Grid concept and detract from the value of green spaces on the local heritage character.

On the site selection process, the scoring does not reflect the importance given to green spaces and is subjectively high. It should be reconsidered for "privacy" and "local character" as well.

502 is on a narrow track and both sites GB/MOL should have a score of minus 5 not plus 5.

The social deprivation category is illogical as pressures on local services apply equally across Croydon.

The assessment should be reconsidered by an independent party.

Sites 502 and 661 if allowed would be contrary to the Green Grid concept and detract from local greenspaces and their contribution to local heritage.

On the site selection process, the scoring system does not reflect the importance of green spaces, the scoring is subjectively high, especially for "privacy" and "local character".

502 is on a narrow track and for both MO/L/G SF2.7 makes no reference to the impact on surroundings or local residents.
| 2164/01/002/DM43.4/O Mr John Mills | **Object** | Soundness - Justified | DM43.4 502 | **Change** | The respondent objects to the proposal to site three gypsy and travellers sites in the green belt, allowing housing on some of the precious green space and back gardens and would completely change the character of the borough. The sewage and water is up to the limit. | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use. |

| 2164/02/002/DM43.4/O Mr John Mills | **Object** | DM43.4 502 | Croydon Council’s plans to build three gypsy/traveller sites in the Green Belt, allow housing on some of our precious green spaces and back gardens and completely change the character of parts of the borough. I agree with Gavin Barwell With regards this destruction of our green belt land. | **Change** | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use. |
I am writing to object to the proposed traveller sites at Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries. I grew up in this area and work at Oaks Farm Wedding Venue so I am very concerned about both of these proposed sites. I consider the development at Coombe Farm to be inappropriate for the following reasons:

- The site is in a green belt area. National guidelines say that Traveller sites in the green belt are an inappropriate development.
- There is a long history of planning application refusals on the site, so it is unclear why this development would be allowed in the green belt when other developments have not.
- The access road to this site, Oaks Lane, is completely unsuitable for a large number of large vehicles - it is a narrow road and simply was not designed for the high traffic levels we can expect with the proposed additional residents.
- There is no pavement on Oaks Lane so the additional traffic will make the road extremely unsafe to pedestrians.
- It is a tight turning on the entrance on Oaks Road so it will be extremely difficult for large mobile homes and trailers to turn in and out.
- The access from Oaks Road is very congested at rush hour and is also very close to the tram line and traffic lights. It is an accident black spot and there have been a number of road traffic incidents on this stretch of road.
- The proposed size of the traveller site is 15-20 pitches, which can each house 3 mobile homes. Therefore, there could be up to 60 mobile homes on the site. Should further caravans pitch up to use the site, it is unclear how this could be monitored or controlled - so the numbers could increase further. Even at the proposed level, the size of this traveller population, compared to the local community, which is relatively small on Oaks Lane and Oaks Road is totally overwhelming and would not be conducive to social cohesion in the area.
- The location of Coombe Farm is beautiful and adjacent to the fabulous local amenity Lloyds Par. This is a sanctuary for wildlife and local residents and visitor. Green Spaces like this are short supply in Croydon. The appearance of this large traveller site in such a location and the affect on wildlife should be taken into account. A brown fitted site would be much more appropriate.
- Coombe Farm is listed by the London Borough of Croydon as a grade II listed building of historic
interest. The view of this important historical building will be ruined by the proposed settlement. Furthermore I understand that the building itself will be used for toilets and kitchens for the site (up to 60 families). Is this an appropriate change of use for such an important part of local heritage?

- The cost of this site will be enormous, in ground rent or compulsory purchase, removing existing outbuildings, and the work required to make the site ready, building toilets/kitchens, additional drainage, plumbing and electrical work, etc. Croydon Council has an enormous shortfall in council housing for the community already resident in Croydon. Surely it would be better to spend taxpayers' money on addressing the housing needs of ordinary families who are currently resident in the borough.

- The schools in this area are so over subscribed that there have been some proposals that a new school needs to be developed off Coombe Road. With such a lack of school places for the existing community, there must be insufficient infrastructure to educate the children from up to 60 extra families.

- Since there is no pavement on Oaks Lane and insufficient lighting when it is dark, there is not safe access for the travellers and their children to safely reach essential amenities such as schools, doctors and shops on foot. If they can only go
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 502</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2191/01/002</td>
<td>Mr Rodney Beale</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Objection to the proposals for gypsy and travellers as not the most appropriate for Croydon and unsuitable for the lovely country area of Croydon visited throughout the year by families, residents and visitors. The approach is deliverable but undesirably and will ruin the only real part of the country area in Croydon, which grows with housing and office blocks almost daily. The preferred approach will not enable sustainable development as it will spoil the existing areas where sites are suggested and which will never be the same again. It will also affect schooling, health, and cause disturbance around all areas. If Croydon must comply, areas such as Purley Way or an extension of facilities at Laythams Farm should be the correct options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301/01/010</td>
<td>Breda Mohan</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td></td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2302/01/007</td>
<td>Brenda Stratford</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td></td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. It has also been found unsuitable as part of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment due to high risk of surface water flooding. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2304/01/002</td>
<td>Mandy Lambert</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td></td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

02 September 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object Date</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2318/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Julie Litchfield</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2326/02/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Mollie Dagnell</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of the location of site 502 as a gypsy and traveller site. The site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2334/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Noel Vas</td>
<td>The council plans to create a Gypsy/Traveller site here. This is a greenbelt site, and it is not appropriate to put a traveler site here. Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. I would have thought it would be in the Council’s interest to arrange for travellers to be in permanent housing and send their children to school. This is because I understand that many travellers do have permanent housing that they live in during the winter and other months when their caravans would get stuck in the mud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2361/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Alan Chitty</td>
<td>My objections are based on the fact that the proposals are not in the best interests of the electorate of the borough and that the proposals will only be harmful to the environment offering no benefits to the community. Building on the Green Belt is not the best option. In the case of the proposed traveller sites PTF is green belt, there are no suitable transport, school or social services in the vicinity. Combe Farm is green belt and Conduit Lane are both close to well established businesses which will be blighted by having such sites in close proximity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2363/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Anthony Cole</td>
<td>I believe the proposed traveller sites are inappropriate in these Green Belt areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2364/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Alison Crane</td>
<td>Coombe Farm Oaks Road site is not a suitable site for a traveller site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2382/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Miss Lorraine Gooding</td>
<td>I strongly object to the proposals for a Gypsy and Traveller site in this area of Croydon. It will certainly change the character of this beautiful part of Croydon. The two locations (Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries) are in the Green Belt and therefore contrary to government policy (Policy E of Planning Policy for Gypsy Sites) which states traveller sites temporary or permanent in the Green Belt are inappropriate. Our neighbourhood has encountered continual and numerous travellers campsites over the years. They left rubbish, human excrement and were seen trying to steal vehicles and prowling around private homes. It took weeks to clear up. I also have weekly encounters near where I work on Imperial Way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2429/02/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs E Abdul-Nabi</td>
<td>Object to the use of Coombe Farm as a Gypsy and Traveller site as it would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SPZ.7a and SPZ.7b.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -6. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr & Mrs Jeffrey

Object

Not too long ago we recently had to remove Gypsies from our village at cost to our residents as they left the village in a complete mess.

Mr & Mrs Jeffrey

Object

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr & Mrs Jeffrey

Object

I will be objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Alan Warner

Object

The purpose of this e mail is to register my objections to the proposed change to the designation of Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. I understand that the Council have identified two locations for travellers/gypsy sites at Coombe Farm ref 502. These proposals are contrary to Government Policy (Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller sites) which states that Travellers sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

I have lived in this area for 25 years and in conjunction with the efforts of our Residence Association and Croydon Council they have maintained the beauty of the area for the good of all that live here. I cannot protest strongly enough to ensure that these changes do not proceed as it can only make the area much worse for all concerned. Please consider my objection seriously as I do not want the character of the area changed for the worse. I look forward to receiving your acknowledgement and response at your earliest convenience.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2493/02/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ben Plummer</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td>Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2540/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Sandra Cooper</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I object to the use of this site as a Gypsy and Traveller site.</td>
<td>Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2541/01/011/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms Susanne Million</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502 for the use as a Gypsy/Traveller site.</td>
<td>Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2542/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>N Johnceline</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>Object to proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Coombe Farm (reference number 502). This site is in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in exceptional circumstances. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are in appropriate development. There are no ‘very special circumstances’ that warrant the proposed use of these Green Belt sites. The site does not have any local amenities-shops, healthcare, primary schools (I think there is only one secondary school in the immediate area), so will not serve the traveller community. Surely expanding the existing brownfield site in Purley Way would be more cost effective and preferable to the travellers as it provides opportunities for employment, schools and medical care in the immediate vicinity, which the proposed sites do not.</td>
<td>Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objection to Site 661 and 502 for Gypsy and Traveller sites as inappropriate development within the Green Belt, with traffic issues at Coombe Road junction, and the proposed sites are not within reasonable walking distance of local amenities. Walkways are inadequate and it is difficult for pedestrians to cross Coombe Road in heavy traffic. Also object to the alternative option of a school on site 661 as there is already a school at the other end of Melville Avenue which causes traffic during term time in the morning and evening in the surrounding area. Traffic in Melville Avenue which is approached via Crohan Road or Coombe Road (busy roads) is often chaotic and any increase should not be countenanced and may lead to accidents.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Objection to Site 661 and 502 for Gypsy and Traveller sites as inappropriate development in the Green Belt and the impact on local traffic, with traffic issues at Coombe Road junction, and the proposed sites are not within reasonable walking distance of local amenities. Walkways are inadequate and it is difficult for pedestrians to cross Coombe Road in heavy traffic. Objection to alternative use of site 661 as a school on grounds of traffic impact.

The plans for travellers sites on the local green belt are unacceptable and will change the character of the area and also overburden the already problematic local road infrastructure.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I am writing to object to: Coombe Farm off Oakes Road, site reference 502. This site would constitute inappropriate development in the green belt and would not comply with policies SP2.7a and SP2.7b. In the consultation process with the Gypsy and Travellers they requested small sites that are more manageable. This site is close to a busy road and tram lines that could be dangerous to children. They also requested sites near to doctors, primary schools and shops. There is a suitable brownfield site existing alongside the Purley Way, offering more opportunities for employment. It is very important that the sites offer safe entrance and exits to sites to ensure there is no danger of accidents. This site is not suitable and would be costly to the council's already stretched budget. The consultation refers to the need for good access for roads as "they often move larger vehicles as part of their livelihood and way of life". Coombe Road and Oakes Road are already very busy, the sites would cause no end of delays and frustration to drivers.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Public Authority</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 502</th>
<th>Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 502 (Coombe Farm)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms Cliona Moore</td>
<td>2552/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>2552/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss F Matthews</td>
<td>2556/03/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>2556/03/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>We must protect our green areas and surely there are better sites than this one. It would be detrimental to the green belt and the character of the area. The idea that because there are glass houses already in Council owned nursery that it can bypass the usual green belt restrictions seems dubious. The site is completely impractical in terms of access and safety being close to very busy roads. Suggestions are: 536- Croydon Airport, Waddon 632- Kent gateway, Bridle way 767- Cane Hill -South part, Coulsdon.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Sean McDermott</td>
<td>2563/03/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>2563/03/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>Objects to the siting of a gypsy and traveller site in this location.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Shirley M Kell</td>
<td>I object to the building of Traveller Sites. 1. Ref No 502 - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road identified as suitable for 15-20 pitches. 2. Ref No 661 - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane identified as suitable for 15-25 pitches. I strongly object to either of these areas being used as gypsy/traveller sites. They are both in the Green Belt and are totally inappropriate for such use. In addition they would be in close proximity to Coome Lodge Travelodge, a very popular local venue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs S White</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Radford</td>
<td>I would also like to be provided with further details of the following matters that have been used as reasons to discount many of the proposed sites that scored significantly higher than the Site and site nos. 502 in the Proposal: • Site 120: Proposed community facility; • Site 324: Employment and proposed residential use; • Site 488: Proposed residential development; and • Site 522: Proposed district energy centre, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object

I am writing to object about Site References 661/502, both being inappropriate use and development of Green Belt land. There are adjacent areas of outstanding beauty, sites with biological significance, as well as playing fields for the local community. These would all be affected, not least during the construction of Travellers Sites. The London Plan does not advocate such a development and seems unrealistic for two such sites to be located in the London Borough of Croydon, already over-stretched owing to refugees and asylum seekers arriving at the borough’s Home Office. Not only will this proposed development overburden Croydon as a whole, but also our homes (within 2 miles of said sites). Amenities, Schools, GPs practices and the like will be inadequate for an influx of such a population.

Without adequate provision of facilities more than homes alone, not only will the Travellers be disappointed but also local residents who chose to live, close to this location owing to the outstanding open spaces. We have seen the Riots of 2012. Many foreign visitors have sought to live in our Borough. However, the very nature of the name ‘Traveller’, suggests this new group of people may be transitory; we may find our Schools and Hospitals will be overstretched and with a nomadic population, teachers and doctors to name but a few will be unable to provide continuity of care, to the excellent standard we desire for the existing community.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2584/02/001/DM43.4/O</th>
<th>Mrs Sharon Hodges</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 502</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am writing to give my objections to the following location as a traveller/gypsy site: Coombe Farm - off Oaks Road Ref 502 This site is on the green belt and so inappropriate for development according to government. The area is a valued beauty spot for people living all over Croydon. There are few such place in our densely populated town and so needs to be protected. The site is on a single track lane with a very narrow access onto Oaks Road which large vehicles such as mobile homes will have difficulty accessing. There are no pavements along the narrow Oaks Road in that area making it dangerous for pedestrians. The lighting in this forested area is very poor. It will be unsafe for pedestrians especially traveller children. There are few local amenities in the area. There are no shops or doctors within walking distance. There are no buses along Coombe Lane. It is a dangerous walk along the road to the tram stop. National guidelines state that a site should not overwhelm the nearest settlements. The residents of Oaks Farm, Oaks Road and Oaks Lane - all in isolated positions - would certainly be overwhelmed. Local businesses would be affected negatively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hope an alternative site will be found to better meet the needs of travellers in the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2584/01/001/DM43.4/O</th>
<th>Mrs Sharon Hodges</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 502</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objections to allocate 502 site for Gypsies and Travellers Inappropriate use of Green Belt land lack of relevant amenities close to hand adverse effect on neighbouring businessess and leisure amenities site has a more appropriate use for a school inappropriate site to meet the needs of travellers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate site for the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>The proposals to develop this site for Gypsy and Traveller pitches is completely inappropriate because:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- It is in Green Belt and is therefore contrary to Policy E of Planning for Traveller Sites (government guidance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The site is some distance from public services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- A site should be found in the Purley Way area instead where the existing site is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- A site here would compromise the ability of the current generation and future generations to enjoy this green space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Damage to this green space would make Croydon a less attractive place to live in and discourage business relocation to Croydon reducing employment opportunities for Croydon's residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The scoring system does not reflect the importance of green spaces and is highly objectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The road access to this site is a single track lane which would be inaccessible to large mobile homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- There is a mistake in the scoring system and it should be recorded as -5 for being in Green Belt, not +5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The social deprivation criterion is illogical as pressures on services apply equally across Croydon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Change | The site should be reassessed by an independent party. |

| Change | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 502</th>
<th>I am writing to object to site 502's use as a gypsy and traveller site. This would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with SPF2.7a and b.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Change | I am writing to object to site 502 as a gypsy and traveller site |

| Change | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use. |
Our objections in respect of the Coombe Farm are as follows:
1. The site is in a green belt area. National guidelines say that travellers/gypsy sites in the greenbelt are inappropriate development. Even if the properties are demolished to provide for the pitches there will still be a large spillover into the Green Belt. This means that planning permission should not be available.
2. The site is on a single track lane with a very narrow access onto Oaks Road which the large mobile homes will not be able to access. The lane is also used by aggregate Lorries (shorter than mobile homes), local residents, members of the sports ground and opposing teams and visitors to Lloyds Park, a much loved public amenity.
3. The site has no safe walking route to schools, shops, doctors, etc. There is no pavement along Oaks Lane and very poor lighting when dark. There is only partial pavement on one side of the road along Oaks Road as well. How will it be possible to safeguard so many additional people including a great number of children? This development is unsustainable as everyone will have to use cars to access the basics of life.
4. The size of the pitches would accommodate a far greater number of caravans than can be controlled by planning restrictions. Even if the restrictions are adhered to, there could be as many as three families on each pitch. With planning for 20 pitches this would mean 60 families and 60 mobile homes, not to mention additional caravans in tow, trucks, vans, trailers and cars.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2590/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Wilkinson</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2592/03/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Lewis</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I am concerned about Coombe Farm being allocated - this is inappropriate in this location adjoining Lloyd Park, Coombe Gardens and in the Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2592/02/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Lewis</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I am concerned about Coombe Farm being allocated - this is inappropriate in this location adjoining Lloyd Park, Coombe Gardens and in the Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2592/01/002/DM43.4/C</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Lewis</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Inappropriate in this location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary:
Not in line with Government planning policy on the Green Belt

Detail:
• Government planning policy with regards to traveller sites wants to ensure that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development.

• The proposal to create a permanent traveller site on land designated as Green Belt land is contrary to Policy E of the Planning Policy: “Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances.” There are no very special circumstances.

• The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the “very special circumstances” justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt.

• The local character description is clearly at odds with the proposal. The justification acknowledges the Green Belt issue, though insufficiently, but relies on the fact that there are existing structures. These are not in fact substantial — being glasshouses — and could be said to be at least environmentally consistent with the Green Belt. But there is no very special circumstance justification proposed as required by Planning Policies.

• Approving the proposal would set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to be subject to similar development. It is not in the community’s interests to allow the erosion of the green spaces surrounding the community and we object to the impact this site could have on the environment and wildlife.

In the light of these issues, it is not appropriate simply to weight Green Belt as one of many factors to be considered, but rather it presents an overarching policy objection that cannot be over-ridden in the way proposed. The decision making process is contrary to Government guidance. To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now and we do not believe that the site is deliverable.
Assessment and selection of sites for Gypsy and Travellers undertaken was credible.

Plan makers have not considered the time it will take to commence development on site need for infrastructure improvements – roads, GPS, schools and transport.

There is basis for challenging the way in which this potential site has been selected.

1 Para 3.1 – Green Belt sites included for review of eligible sites "to ensure that all locations for a site considered", but at the same time "Exclusion of sites in Croydon Metropolitan Centre and within District Centres and Strategic Industrial Locations and Conservation Areas due to viability, deliverability and impact on heritage considerations". To me, this view appears unbalanced and un-evidenced, as if other relevant criteria have not been considered. Why is a ‘conservation area’ or ‘industrial location’ not viable, yet a very pleasant piece of open parkland near central Croydon which is accessible to most residents of the borough suddenly is viable? There is no evidence for these assertions of viability.

4 Para 4.1 sets out the criteria and weightings. As indicated above, Green Belt with no built form is given a weighting (-10) which, though high, is not very significant given that there are 29 or 30 criteria and can easily be outweighed by other factors that are less significant in policy terms. Furthermore, Coombe Nurseries has been weighted -5 for Green Belt, in recognition of the fact that there are some structures on the site, AND has been given 5 for the fact that (in the assessor’s view) such structures as there are can be converted to traveller use (if the buildings had to be demolished, on a green field site, this would have attracted -5).

1 SP2.7 on the Council’s proposals to deliver 39 additional gypsy and traveller sites indicates that land will be allocated in accordance with the proposals, but that any ADDITIONAL sites that are not so allocated should meet some stated criteria, including good access to local shops and essential services and good transport access; these seem to be criteria that were excluded from the proposed allocation, suggesting that any alternative proposals would need to meet stiffer criteria. Is this a fair view?
The bases for site criteria weightings are unclear. The proposed development does not meet the needs of the present (see further info in section 3). Gypsies and Travellers needs are not addressed: not enough local amenities, sites are too big, unfit local roads.

The proposed development does compromise the future of the local area.

• Government planning policy is to ensure local planning authorities have due regard to the protection of local amenities and the local environment.

• It is likely the proposals will have an adverse effect on local businesses.

• Coombe Wood is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) (List of Historical Park and Gardens 2008) and borders the proposed Coombe Lodge Nurseries site, and would be negatively impacted by the plans. Croydon Council has already recognised this in its Development Management Policies document.

• The Borough Character Appraisal of 2015, the local area is listed as having special character. The proposed development is not sensitive to, and does not respect, this.

Based on survey responses, most Gypsies and Travellers living in the Croydon area would prefer small, family sized sites. Stakeholder comments suggested that smaller sites have fewer inter-family tensions and are therefore easier to manage. The plan goes against these wishes.

• The proposed plan does not take into account the need for good access to roads. The Croydon Local Plan paragraph 4.19 refers to the need for good access to roads, stating that Gypsies and Travellers "often need to move larger vehicles as part of their livelihood and way of life" – this may be an assertion relevant to the assessment of sites and the narrowness of Coombe Lane.

The proposed sites are not suitable for traveller vehicles.

• It is very important that the site has a safe entrance and exit. There are very strict Highway regulations about visibility at the entrance/exit to sites to ensure there is no danger of accidents. This links into the insufficient local infrastructure and we know how dangerous the junctions Coombe Road/Oaks Road/Conduit Lane can be. Both sites are accessed by single lane roads and the proposed plans do not take into consideration the potential extensive
alterations needed to the local road network.

10.18 The settled community neighboring the sites should also be involved in the consultation from an early stage. There may be scope for expanding existing sites to meet some of the need. However, the preference is for smaller sites which tend to be easier to manage.

• Is there not scope for extending existing sites in the Borough to meet some of the need? It is not clear how much consideration has been given to this.

10.19 In terms of identifying broad locations for new sites, there are a number of factors which could be considered including:

• Social
• School catchment areas

• The area is not in a school catchment area.

10.21 Gypsies and Travellers undertaking the survey also suggested that it is important that new sites are located close to amenities such as shops, schools and health facilities.

• There are no local shops and amenities
• There are no local buses although there is a Tram.
• The GPs in the area are already full to bursting.
• Croydon University hospital cannot cope with the influx of patients already. This would add further nursing and Finance pressures.

10.22 CLG (2012) guidance suggests that Local planning authorities should strictly limit new traveller site development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements.

• Gypsies and Travellers often need mixed-use employment sites (as they often run a business from the place where they live). The proposed plan does not address this in a Green Belt location where commercial activities on site could lead to substantial hazardous contaminants and waste materials escaping from the site.

• Gypsies and Travellers often express their preference to be within walking distance of shops/health centres/schools/local amenities. The proposed sites are not close to any of these. The proposed sites go against Gypsies and Travellers preferences and against environment and climate
initiatives by promoting the use of
their own vehicles for daily life.

• From Government Guidelines, Local
planning authorities should ensure
that their policies ensure that children
can attend school on a regular basis.
The site is well away from schools
(particularly primary school provision)
and clearly does not reflect the above
aim, or facilitate regular school
attendance. Widely recognised by
Government source that Literacy can
be an issue within the Travelling
community, this would place even
more pressure on local schools to
provide for support of their needs.
Recent studies suggest a greater
proportion of ill-health amongst the
travelling community, adding more
pressure to local health centres. In
addition to going against Government
Planning Policy for traveller sites, the
closest services will therefore have
further demands placed on them.

• There is evidence of periodic
overcrowding on traveller sites,
throughout the year and at a peak
during winter months. This would yet
further increase demand on local
services. The plan makers have
made no indication that they would
take this into consideration or look to
limit overcrowding.

The Croydon Local Plan Note that
paragraph 4.19 in referring to the
need for good access to roads, states
that “they often need to move larger
vehicles as part of their livelihood and
way of life” – this may be an assertion
relevant to the assessment of sites
and the narrowness of Coombe Lane.
The local roads would not be suitable
for the continuous use of “larger”
vehicles.

• gypsy-traveller.org - The best type of
land is a ‘brown field’ site. The site
should be close to local amenities. It
is very important that the site has a
safe entrance and exit. There are
very strict Highway regulations about
visibility at the entrance/exit to sites
to ensure there is no danger of
accidents and this is very important.

The objections may be summarized
as:

- inappropriate use of Green Belt land
- lack of relevant amenities close to
town
- Lack of supportive infrastructure
- Adverse effect on neighboring
businesses and leisure amenities
- site has a more appropriate use for a
2599/01/007/DM43.4/O Helen Armstrong

Object: Coombe Farm should be acknowledged as Green Belt

Change: Coombe Farm should be acknowledged as Green Belt

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

2600/01/001/DM43.4/O Hitesh Patel

Object: DM43.4 502

I am writing to register my objections for the following proposed sites for Gypsy and Travellers Site Coombe Farm, Oaks Road - Reference 502.

Following up from the letter sent by Steve Murphy (General Manager). I too am not happy with what you are planning to impose on our lives. Reiterate, the travellers/Gypsies are very rude & me being of Indian origin, little children of no older than 6 or 7 came over, took our golf balls, calling me racially abusive names with their guardians not standing more than few yards. I do not believe a society of such vulgarity should be accommodated at the cost of decent law abiding citizens. I'm not being a Nimby, just want to enjoy my time at this beautiful golf course at the weekends in the main, so please put yourself in our shoes. Please reconsider your options. As a suggestion, opposite Purley way playing fields would be ideal place to create an enclosure.

It's also not fair that whereas we pay for our way in life these get handed pieces of land at our expense. I've every faith in you & your team to make the right choice without upsetting the apple cart.

2604/01/002/DM43.4/C I and W Smith

Object: DM43.4 502

We are writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites.

Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Ian Broyd  
Object DM43.4 502  
Croydon has very few green places that are actually loved and residents are proud of so they need to be left as they are or enhanced. The proposal to place travellers site is not acceptable. These sites are stated by the Council to be in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". Also these sites are far from schools and shops therefore not suitable for the proposed change of use.

Richard Parrish  
Archbishop Tenison's School  
Object DM43.4 502  
I am writing on behalf of the school and its Governors to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502.
The ground for my objections is: both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b, with Policy SP7.2 and the protection of the green grid or with 6.15 Strategic Objective 10 relating to the green grid.

Miss P Jones  
Object DM43.4 502  
I most strongly object to the use of either the locations planned as Gypsy/travellers sites as they are both in green belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation interest. The Government clearly states that "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the green belt are inappropriate development."

Mr T A Braim  
Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 502  
Why do Gypsies and Travellers have preferential treatment with regard to having sites where public transport accessibility is not an issue disregarding government guidance. Likewise over privacy.
This site will require access to Coombe Road at a staggered junction which is congested at the best of times and a nightmare in the morning and evening peaks.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2626/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs A Little</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>This is inappropriate development in the green belt; there are no local amenities for mothers and young children - primary schools, local shops, doctors surgeries. There is a need for infrastructure improvements, road access and schools. There are not enough local amenities. It is highly likely the proposals will have an adverse effect on local businesses. The area is listed as having special character (the Borough Character Appraisal 2015) and the proposals are not sensitive to this.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Marin Little</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>The proposed site is not suitable for the proposed development; it is not close to any amenities such as schools, shops, medical services. It would create a significant road hazard and greatly increased traffic. It would be inappropriate use of green belt. There are many more suitable sites for the proposed development. There is a complete lack of local infrastructure, funds and acceptance by local ratepayers and tax payers. Probable hostility between local residents and inhabitants of the proposed site. There is a lack of local amenities, adverse effect on local residents and businesses. Inappropriate use of green belt land; negative impact on local environment, flora and fauna.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:

- Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site 661;
- Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site 502;
- Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane, site 755;

as all three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites', published by the Government in August, states very clearly that 'Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development'.

The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the 'Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers'. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of 'extensive political consultation'. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria.

Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be 6. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mrs Krystyna Joanna  
Object Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane is on the Green Belt. 

Not in line with Government Planning policy on the Green Belt. 

- Government Planning Policy with regards to traveller sites wants to ensure that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development. 

- The proposal to create a permanent traveller site on land designated as Green Belt land is contrary to Policy E of the Planning Policy 

"Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. There are no very special circumstances. The preferred approach is not deliverable. To be considered deliverable, the sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now and we do not believe that the Assessment and selection of the sites for Gypsy and Travellers undertaken was credible. 

Plan makers have not considered the time it will take to commence development on site, need for infrastructure improvements - roads. 

There is basis for challenging the way in which this potential site has been selected. 

1. Para 3.1. Green Belt sites included for review of eligible sites "to ensure that all locations for a site considered" but at the same time "Exclusion of sites in Croydon Metropolitan Centre and within District Centres and Strategic Industrial Locations and Conservation Areas due to viability, deliverability and impact on heritage considerations". Is this even handed? 

4. Para 4.1 sets out the criteria and weightings. As indicated above, Green Belt with no built form is given a weighting (-10) which, though high, is not very significant given that there are 29 or 30 criteria and can easily be outweighed by other factors that are less significant in policy terms. 

Furthermore, Coombe Nurseries has been weighted -5 for green belt, in recognition of the fact that (in the assessors view) such structures as they are can be converted to traveller use (if the buildings had to be demolished, on a green field site, this would have attracted -5). 

1. SP2.7 on the Council's proposals to deliver 39 additional gypsy and traveller sites indicates that land will be allocated in accordance with the proposals, but that any ADDITIONAL sites that are not so allocated should meet some stated criteria, including good access to local shops and essential services and good transport
access; these seem to be the criteria that were excluded from the proposed allocation, suggesting that any alternative proposals would need to meet stiffer criteria. Is this fair and even handed? The basis of the criteria weightings are unclear.

- The national planning policy framework makes it clear that unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the “very special circumstances” justifying inappropriate development on a site within a green belt.
- The local character description is clearly at odds with the proposal.
- The justification acknowledges the green belt issue, though insufficiently, but relies on the fact that there are existing structures. These are not in fact substantial – being glass houses, and could be said to be at least environmentally consistent with the green belt. But there is no very special circumstance justification proposed as required by planning policies.
- Approving the proposal would set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to be subject to similar development. It is not in the community’s interests to allow the erosion of the green spaces surrounding the community and we object to the impact this site could have on the environment and wildlife.

In light of these issues, it is not appropriate simply to weight Green Belt as one of the many factors to be considered, but rather it presents an overarching policy objection that cannot be over-ridden in the way proposed. The decision-making process is contrary to Government guidance.
Buildign on green belt land does not meet the Strategic objectives. National Planning Policy for Traveller Sites states that temporary or permanent sites are inappropriate development in the green belt. There are no apparent exceptional circumstances that could warrant the proposed use of this green belt site. It would set an unwanted precedent.

The road infrastructure is inadequate to allow vans and caravans in and out of Coombe Farm and the road is currently a single track. There are no local services such as schools, shops or healthcare facilities and would therefore not serve the traveller community very well.

National policy dictates that in planning for traveller sites, the Council must relate the number of pitches or plots to the circumstances of the specific size and location of the site and the surrounding population's size and density. An area impact assessment must be considered by the Council as part of the planning process.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

The following should be added to SP2.7:

IT MUST BE ENTIRELY ACCEPTABLE IN RELATION TO ITS IMPACT ON NEARBY PUBLIC SPACES AND RESIDENTS AND BUSINESSES IN THE AREA

If this was included for site 502 it would be realised that the development was inappropriate due to the green belt and the lovely gardens of Coombe wood

These areas should be left to families and dog walkers to enjoy the open space

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object

I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr John Walsh
Object

DM43.4
502

Objects to all gypsy and traveller sites (as chairman of Campion Close Freeholders Limited and Parkland Management Company Limited which comprise 75 properties). The proposals conflict with Policy E 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' which states that temporary or permanent sites are inappropriate development in the green belt. What happens if the travelling community outgrow these sites? Surely the many industrial sites in the area would be more suitable, or Valley Park?

The proposals would clearly harm the green belt and would have a negative impact on the environment and wildlife in Coombe Wood, Shirley Hills and Lloyd Park some of which is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest and it would create a precedent for further erosion of our valuable local amenity.

Coombe Road and Coombe Lane are already very busy roads. These proposals would exacerbate this problem if significant road improvements were not carried out. These proposals would also exert pressure on local services that are already stretched. The junctions at Coombe Road, Oaks Road and Conduit Lane are already dangerous.

What social and economic benefits would a gypsy and travelling community bring to the existing local community in this area as well?

Mrs E Ballard
Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4
502

I object to the allocation of Coombe Farm as a Gypsy and Traveller site. In the past few years we have suffered from frightening results from unauthorised Travellers sites. Residents and local businesses alike have experienced unacceptable behaviour problems and unacceptable mess, with both physical and psychological effects. I urge you to see that these plans are not allowed.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I am writing to object to: The use of the following locations as traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane Site reference 661, Coombe Farm off Oaks Road Site reference 502, Pear Tree Farm Featherbed Lane 755. Because these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

To build so close to award winning gardens such as Coombe Gardens, Heathfield or a picturesque Wedding Venue such as Coombe Farm will be detrimental for the local businesses and residents. People from the wider area also enjoy these places. People travel from miles around - even by the coachload - to see these parks in Croydon. If they are built right up to with mobile homes or prefabs and other semi-permanent residences, they cannot fail to appear less attractive.

With regard to homes for Travellers, I do not wish to stereotype any group in our society, but first-hand experience of travellers staying recently in Sunken Lane has shown that they do not respect our precious green areas in the same way as the Heathfield and Ballards Farm residents do. I visited Sunken Lane after their recent departure and saw bathroom suites, mattresses and piles of other waste including dirty nappies and rubbish dumped in and around the beautifully Shirley Hills area. Pathways were blocked and cars could not turn in Sunken lane. Street lights in the local area had been broken so that this fly-tipping could not be filmed by CCTV. In the days before, my sons had felt intimidated when travelling home from school by the travellers' children and had to call me to collect them by car from the Coombe Rd tram stop. I took the time to visit the Layhams Farm Traveller site so that I could make an informed opinion and I was greeted by dogs off leads and groups of men gathering as soon as I approached. They did not trouble me, but I was made to feel decidedly unwelcome. Outside of the area some of the teenagers were crouched in the road and were smashing the top off bottles and then sprinkling glass in the road where cars were passing. If the sites proposed are to be like this, then I would be very unhappy if the plans were to go ahead.

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Traveller site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object

The assessment and selection of sites for Gypsy and Travellers has been unacceptably skewed in favour of remote and unsustainable sites. Premier Inn Hotel Ltd objectives to the proposed allocation for the following reasons:

- The site is located in Metropolitan Green Belt. The DCLG’s Planning Policy for Traveller Sites explicitly states in Policy E that traveller sites are inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It also notes that unmet need is not ‘very special circumstances’ that would justify development in the Green Belt. The proposed allocation is contrary to this policy.

- In the Council’s assessment it states that a score of -5 will be applied to sites with ‘built form’ in the Green Belt. However, in the assessment a score of +5 was applied to this site. The importance of this site’s Green Belt designation has been undervalued. The assessment draws a distinction between Green Belt sites with and without ‘built form’, a distinction that is not supported by national level policies and guidance. Other assessment criteria (e.g. Flood Zone) with -5 is given a “red” status whereas the -5 for Green Belt has only been given “amber”. This indicates that the Green Belt has not been properly taken into account.

- The Council notes that the Gypsy and Traveller population prefer to use their own transport and be located away from the existing residential community. This is contrary to CLG guidance.

- The changes proposed in the Housing and Planning Bill are also relevant as this indicates that Central Government is against Gypsy and Traveller housing being treated in isolation from the rest of the population, contrary to the approach adopted by Croydon Council in this assessment.

- The Council’s assessment under ‘privacy’ gives a score of +10 to sites away from existing residential areas and -10 for sites in existing residential areas. Other criteria only have a 5 point swing. The assessment therefore gives a strongly weighted preference to comparatively remote and unsustainable potential sites that are considered to be ‘private’ while underrating factors that are relevant to the sustainability of potential sites which is directly contrary to the NPPF.

In conclusion the proposed allocation is the result of a flawed assessment and should be removed from the Local Plan in favour of a more sustainable site.

Change

The site should not be allocated for a Gypsy and Traveller site and the assessment criteria should be reviewed.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Oaks Farm Receptions Ltd objects to the proposed allocation of Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane and Coombe Farm, Oaks Road as Gypsy and traveller sites for the following reasons.

Both sites are located within the Metropolitan Green Belt. Policy E of the DCLG’s Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (August 2015) explicitly states that traveller sites are inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It also notes that unmet need is not a "very special circumstance" that would justify development in the Green Belt. The proposed allocation is therefore contrary to this policy.

In conclusion, the proposed allocation of Coombe Farm, Oaks Road (site number 502) and Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane (site number 661) as Gypsy and traveller sites is the result of a flawed assessment process. These proposed allocations should be removed from the Local Plan and more sustainable sites that would not result in inappropriate development in the Green Belt should be sought.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I am writing to strongly object to the permanent Travellers site proposed on Coombe Farm. I have numerous points to raise with Croydon Council.

1. The access road to Coombe Farm is very narrow especially where it joins Oaks Road. Large mobile homes will not be able to gain access.
2. As far as I am aware it does not have main drainage. Who will pay for that improvement?
3. The land is constantly water logged even in the summer and prone to flooding. Who will pay for the necessary new drainage?
4. Oaks Road suffers from traffic jams due to the tram crossing and the difficulty in turning right onto Coombe Road. Caravans, trailers and lorries owned by Travellers will only add to this problem. Oaks Road has also had numerous accidents due to speeding hence the speed monitor on the road.
5. This area already has a serious problem (as in deed does all the borough) with Travellers. The area is surrounded by green fields and a permanent Travellers site will only be a magnet to other Travellers.
6. Will new street lighting be necessary and who will pay for it?
7. If the Travellers have access to the house at Coombe Farm, will you be contacting English Heritage for their approval for any work that is carried out on the property as it is listed.

Travellers have occupied the field in front of our house and adjacent to it on numerous occasions, causing many difficulties and anxiety to us. These are some of the many problems we have had to deal with;

1. Many times they have driven lorries and vans at speed through our front garden when a wedding was taking place. Young children are playing in this area as well as adults socialising. It is a very frightening experience for everyone and we cannot stop them.
2. I have been swore at and shouted at when I have been attempting to clear up the rubbish they have left in the lane before a wedding. This includes bags of faeces on the ground and hanging from the trees.
3. We have witnessed young adults and children from the Travellers site stealing scooters, tricycles and space hoppers belonging to our grandchildren from our garden. We have been told by the police not to approach them. The security man and the dog handler that was on the field told me they took our garden toys away with them.
4. On one occasion the travellers...
arrived in our lane at about 7.00 pm just as some guests at the wedding were leaving and others were arriving for the evening party. The Travellers completely blocked the lane and nobody could move. They were very abusive to the wedding guests. A neighbour called the police on our behalf. The police tried to stop the Travellers getting onto the field but eventually they had to let them enter the field because the Travellers were becoming very nasty. The residence of Oaks Road and Oaks Farm had to then live with these people next to their houses until the council removed them. We were very grateful for the council’s action, thank you.

We have taken the advice of the police and never approached the Travellers, they warned us how aggressive they can be. Our house is quite isolated and we have no street lighting. We are very concerned about having Travellers so close. We have always cooperated with the police and Croydon Council in trying to stop the Travellers occupying the fields in this area and have had to report numerous incidences of fly tipping.

A few years ago Croydon Council asked us to contribute £6,000, half the cost of a bund running along the length of our access road. This we agreed to do. Unfortunately a gate had to be put in the bund for access for grass cutting purposes. The Travellers have broken the lock on the gate twice and entered the field. The golf course have recently kept a trailer across the gate to stop the Travellers entering. They have also had many problems with the Travellers.

Having three Traveller’s sites so closely located in an area will form a strong and sometimes difficult Traveller and Gypsy community (Romany Gypsies dislike Travellers). This will change the demographics of the Heathfield Ward. As I have said before and cannot emphasise enough, it will attract other Travellers to the green fields in this ward. Croydon Council are storing up a serious problem for themselves, especially as some of the sites are privately owned. Has nobody learnt the lessons of Dale Farm in Essex! Do you really want this to happen in Heathfield in five or six years’ time.
1. Travellers/Gypsy Sites: We echo concerns raised by other voices in Croydon. While accepting the need for appropriate sites for travellers and gypsies we question the ability of the Council with current levels of resourcing to manage an increased number of sites effectively. With specific reference to Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm:

•The loss of the greenhouses at the Nurseries site (Conduit Lane) has potential significance for community, educational and employment opportunities
•This will be a new, permanent development on green belt land
•Access to and from the site on a dangerous section of Coombe Road will impact on traffic flow and road safety more generally.
•There is no overflow space if and when the site becomes full.
•There is likely impact on parking for access to Coombe Woods, the café and on the elderly visiting the area.
•As the two nearest schools (Royal Russell and Cedars Catholic) are independent, does this satisfy the criteria that travellers sites be located close to schools?
•Similarly, the criteria that sites should be close to shops will not be met.
•There is a real concern that there will be a negative impact on the environment of Coombe Woods, its biodiversity and the contamination of groundwater. Recent experience in Lloyd Park demonstrates a potentially serious problem with litter and lack of rubbish disposal. This leads to the Council having to collect rubbish and the creation of a hazardous refuse collection point.
The more specific site allocations represent a large reduction in the amount of designated and non-designated open space. While we acknowledge the need to build new homes and associated infrastructure such as schools, Croydon’s growing population also needs quality open spaces for all the human amenity and ecosystem services which they provide.

This area of Green Belt has not been removed from the Green Belt via the Review process; therefore it must be assumed that it continues to meet the criteria for designation. Therefore, the proposed Gypsy and Traveller Site would be considered to be an inappropriate development (following Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveler sites published by the Government in August 2015) and the Council must prove that exceptional circumstances exist. The fact that it may in part be brownfield is not a reason in itself to waive this protection. We request clarification that any proposed development at the site must ensure that they use the same footprint of the building and do not increase any height, ensuring that the openness of the Green Belt is not affected.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 502 (Coombe Farm)
object to the proposals for site 502 because it is contrary to Policy 7.17 of the London Plan which states that strong protection should be given to MOL and the site should not be redesignated without consultation with residents and local businesses. Policy 7.18 states that open spaces in London must be protected and their loss resisted as it will affect the urban attractiveness of the area and have both emotional and financial repercussions. It would impact on the social and sport activities in the area and have an adverse ecological impact. Also object on grounds that the sites are not within the required distance for both schooling and medical services.

Mr Terrence Pais

Object

I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 502 (Coombe Farm)

Ms Alison Lawton

Object

I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation as it would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. I believe that in your report you have miscalculated. The category where the mistake has been made is GB/MOL where an amber rating has been correctly given. The score for an amber is -5 and a +5 score has been incorrectly allocated. This reduces the overall score for the site by ten points from 26 to 16.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
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2666/01/002/DM43.4/O C Morley-Smith  
**Object**  
DM43.4 502  
Any permanent sites for those people need to be properly managed and controlled and the occupants seen to be paying their way as other residents in the borough are expected to.  
**Change**  
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

2668/01/001/DM43.4/O Mrs Zelda Levy  
**Object**  
DM43.4 502  
Site is in the Green Belt and is contrary to Government Policy. Croydon needs Green Belt more now than ever due to the number of high-rise blocks of flats. It is vital that the Green Belt is kept open, permanent and not subject to encroachment.  
**Change**  
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

2678/01/001/DM43.4/O Ms Lorna Bennett  
**Object**  
DM43.4 502  
I have witnessed numerous incidents where travellers have occupied parts of Lloyd Park and the surrounding area without permission. I have always felt intimidated and have been personally threatened and insulted by them. I believe it would be a gross misuse of our vital Green Belt and a detriment to the whole area for this site to be used for Gypsy and Traveller pitches.  
**Change**  
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

2679/01/005/DM43.4/O Mrs Valerie Mickelburgh  
**Object**  
DM43.4 502  
The land is green belt.  
**Change**  
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

2682/01/004/DM43.4/O Mr & Mrs Kellas  
**Object**  
DM43.4 502  
I would say to the Council Croydon is full and kindly leave our precious Shirley open spaces and attractive streets alone, we don't need an odd assortment of blocks of flats amongst the semi-detached and small detached properties here, or in similar Croydon suburbs. It would be an architectural disaster along the lines of the 1950s concrete jungle development of the centre of Croydon. And we don't have the infrastructure to cope with more people, or the roads to cope with the traffic we already have.  
**Change**  
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2683/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Iles</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>The idea of developing the areas in and around Oaks Road is completely nonsensical. Again, who ever thought up this one does not believe in green spaces or the considerable increase in the local road infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2695/01/003/DM43.4/C</td>
<td>Cllr Chris Wright</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2695/01/003/DM43.4/C</td>
<td>Cllr Chris Wright</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>There is concern that sites that have been identified as locations for gypsies and travellers are considered inappropriate in green belt and constitute a dangerous precedent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Beresford Walker

Object

DM43.4

5. Proposed Policy DM43 Creation of Gypsy Traveller sites at Coombe Farm, off Oakes Road, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, off Conduit Lane and Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage Featherbed Lane.

I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Such development is in breach of Policy Eat Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that ‘Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites now, and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough. If the number of Gypsy/Traveller sites really needs to be increased by this amount then a more appropriate location would be around the existing site at Purley Way. The positioning of a Gypsy/Traveller site adjacent to the car park for Coombe Woods, between the Chateau Restaurant and the Hotel/restaurant, would probably deter me from using any of these attractions.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I have restricted my objections to those plans that primarily affect the area of Shirley I which I live, but the same objections apply to other proposals in other parts of the borough.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - DM43.4</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Tahir</td>
<td>The site should remain as Green Belt and the access is not suitable for large vehicles and mobiles which would cause problems for drivers. It would have an adverse impact on local businesses and the Golf Club.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Thomas</td>
<td>It is inappropriate to site a Travellers site at this location. It is contrary to government policy as it is Green Belt.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We wish to object to the proposal Gypsy/Traveller site Ref 502 for the following reasons:

- Sustainability of the proposed site and the need for any such provision

The current proposals seem to have been produced in isolation from the other neighbouring Councils even though the above clearly indicated that nearby councils such as Sevenoaks, Tandridge and Bromley have a higher demand. Proposals in the Housing and Planning Bill 2015-16 are to remove the statutory requirement on local authorities to assess the specific accommodation needs of Gypsy and Travellers - the emphasis being that when authorities are carrying out a review of housing need that it considers the needs of all the people residing in or resorting to their district, without any references to Gypsies or Travellers.

We hope that the Council will consider the needs of our neighbours and local services and businesses as weighty as those of the Gypsy and Traveller people. There is a lot of opposition to the proposed sites from people currently residing in the district due to the threat of the Green Belt, increased traffic and increased pressure on local services.

The Assessment selection for the sites for Gypsies and Travellers scored lowly should have resulted in an acceptance that none of the sites are really particularly suitable and that the Council will need to liaise with other Councils if determined to make provision.

With regard to the sustainability of the sites, following on utilising the scoring assessment, we strongly object on a number of grounds:
- All sites lie within the Green Belt. This raises concerns about the impact on the Green Belt as a result of having to provide amenity blocks, communal facilities, safe play areas and areas for grazing horses.
- All three sites are unsuitable because they do not have good means to transport.
- Sites should have access to essential services including health and education facilities and access to local shops. None of the sites have good access to local schools (the nearest primary is over subscribed and the nearest post office is 1.7 miles away.)

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 502</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2703/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs McFeat</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2706/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Panagakis</td>
<td>Soundness - Consistent with National</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2707/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr A E Hodgson</td>
<td>The area now known as Lloyd Park, all this farmland was gifted to Croydon Council and very heavily covenanted by the Lloyd / Garwood family, so that the people of Croydon should FOREVER be able to use the area as a public open space purely for recreational purposes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr & Mrs Rowlands

We enclose our statement of objection to the local development plan which we believe would profoundly damage the Shirley area and the in particular, we wish to oppose the proposed use of the Coombe Farm site Ref 502 for use as a Gypsy/Traveller site.

We have unpleasant first-hand experience of living in close proximity to gatherings of travellers who have from time to time descended on fields neighbouring our house. We believe that allowing large groups to have sites in the same vicinity as the borough is proposing, is likely to bring similar problems. In the past the site of their encampment has been left strewn with litter and with evidence close to the mobile homes themselves, of illegal fly tipping. At times, we found the behaviours of some individuals to be intimidating.

The case against the broader proposals as well as against the choice of the traveller sites as is well made in the documents to which we have added our signatures.

There may in, the fullness of time be a case for making a legal objection to the Borough’s plans along the lines of a judicial review, given the apparent breach by the borough of regulations designated to protect the green belt in the interest of the wider community, a legal objection we believe would command the support of many local residents who share our views.

DM43.4
502

Mr Alan Magrath

It is a green belt area and national guidelines say that traveller sites in the green belt are inappropriate. Planning permission should not be available. The site is accessed via a narrow road. There is poor lighting and no pavements. The sheer number of caravans, cars, trucks and vans on one site would be an eyesore on the edge of one of the few large green spaces in central Croydon.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

DM43.4
502
Mrs & Mrs Rutherford

Object

DM43.4 502

I am writing to object to:

Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502 for use as a gypsy and traveller site, as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b; or with Policy E of "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites" published by Government in August which states "Traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development;"

Based upon the Scoring criteria Table 1, there are errors in the scoring in the policy designation assessment table under the GB/MOL. In view of the errors the following site should be considered:

16 - Heath Clark playing fields, Stafford Road Waddon
518 - Wandle Road surface car park, Wandle Road, Croydon Opportunity Area.
536 - Land of former Croydon Airport runway, south of Imperial Way, Waddon.
552 - Wandle Road surface car park, Wandle Road Croydon Opportunity Area.
632 - Land south of Threehalfpenny Woods, Kent Gateway, Bridle Way Addington.
767 - Cane Hill south part, Hollymeak Road, Portnalls Road, Coulsdon.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr Chris Hutchinson

Royal Russell School

Object

DM43.4

Page 5 Green Belt designation - the applicable scores are -10, -5 and +10. The proposed sites all scored +5. The applicable score should be -5. Page 6 Privacy - this attracts +10 or -10. A Green Belt/Open Land site will naturally provide greater privacy and so attracts +10, meaning the difference in score from a site with privacy to a site without privacy is 20 points - a sizable margin that impacts heavily on the ultimate score for each site. Page 6 Social Deprivation - why should these areas be treated differently and therefore attract a score of +10? Page 6 Access to Services - attracts a neutral 0 score. Why is access to essential services scored as unimportant? Page 6 Employment and community use re-provision - only scores -5. This should be higher if businesses need to relocate or cease to exist with loss of employment, such as the Wedding venue business on the Oaks Farm land. Page 7 Brownfield vs Greenfield site - The criteria indicated that a brownfield site that has a building that can be converted for traveller use will score 0, whilst a Greenfield site with the same criteria score +5. Please explain.

DM43.4

502

GBMOL should be 5, not +5 as shown. Site access should be -2 and not +5. Building on Greenfield site should be 0 not +5. Overall score should be 4 not 26. Not including the +10 for Privacy.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr A Zelisko

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

502

I object to the use of this site as a Gypsy and Traveller site. The site is in Green Belt and contrary to national policy (as it is inappropriate development in the Green Belt).

The immediate area is sparsely populated. National guidelines state the such sites should not overwhelm the nearest settlements and this site would.

The Croydon GTANA 2013 specifies that proposed sites for Gypsies and Travellers should have good access to local shops. There are none near this site.

The Croydon GTANA 2013 specifies that proposed sites for Gypsies and Travellers should be near bus routes and have good access to roads, with a specific reference to larger vehicles. This site is a considerable distance from public transport and access is down a single track road.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr Alan Weeks  
Object DM43.4 502  
Can you please advise me as to why there is only one notification in Shirley Avenue CR0 8SQ (approx. 150 houses) regarding the above plans.  
Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr & Mrs Reynolds  
Object DM43.4 502  
Please don’t tell us that we have to put up with gypsy/traveller sites at places that are used by locals and non local residents for pleasure. I have a caravan on a site not too far from Croydon and when travellers are allowed to come on to the site they always leave the site in a dreadful state and ruin the enjoyment for everyone on site.  
Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr David Martin  
Object DM43.4 502  
I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.  
Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr Eric Green  
Object DM43.4 502  
Coombe Farm, Oaks Road is such a ridiculous suggestion it beggars belief. This site is totally unsuited for use as a traveller site, and would utterly destroy one of the few remaining pleasant places in Croydon.  
Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr D Lawton  
Object DM43.4 502  
I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation as it would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. I believe that in your report you have miscalculated. The category where the mistake has been made is GB/MOL where an amber rating has been correctly given. The score for an amber is -5 and a +5 score has been incorrectly allocated. This reduces the overall score for the site by ten points from 26 to 16.  
Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>DM43.4 502</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2739/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Colin Campbell</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I am writing go object to:</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2740/01/010/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Ian K White</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the use of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road Ref: 502 as a gypsy/traveller site.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2742/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr E Tilly</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Object to the travellers sites all 3 are in Green Belt and one next to a site of Nature Conservation. This would constitute inappropriate development and is against Govt guidance. None of these sites have easy access to Local infrastructure</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residential development is a viable option. We already have very limited housing. However, this should never be built over green belt.

Existing infrastructure just cannot cope with additional population in Croydon:
1. We have to wait for at least 4-5 days to get appointment at doctors – many times we do not get appointment.
2. We have to wait for at least 15 minutes to get a turn to play swing/slide for my son in any local park. The parks are so crowded during summer. Already children are getting very less exercise. If 40 families come over with more than 80 children then it would be extremely overcrowded.
3. There are not enough schools in the area. We should build more schools.
4. There is very limited green space in Croydon. Government policy states that you cannot build temporary or permanent sites on green belt. Putting the travellers site near green belt will endanger the
5. Increased traffic due to a planned school and travellers sites will cause traffic chaos.
6. We need green belts for good health of the citizens. Steps like these would encourage the encroachment of green belts.

Existing infrastructure just cannot cope with additional population in Croydon:
1. Travellers should be encouraged to settle down and mix with the local community. So permanent housing is better. This way they will avoid the stigma too. Their future generations can have better life. But this needs to be planned properly on the brown field sites.
2. We have to wait for at least 4-5 days to get appointment at doctors – many times we do not get appointment.
3. We have to wait for at least 15 minutes to get a turn to play swing/slide for my son in any local park. The parks are so crowded during summer. Already children are getting very less exercise. If 40 families come over with more than 80 children then it would be extremely overcrowded.
4. There are not enough schools in the area. We should build more schools.
5. There is very limited green space in Croydon. Government policy states that you cannot build temporary or permanent sites on green belt. Putting the travellers site near green belt will endanger the
6. Conduit Lane is a no drive through zone. Increased traffic due to a planned school and travellers sites will cause traffic chaos.

7. We need green belts for good health of the citizens. Steps like these would encourage the encroachment of green belts.

Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane) and 502 (Coombe Farm) - If a site is Green Belt/MOL-built form then it is marked as (Amber/Orange), which means a score of -5. "+5" has been used which increases the rating by 10 points. Error in calculating site access for 661: There are cars parked on that road and the entrance is through a very busy main road. The site cannot have a rating of +9. It should be -2. That is a difference of 7 rating points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2754/01/003/DM43.4/O | Mr P Sowan | Object  
DM43.4  
502  
The impact of the site proposals on Oaks Lane and Lloyd Park appears incompatible with peoples expectations of enjoyment of open areas and would detract from the attractiveness of the open space. It would also cause traffic and access problems in the area. The proposed use as a travellers site would be incompatible with the "green link" status and a mobile home site of any kind is unacceptable. Also concern regarding the costs of the facilities that would be necessary and fly-tipping at this site is already a problem. |
| 2765/01/001/DM43.4/O | Pauline Newbold | Object  
DM43.4  
502  
The site is in the green belt. Coombe Farm is a listed historic property with covenants on its usage. It is classified as an Archaeological Priority Zone and part of the site is designated a Site of Nature Conservation Importance. Increased vehicle movements to the site would be hazardous because of the present restricted and unsuitable road access to the site, the junction with Oaks Road being near the tram link crossing and the increased congestion at Oaks Road/Coombe Lane/Coombe Road that already exists at peak hours. There appear to be inadequate safe walking routes to schools/shops/medical facilities and limited pavement facilities in Oaks Road. 15-20 pitches could overwhelm the existing community. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|           |        | Change  
The site is in private ownership and the landowners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsies and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use. |

02 September 2016  
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Ms Janet McQuade

Object

DM43.4

502

The Council acknowledges that the site is in the Green Belt (and one of the sites borders an SNCI). The Planning Policy for Traveller Sites states that traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The Council's approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Brownfield or industrial land should have been proposed not green belt. Why does the Council need to quadruple the number of sites for gypsy and travellers? The intention may be to do away with illegal encampments but may instead mean the area becomes a hub for travellers.

Why were no appropriate sites suggested for Coulsdon? Opening sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm will be detrimental to the amenity of adjoining owners. There is a lack of amenities close as hand. There are insufficient local infrastructure to accommodate the plans.

Other sites the council should reconsider instead of both Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm are: Expand existing permanent sites in Latham's Way off Beddington Farm Road, Heath Clark playing fields, Stafford Rd, Waddon, Timebridge Community Centre, Field Way, New Addington, Land adjacent to 103 Goodenough Way, Old Coulsdon, Wandle Road, car park, Wandle Rd, Croydon, Land of former Croydon Airport, runway, south of Imperial Way, Waddon, Land adjacent to Ashburton playing fields at rear of 2-88 Coleridge Rd, Addiscombe, By Pavilion Playing Fields, Purley Way, Land south Of Threashalpenny Woods, Kent Gate Way, Bridle Way, Land west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, Elmside, Addington, Cane Hill-south part, Hollymeak Road, Portivals Rd, Coulsdon.

Cllr Susan Winborn

London Borough of Croydon

Object

DM43.4

502

Objects to this site being used for a gypsy and traveller site. It would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 502

All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

DM43.4 502

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4

All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross-party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
we are absolutely devastated to find out this shocking plan that the council has in mind for Shirley.

I strongly suggest that you consider elsewhere like New Addington and alongside Addington Road (mad mile), open space in Purley Way after the Colonnades, alongside Mitcham Road and Beddington Lane and the list goes and let remain the beautiful green belt area in Shirley unspoiled and untouched, so that we, our children and the elders that arrange walking groups can all continue to benefit from walking, jogging around the area of Oaks Road, Coombe Park, Oaks Farm leading to Lloyd's Park and up to the Royal Garden restaurant, I healing fresh air rather than the pollution from the cars like we see so many people jogging on the pavement else where.

We wish to object to the above referenced Sites which are being considered for the location of two gypsy and traveller locations on the following grounds:

• Inappropriate use of Green Belt Land
• Sites that are located on the Green Belt, considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and against Government Policy ("Planning policy for Traveller Sites", DCLG, August 2015)
• Selection of Proposed Sites should have a bias towards Brownfield or Industrial Land not Green Belt
• Detrimental to the Amenities of Adjoining Owners
• Lack of relevant Amenities close at hand
• Insufficient Local Infrastructure to accommodate the plans

However, we do wish to be seen as entirely negative and would ask that consideration be given to locating at the Existing Permanent Gypsy Site in Lathams Way off Beddington Farm Road.

Objections summarised as:
- Inappropriate use of Green Belt land
- Lack of relevant amenities close to had
- adverse effect on neighbouring businesses and leisure amenities
- site has a more appropriate use for a school
Object: Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 502

All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of extensive political consultation. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -6. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Gypsy and Traveller Sites:
- Detrimental to the amenities of adjoining owners.
- Inappropriate use of green belt land.
- Sites that are located on green belt, considered to be inappropriate development for traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and against Government Policy (*Planning policy for Traveller Sites* DCLG, August 2015).
- Lack of relevant amenities close to hand.
- Insufficient Local Infrastructure to accommodate plans.
- Selection of proposed Site should have bias towards brownfield or industrial land not green belt.
- Why are two sites in very close proximity to one another being proposed.
- Imbalance across the borough with all sites being proposed in the south of Croydon.
- Why not expand the existing permanent gypsy site in Lathams Way off Beddington Farm Road.
- If one has to select one of the proposed sites, the preference’s for Perar Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane.

Other sites that the Council should reconsider instead of both Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm are the following.
- 16 Heath Clark playing fields, Stafford Road Waddon
- 120 Timebridge Community Centre Field Way, New Addington
- 518 Land adjacent to 103 Goodenough Way, The Admirals Walk, Old Coulsdon
- 622 Wandle Road surface car park, Wandle Road, Croydon Opportunity Area
- 536 Land of farmer Croydon Airport runway, south of imperial way, Waddon
- 592 Land adjacent to Ashburton playing fields at rear of 2.88 Croydon Road, Addiscombe
- 533 By Pavillion playing fields Purley Way, Waddon
- 632 Land south of Threehalfpenny Woods, Kent Gate Way, Birdle Way, Addington
- 636 Land west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, Elmside, Addington
- 767 Cane Hill south part, Hollywood Road/Pontins Road, Coulsdon

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
The Whitgift Foundation

Object     DM43.4
Number     502

Our client is deeply concerned about the manner in which the Evidence for the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options) ("the Evidence Paper") has been prepared. The scoring assessment applied by the Council is reductionist and disregards the wider context (for example outreach programme and supports) within which sites sit. Without that appreciation we do not consider that the Evidence Paper adequately supports the Council's Strategic Objectives. The Evidence Paper identifies four "absolutes" for the initial screening. In the absence of any justification and evidence backed rationale behind these "absolutes" we are left to conclude that there is none. A site should be available and deliverable. We consider that to be an appropriate test in determining the suitability of a site for development. There is little explanation as to what factors the Council has taken into account for the purposes of scoring whether a site is deliverable—particularly over a 20 year period. No consideration is given to the use of CPO powers where a site for example could be suitable save for possible issues over deliverability. The use of CPO powers should be a consideration for the purposes of deliverability. The existence of contamination cannot be considered in isolation. There does not appear to be any detailed analysis of whether the extent of contamination on some sites, and the costs of remediating that contamination, would render that site undeliverable in the plan period. A failure to acknowledge the need for sites to be located in proximity of public transport services does not support the principle of sustainable development.

In adopting this flawed approach the Council have failed to consider the contribution that smaller sites could make in delivering sites for gypsy and traveller communities. As a result, the initial screening process was biased towards larger sites despite the evidence base showing that such sites were not supported by the gypsy and traveller community. As a result, the Council has not properly considered if there are exceptional circumstances which justify any of the identified Green Belt sites coming forward for use as traveller sites.

For the reasons detailed above, the assessment proceeded from an erroneous starting point of "absolute" requirements that were neither justified nor supported by the Council's existing gypsy and traveller policy. The Evidence Paper is lacking in detail, and the scoring criteria overly simplistic. As a result, the evidence put forward by the Council is lacking in transparency and is an unsound base for policy making.

To ensure transparency in the planning process the same tests should be applied to allocated sites and windfall sites.

For the reasons detailed above, the site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for sites 661 and 502. If a site is Green Belt/MOL built form then it is marked Amber/Orange which means a score of -5 but +5 has been used which increase rating by 10 points.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object Soundness - Justified  
DM43.4  502

All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. I am concerned that all three sites are also some considerable walking distance away from GP practices, shops, schools, public transport and other local services which would be contrary to the Council's Health and Wellbeing Strategy.

Furthermore, Policy E of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites', published by the Government in August, states very clearly that Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the 'Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers'. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of 'extensive political consultation'. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

Change  The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Residential development is a viable option. We already have very limited housing. However, this should never be built over green belt.

Existing infrastructure just cannot cope with additional population in Croydon:
1. We have to wait for at least 4-5 days to get appointment at doctors – many times we do not get appointment
2. We have to wait for at least 15 minutes to get a turn to play swings/slides for my son in any local park. The parks are so crowded during summer. Already children are getting very less exercise. If 40 families come over with more than 80 children then it would be extremely over crowded.
3. There are not enough schools in the area. We should build more schools
4. There is very limited green space in Croydon. Government policy states that you cannot build temporary or permanent sites on green belt. Putting the travellers site near green belt will endanger the
5. Increased traffic due to a planned school and travellers sites will cause traffic chaos.
6. We need green belts for good health of the citizens. Steps like these would encourage the encroachment of green belts.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Incorrect calculation in selection criteria for site 661 and 502. If site is in Green Belt/MOL built form than it is marked as Amber/Orange which means a score of -5. +5 has been used which increase the rating by 10 points.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
This would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1996). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross-party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be 0. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2857/01/009/DM43.4/C Philip Talmage</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>Two proposed gypsy/traveller sites in Shirley (reference numbers 502 and 661 on Changes to the Policies Map). Both sites are inappropriately located in the Metropolitan Green Belt and poorly located for public services, and there is in any case no need for such an increase in the number of such sites within the Borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2863/01/002/DM43.4/O Jonathan Nicholas</td>
<td>Object DM43.4 502</td>
<td>In appropriate development in the green belt. There is an imbalance in the borough with both this site and 502 being in the south of the borough and in close proximity to each other. Such proposals should be located on industrial/brownfield land rather than greenbelt. As an alternative, expand Laytham's Way. Other sites considered suitable are: 552, 536, 120 - which would not interfere with the little green space we have left.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Objections raised to the use of the following locations as Gypsy/Traveller sites:-

Coombe Farm off Oaks Road Reference Number 502
Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane Reference Number 661

1. How has the London Borough of Croydon involved its Community in the planning of the Coombe Farm and Coombe Gardens Traveller Sites? What opportunity was given by Croydon Council for the local residents to put forward their own ideas and participate in the development of the Sites? See - London Borough of Croydon's “Statement of Community Involvement - October 2012” (https://www.croydon.gov.uk/sites/default/files/articles/downloads/involvement-oct12.pdf) Reference 2.11 & 2.12 these Guidance Rules have been ignored

2. There is no pavement access to either of the proposed sites therefore most travel to and from these sites to local amenities, (shops/doctors/schools) would be by vehicle – causing even greater traffic problems to the Coombe and Oaks Road junction.

3. Residents call for an independent (i.e non-Labour) lead enquiry into the full extent Mr Ansari (owner of Coombe Farm, a proposed traveller site) has been able to influence Croydon Council specifically & Labour Government more broadly through financial bribery?

Quote from the 2011 Localism Act;
"Through the Localism Act, the Government has abolished the Standards Board regime. Instead, local authorities will draw up their own codes, and it will become a criminal offence for councillors to deliberately withhold or misrepresent a financial interest."

Tens of thousands of pounds including cash equivalent goods & services (e.g. supply of rent-free premises for council business, travel expenses and campaign donations) have been disclosed but misrepresented as donations. These are in fact bribes in return for planning leniency (see press article.)


4. In the restrictive Covenants for Coombe Farm, (defined as 80 Oaks Road) which are for "the Settlers and their successors in title" stated "No part of the Property shall be used for any offensive noisy, dangerous
pursuit or occupation or for any purpose which shall or may grow to be in any way a nuisance damage grievance or annoyance to neighbouring properties or the neighbourhood.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2867/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>J Giles</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2868/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Graham Lyon</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am objecting to the following sites being considered as suitable as Permanent Sites for the above use:
1) Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane, Coombe Road, South Croydon, CR0 5RQ
2) Coombe Farm, Oaks Road, Shirley, CR0 5HL

I am very disturbed to hear of the proposed plans for providing permanent sites for the Gypsy and Traveller people on these sites, mainly on the grounds that they are both much valued and appreciated areas of natural beauty and relatively unspoiled areas on Green Belt land, which I consider is an inappropriate use of such areas. I understand, in fact, that it is against stated Government Policy (“Planning policy for Traveller Sites” DCLG, August 2015).

My objections are based on the following grounds:
1) Neither of these areas has local amenities nearby, or sufficient infrastructure to accommodate these plans.
2) Whilst it is a statutory duty of local councils to provide these sites for travelling people - and, indeed, an act of common humanity that such groups are catered for - it is usual that brownfield or industrial land is used, rather than open greenbelt land.
3) Both these sites are comparatively close to each other; certainly both are in residential areas in South Croydon, thus impacting on amenities of local owners, and arousing local feelings. What is the reason behind this decision?
4) Can the existing permanent site in Latham's Way off Beddington Farm Road be expanded?

There are many sites which might be considered which are not near areas of heavy residential occupancy, in the Waddon playing fields areas, for example. The Pear Tree Farm area in Featherbed Lane is also more suitable.
Incorrect calculation for site 502 and 661. If the site is Green Belt/MOL built form then it is marked Amber / Orange which means a score of -5. +5 has been used which increases the rating by 10 points.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 502

1. Mis-calculation of the score while selecting the site:

If a site is Green Belt/MOL-built form then it is marked as (Amber/Orange), which means a score of -5

If you go to page number 9 of the document in the link below, you can find that Amber is scored as +5 as opposed to -5.


Please, check the other scores too before finalising this site. This site is clearly not suitable for building on the gypsy site as it is a green belt site.

2. I will be objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

“Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Existing infrastructure just cannot cope with additional population in Croydon:

1. Travellers should be encouraged to settle down and mix with the local community. So permanent housing is better. This way they will avoid the stigma too. Their future generations can have better life. But this needs to be planned properly on the brown field sites.

2. We have to wait for at least 4-5 days to get appointment at doctors – many times we do not get appointment

3. We have to wait for at least 15 minutes to get a turn to play swing/mats for my son in any local park. The parks are so crowded during summer. Already children are getting very less exercise. If 40 families come over with more than 80
children then it would be extremely overcrowded.

4. There are not enough schools in the area. We should build more schools.

5. There is very limited green space in Croydon. Government policy states that you cannot build temporary or permanent sites on green belt. Putting the travellers site near green belt will endanger the

6. Increased traffic due to a planned school and travellers sites will cause traffic chaos.

7. We need green belts for good health of the citizens. Steps like these would encourage the encroachment of green belts.
Residential development is a viable option. We already have very limited housing. However, this should never be built over green belt.

Existing infrastructure just cannot cope with additional population in Croydon:
1. We have to wait for at least 4-5 days to get appointment at doctors – many times we do not get appointment
2. We have to wait for at least 15 minutes to get a turn to play swing/slide for my son in any local park. The parks are so crowded during summer. Already children are getting very less exercise. If 40 families come over with more than 80 children then it would be extremely over crowded.
3. There are not enough schools in the area. We should build more schools.
4. There is very limited green space in Croydon. Government policy states that you cannot build temporary or permanent sites on green belt. Putting the travellers site near green belt will endanger the environment.
5. Increased traffic due to a planned school and travellers sites will cause traffic chaos.
6. We need green belts for good health of the citizens. Steps like these would encourage the encroachment of green belts.

Existing infrastructure just cannot cope with additional population in Croydon:
1. Travellers should be encouraged to settle down and mix with the local community. So permanent housing is better. This way they will avoid the stigma too. Their future generations can have better life. But this needs to be planned properly on the brown field sites.
2. We have to wait for at least 4-5 days to get appointment at doctors – many times we do not get appointment
3. We have to wait for at least 15 minutes to get a turn to play swing/slide for my son in any local park. The parks are so crowded during summer. Already children are getting very less exercise. If 40 families come over with more than 80 children then it would be extremely over crowded.
4. There are not enough schools in the area. We should build more schools.
5. There is very limited green space in Croydon. Government policy states that you cannot build temporary or permanent sites on green belt. Putting the travellers site near green belt will endanger the environment.

Build a residential estate instead of a travellers site

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
6. Conduit lane is a no drive through zone. Increased traffic due to a planned school and travellers sites will cause traffic chaos. 

7. We need green belts for good health of the citizens. Steps like these would encourage the encroachment of green belts. 

Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane) and 502 (Coombe Farm) - If a site is Green Belt/MOL- built form then it is marked as (Amber/Orange), which means a score of -5. -5 has been used which increases the rating by 10 points. Error in calculating site access for 661: There are cars parked on that road and the entrance is through a very busy main road. The site cannot have a rating of +5. It should be -2. That is a difference of 7 rating points.
Object

DM43.4

502

I am writing to register my strongest possible objection to the following proposals for gypsy and travellers sites:
- Coombe Farm, Oaks Road - Reference 502
- Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane - Reference 661

I am an active member of Shirley Park Golf Club and vividly recall the hugely, disruptive presence of the gypsies when they trespassed onto Coombe Farm a couple of years ago. There is sometimes a romantic notion that gypsy/traveller community wish to get on with their lives and not affect the urban population wherever they pitch up; I am afraid that the bare facts reveal that this to be a complete fallacy and the stark reality is far from this rosy, TV documentary image.

It will come as no surprise to you to learn that there were numerous, illegal intrusions onto the golf course during their uninvited stay. Sadly but I am afraid rather predictably, these incursions resulted (of course) in a plethora of petty thefts and incidents of mindless damage to the course as well as necessitating a "marshalling" of parts of the course. These factors coupled with the constant verbal abuse made play almost untenable and at one point, a decision was made to close certain parts of the course until they were finally evicted.

I think it is important to stress that this is not just about my personal feelings, there are more far reaching implications. Certainly if their presence was to be made permanent, there is no way I personally would continue my membership at Shirley Park Golf Club and I can safely say a lot of the members feel the same way.

It was apparent what the inhabitants of Croydon thought when another historic business at Reeves Corner was attached not so long ago. Shirley Park Gold Club has been a valuable part of our community for over 100 years providing enjoyment for thousands of members, safe recreation for youngsters and of course valuable employment for many, not to mention the thousands of pounds raised to help Croydon Opportunities.

The success of the club also allowed the purchase of the land in recent history and it often surprises my guests to see this beautiful side of Croydon. Surely it is not right to jeopardise this great part of our local heritage in attempting to temporarily resolve this long running problem?

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
hard to shake off its previous image - please do not put this progress at risk.

2879/01/006/DM43.4/C Mr Roy Saunders

Object

DM43.4

502

object to the development of travellers site at Coombe Farm as it is protected land as Green Belt and against government Guidance

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

2882/01/002/DM43.4/O Ms Nina Maund

Object

DM43.4

502

The use of Coombe Farm as a gypsy and traveller site is inappropriate as it is a green belt site and will change the character of the area.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

2884/01/002/DM43.4/O Mr David Brown

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

502

It is inappropriate to identify Coombe Farm off Oaks Road and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane as suitable sites for gypsy/traveller pitches as they are both in Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Importance.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

2885/01/002/DM43.4/O Mrs Anita Pepper

Object

DM43.4

502

I do not want a Gypsy site on the land either.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

2886/01/003/DM43.4/O Mrs Dianne Haile

Object

DM43.4

502

I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road. site reference 502 as gypsy and traveller site because it would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 502</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2888/01/002/DM43.4/0</td>
<td>Mr. Phillip Moore</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site as a gypsy and traveller site as it would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore there is an incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for this site. If a site is Green Belt/MOL - built form then it is marked as (Amber/Orange), which means a score of &quot;-5&quot;. A score of &quot;+5&quot; has been used which increases the rating by 10 points.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2889/01/003/DM43.4/0</td>
<td>Mr. Peter Lawton</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the use of this site for a gypsy and traveller site.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object DM43.4 502

- Detrimental to the Amenities of Adjoining Owners
- Inappropriate use of Green Belt Land. Sites that are located on the Green Belt, considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and against Government Policy (Planning policy for Traveller Sites, DCLG, August 2015)
- Lack of relevant Amenities close at hand
- Insufficient Local Infrastructure to accommodate the plans
- Selection of Proposed Sites should have a bias towards Brownfield or Industrial Land not Green Belt
- Why are the Two Sites in very close proximity to one another being proposed and also imbalance across borough with all Sites being Proposed in the South of Croydon.
- Expansion of the Existing Permanent Gypsy Site in Lathams Way off Beddington Farm Road would be better solution
- If one has to select one of the proposed sites, the Preference is for Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane as this would have least impact of the 3 sites.

Other Sites that the Council should reconsider instead of both Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm are the following. Just because a number of the following Sites are GB/MOL (Green Belt / Metropolitan Open Land) this should not preclude them, as it’s not impossible to have them redesignated:

16 - Heath Clark playing fields, Stafford Road, Waddon
120 - Timebridge Community Centre, Field Way, New Addington
518 - Land adjacent to 103 Goodenough Way, The Admirals Walk, Old Coulsdon
522 - Wandle Road surface car park, Wandle Road, Croydon Opportunity Area
536 - Land of former Croydon Airport runway, south of Imperial Way, Waddon
552 - Land adjacent to Ashburton playing fields at rear of 2-88 Coleridge Road, Addiscombe
553 - By Pavilion Playing Fields, Purley Way, Waddon
632 - Land south of Threehalfpenny Woods, Kent Gate Way, Bridle Way, Addington

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003/01/01</td>
<td>Mr Adam Tierney</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>As one of the caterers working at Oaks Farm the proposed location for the travellers's site will have a huge impact on Oaks Farm wedding venue and also Tierneys Caterers. We as caterers have experienced difficulties with the travellers when we have worked at Oaks Farm when they parked illegally, blocking access to the lane when moving their caravans as well as stolen items from the venue while we worked on site. I have seen the impact of when travellers are parked illegally at the top of Oaks Farm. They have not had one booking and it has had a dreadful effect on their future booking which has also had a knock on with Tierneys Caterers as the other caterers that work there.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/02/08</td>
<td>Ms Debbie Butler</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites: Coombe Far off Oaks Road reference number 502; and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661;</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am a member of Shirley Park Gold Club as well as a local resident. I am writing to register my objection to the following proposed gypsy and traveller sites:

- Coombe Farm, Oaks Road, Ref 502
- Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane, Ref 661

The policies laid out on the Mayor of London, policy 7.7 clearly states that the mayor's office fully supports the protection of Metropolitan Open Land, and states that the strongest protection should be given to London MOL and inappropriate development refused. The policy lays out what needs to be established to designate an area as MOL but does not make it clear how Council can de-designate an area.

I therefore object to any permanent traveller site being constructed on MOL, especially if the area is simply going to be de-designated without any consultation with local residents and businesses.

I object strongly that Croydon Council can de-designate MOL or Green Belt to suit their needs to accommodate a permanent pitch. I cannot see any justification to change the designation, and intrude into the lives of the residents of Oaks Road and surrounding area. This will massively affect the attractiveness of the area and both the emotional and financial reprehensive for many lives.

Policy 7.18 relating to protection of open spaces clearly states that open spaces within London must be protected and any loss must be resisted. I cannot believe the Council would want to go against both of these policies laid down by London assembly.

The Shirley Gold Club provides sport and social activities for up to 700 members in the local vicinity, and also provides an important ecological node in the area. The proposed sites for gypsies and travelers has come as a shock to everyone in its area, as come out of the recent press coverage and attendance at the consultation meetings.

The history of unauthorised "pitches" in this area over the past four years has left a bitter resentment, especially in view of the residual mess and littering, and crime that is accompanied their trespass. This does not change when the site is official.

On each occasion that gypsies/travellers have been in the area, the residents have been affected by verbal and physical abuse. We also have a junior section at the club and children play in the comp during holiday period, as well as weekends. They are often unaccompanied and parents need to...
know that they are in a safe environment. The proposed sites would change that. Please consider other sites.

2913/01/001/DM43.4/O Wendy Wilkinson
Object
I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller site as it would constitute inappropriate development I the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. An incorrect calculation has been applied to the selection criteria for the site. If a site is Green Belt/MOL built form then it is marked as (Amber/Orange), which means a score of +5. A score of +5 has been used which increases the rating by 10 points.

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

2914/01/003/DM43.4/C Ms Nitin Sambre
DM43.4
502
The Travellers sites should be mixed with the existing population and there is insufficient infrastructure at this site. The loss of green space is unacceptable.

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

2915/01/002/DM43.4/O Victoria McVeat
Shirley Park Golf Club
Object
I am deeply concerned about the proposed site. As a ladies golf member of the golf club, I use the area by the 4th hole regularly to play and practice golf. I remember the last time when the traveller/Gypsies were in the area and the mess and debris that were constantly left behind on the Shirley Park golf course. It was extremely upsetting and worrying. There was a lot of unacceptable behaviour like verbal abuse and bikes being used on the golf course. Additionally, as a mother of two teenage boys who are very fond of this sport and play golf I felt extremely uncomfortable and unsafe for them to use that area for practice or golf play when the gypsies and travellers were in the area last time. I would certainly discourage them to use that area in the future if these plans go ahead due to possible aggressive behaviour and verbal abuse from the gypsies and travellers. I agree with the Club that Policy 7.18 relating to Protection of Open Spaces clearly states that open spaces in London must be protected and any loss resisted. I am shocked that Croydon Council would want to go against both of these policies laid down by the London Assembly.

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I write concerning Croydon Council’s proposals contained in the consultation document of the Croydon Local Plan that includes the re-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in Shirley and specifically within the confines of Shirley Oaks. I consider these proposals and others listed above to be inappropriate as they would significantly change the character of the area in which I have lived all 61 years of my life and I wish to add my voice to those already expressing concerns and objections about these proposals.

I strongly object to the proposal to re-designate Metropolitan Open Land to facilitate the building of new homes on land in Shirley Oaks and the provision of temporary or permanent traveller/gypsy sites in areas that are acknowledged by the Council to be in the green belt at Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries in Conduit Lane.

These proposals are totally out of keeping with the character of the area which predominantly comprise owner-occupied semi and detached homes. Surely areas considered to be brownfield sites are more appropriate than the unacceptable use of Metropolitan Open Land?

The proposals affecting the area surrounding Shirley Library are also of concern as this would adversely change the character of the area and potentially result in the establishment of additional unsightly car-parking sites on the south side of Wickham Road, similar to that at the front of the Shirley Medical Centre at 370 Wickham Road.
Elizabeth Wood

Object

The planning authorities should protect local amenity and environment. These do the opposite and will do nothing but harm. Travellers sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The scale of such sites should not dominate the nearest settled community whose interest should be respected. These sites will have a highly deleterious effect on four neighbouring businesses namely The Chateau restaurant, Coach House Café in Coombe Wood, the Premier Inn and the Oaks Farm wedding venue. The numbers being housed will be greater than the occupants already living along Oaks Road. In addition there is no nearby public transport, schooling, doctors surgery or shops. There are not even pavements on both sides of the roads involved. They will be damaging to the nearby site of Nature Conservation Interest. The Council has already spent time and money ensuring that travellers could not park in Conduit Lane. They must have had a reason for so doing. If travellers are allowed on the nursery site there is will make Coombe Wood and gardens a no go area. Why is the Council intending to destroy one of the few remaining unspoilt green spaces in the borough. There must be less sensitive sites within the Croydon boundary where the establishment of a base for the travelling and gypsy communities would be more harmonious.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr Michael R Brookbank

Object

The proposals are contrary to the Government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites and are totally unsuitable for the location for large numbers of families with young children.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I object to the use to the site for a gypsy and traveller site. All three sites are in the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of Planning for Traveller Sites published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the borough, it would be more appropriate to expand existing sites eg. Off the Purley Way. None of these sites have easy access to local schools, healthcare, retail and other amenities. The vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the junction is likely to create additional road hazards.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I object to the use of the site as a gypsy and traveller site. The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I object to the use of the site for a gypsy and traveller site as it would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. There are incorrect calculations in the selection criteria for the site. If a site is Green Belt/MOL - built form then it is marked as (Amber/Orange), which means a score of -5. A score of +5 has been used which increases the rating by 10 points.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

The proposed travellers sites are not suitable and are in breach of the Government's statement that "sites are inappropriate in the Green Belt". These sites are also some distance from public services.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
| Object | DM43.4 502 | This would be in breach of the Government's intentions - Policy E of the Planning Policies for Traveller Sites and that travellers sites (temporary or permanent) are inappropriate development in the greenbelt. This would drain Council resources and reflect on the quality of other services that the Council is required to provide. It would result in the reduction in free and easy access that is currently enjoyed by many. The proposal would have a considerable effect on the business at Oaks Farm and the Premier Travel Inn, forcing these to close potentially. Extending the site at Purley Way should be considered. | Change | The site is in private ownership and the landowners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use. |
We note that there is a recent (2013) report ‘Croydon Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment 2013 Final Report November 2013 which indicates that there is extra need for gypsy and traveller sites in the period 2015-2036. Coombe Farm is not appropriate because under the criteria in paragraph 4.15 of the Strategic Policies (Partial Review), the site is not well-located or accessible to health facilities, shops or education. It is noted that these criteria have been amended from the earlier draft to omit access via public transport-the site is over 15 minutes walk from a tram or bus stop and this would also have made the site unacceptable. The site at Coombe Farm is not deliverable since it is already being developed using existing buildings being converted for housing in accordance with Development Control advice from Croydon Council planning department in 2009. The use of this site for a gypsy and traveller site would not be sustainable because of its distance from existing facilities such as health, shops and education-see why it is not appropriate. The site is in a Green Belt and use of the site for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation contravenes the advice given in ‘Planning Policy for Travellers 2014’. With regard to need, the Housing and Planning Bill 2015 advises that assessment for accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers would no longer be separate from assessment for other housing needs. Accessibility to public facilities is a consideration when assessing new housing locations. The site has been identified because of an increase in the requirement for gypsy and traveller sites in the 2013 Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment along with two other sites The site is accessible only by a narrow lane and is not suitable for long wheel-base vehicles such as are used by travellers including fairs or circuses including lorries and caravans. To introduce gypsy pitches with portable/moveable vehicles whilst retaining the main existing buildings is likely to reduce the openness of the Green Belt. Like residential uses, gypsy sites need amenity space, parking and refuse storage and this will add to the development of the site. Such development within Green Belts is opposed in ‘Planning Policy for Travellers 2014’. The site was formerly used as a residential school. Some of the existing buildings are of local historical interest including the

Coombe Farm should not be allocated as a Gypsy and Traveller site as it is not deliverable.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Traveller site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Locally Listed farmhouse. This was extended in the early 20th century to create a larger residential property which takes up a significant part of the building complex. Parts of the complex of buildings on the site are in use by the landowner and parts as housing. The Plan expects that there will be no additional housing on the site. There are at present around 15 units occupied at Coombe Farm and there are also current planning applications for conversions of other buildings to housing being developed in response to planning advice from Development Control, Croydon in 2009 (pre-application advice). By 2021-6 when this site is expected by the Plan to be in use as a traveller site the landowner would expect that most of the existing buildings will be converted with areas allocated around the dwellings for amenity space and parking. Planning Policy for Travellers 2014 advises that gypsy and traveller sites should not be located within the Green Belt. Just because there is at present a need for increased number of gypsy and traveller sites, there is no justification for using this site. Such allocations would no longer be appropriate at all if the Housing and Planning Bill comes into force which advises councils not to allocate separately for accommodation for gypsies and travellers. The site is not suitable for traveller vehicles because of access via narrow lanes. With regard to ruling out the alternative option for residential, the length of journey to reach facilities in central Croydon applies just as much to gypsies as other residents so should not be used to rule out other types of residents than gypsies.
Object

DM43.4

502

The LB Croydon Cabinet determined on 21.9.15 that consultation be carried out in relation to, inter alia, the prospective allocation of sites for a proposed development plan document.

Amongst the prospective allocations is Coombe Farm, a complex of buildings with a large curtilage off Oaks Road in that part of the borough that the Council defines as Shirley. The document puts forward as the 'Proposed use' a Gypsy and Traveller site and as an 'Alternative option for site' - 'Residential development (conversion or new build)' n.b. the objector owns 'Coombe Farm' but not the adjoining former quarry also forming part of site 502. In a letter of 10.9.15 to the owner the Council states that the 'Reasons for preferred use' are:

- Although the site is in the Green Belt, it already has built form and following an extensive sequential search for sites in the urban area, the site is proposed for a gypsy and traveller site for 15-20 pitches, including a stopping place, with its built form accommodated within the area of the original buildings.

The proposed use as a Gypsy and Traveller Site is objected to on policy and site specific grounds as set out below.

The National Planning Policy Framework does not directly cover the issue. Policy is now set out in the DCLG document 'Planning policy for traveller sites' of August 2015 which planning authorities must take account of in both plan preparation and planning application decisions.

The document contains all national policy pertinent to the proposed site allocation, specifically the following:

16. Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. London-wide policy on gypsy and traveller accommodation is set out in policy 3.8 of the Mayor’s adopted Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance, which is directed towards both Local Development Frameworks and planning decisions, viz.:

3.8 (i) The accommodation requirements of gypsies and travellers (including travelling showpeople) are identified and addressed in line with national policy, in coordination with neighbouring boroughs and districts as appropriate.

The Croydon Local Plan (adopted 2013) sets out policy for Gypsies and Travellers in strategic policy SP2.7 which reads:

- The site should be allocated for residential instead of a Gypsy and Traveller site.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
The Council will seek to deliver ten additional Gypsy and Travellers pitches in the borough by 2021 to meet the needs of Croydon’s Gypsy and Traveller community. This will be achieved by allocating land for Gypsy and Traveller pitches in the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals DPD. Proposals for sites should meet the following criteria:

a. Should be available and deliverable.
b. Should have good access to essential services including health and education facilities and access to local shops; and
c. Have good means of access from roads and be near bus routes and other transport nodes; and
d. Not be located in areas of high flood risk (Flood Risk Zone 3); and
e. Should not have unacceptable adverse impact on the biodiversity of the borough.

In parallel with the consultation on the ‘Detailed Policies’ prospective DPD, LB Croydon have consulted on a partial review of strategic policies set out in the Local Plan (2013). Policy SP2.7 is now proposed to read:

The Council will seek to deliver 39 additional Gypsy and Traveller pitches in the borough by 2036 to meet the need of Croydon’s Gypsy and Traveller community. Land is allocated for Gypsy and Traveller pitches in the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals DPD. Any proposals for additional sites that are not allocated should meet the following criteria: The criteria are as per those in the existing Local Plan except that c. now reads:

c. Have good means of access from roads.

i.e. reference to public transport is deleted.

The site is a large complex of buildings with a mainly soft surfaced curtilage. Any site would need to be to the rear of the complex in terms of space. The complex has a number of planning permissions for the use of constituent parts as dwelling units (Class C3). All the site falls within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The site allocation is contrary to national policy as set out in the government’s ‘Planning policy for traveller sites’ (August 2015) and the requirement of the London Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance that gypsy and traveller accommodation requirements be addressed in line with national policy in proposing the use of a site within the Metropolitan Green Belt. Coombe Farm does not meet the locational criteria set out in Croydon Local Plan policy SP2.7 as existing and as proposed to be amended in that:

(a) The owner does not wish to make
the premises available for this purpose.
(b) For a London location it is remote from essential services with the nearest retail premises, GP surgery and state primary school all being nearly 2 km distant.
(c) With regard to public transport accessibility the score for Coombe Farm on Transport for London’s ‘PTAL’ assessment is 0. This is the worst possible accessibility rating. It is noted that the supporting text for policy SP2.7 as proposed to be altered reads: ‘In addition Gypsy and Traveller sites need good access to the road network as they often need to move larger vehicles as part of their livelihood and way of life. It is submitted that the single lane approach road to Coombe Farm with blind corners and no footpath would be both unsuitable and unsafe for such larger vehicles. (d)(e) Whilst the site is not in a high flood risk zone the former quarry which is included as part of site 502 is a Site of Nature Conservation Importance as defined by the Council in its proposals map.
In its letter of 10.9.15 the Council include as ‘Reasons for Preferred Use’ that ‘. . . already has built form.’ . . . It is not considered that this should be seen as an advantage for a use that primarily requires an open site. In view of the policy and site specific issue set out above the Council is requested to delete ‘Gypsy and Traveller site’ as the Proposed Use for site 502 and instate ‘Residential (conversion or new build)’ as the Alternative option for the site as the Proposed Use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2950/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>A Lemel</td>
<td>09/10/2015</td>
<td>Object DM43.4 502 I object to the proposed gypsy and traveller site at Coombe Farm, Oaks Road. Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2963/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>K Brown</td>
<td>09/10/2015</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 502 Objection to Gypsy and Traveller site at Coombe Farm based on past experiences of unauthorised encampments. Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposal to develop Coombe Farm, Oak Road as a residential development for a Gypsy and travelers site does not fall within the Strategic Objectives because:

Objective 2: This development will not Foster an environment where existing enterprise can prosper, but will reduce enterprise.

Objective 4: This development will not reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation. It will not reduce unemployment, improve skills and education and improve environmental conditions, the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Objective 5: This development is not high quality and will not enhance the borough’s natural environment but will reduce the natural environment by turning a farm into a travelers housing site.

Objective 7: This development will reduce the area as a safe, healthy and cohesive community.

Objective 10: This development will reduce the quality and accessibility of green space and nature.

This proposed development of a travelers site within the Shirley area is not within keeping of the current development within this area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with out housing in the area.

Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area. Building a travelers site will increase noise levels, and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area.

Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. This development would diminish the striking view of the area of Addington Hills and Coombe Farm area.

this development will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The development will change the outlook and community within the Shirley area and future generations will suffer because of this.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
2965/01/003/DM43.4/O Janet Nightingale Object DM43.4 502 Recently I have heard of Croydon Council’s plans for the borough over the next 20 years. I object strongly to the plans for permanent sites for travellers using green belt land. My experience of travellers is not a happy one. In my opinion they are inclined to make a dreadful mess of any area they occupy. They then move on leaving the Council to clear up after them. If they have to be provided with another permanent site please choose somewhere which is not green belt.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

2971/01/001/DM43.4/O Janet Borawia Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 502 Having learnt from reading frightening stories regarding the above, I now understand they are true. I hope you are going to listen to the people of Croydon in that this is not what we want

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

2974/01/009/DM43.4/O Jane Bowden Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 502 4) I understand that the Council has identified two sites in Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites, Coombe Farm off Oaks Road and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane. (Reference numbers 502 & 661). Both of these are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. Both Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries are some distance from public services and traveller sites here risk damaging some of the Borough’s precious green spaces. Extending sites in areas such as the one at Purley Way would be more suitable.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

2980/01/001/DM43.4/O Jean Ure Object DM43.4 502 I am writing to register the strongest protest possible to any plans for allowing a traveller site at Coombe Farm. If there is a need for more traveller sites in the borough then please do let them be located in brownfield rather than greenfield sites. The latter are so very precious to the people of Croydon and it would be utterly shameful were parts of them to be eroded.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2999/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr John Harris</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 1. The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; Policy E of &quot;Planning Policy for Traveller Sites&quot;, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr John Helen</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I will be objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of &quot;Planning Policy for Traveller Sites&quot;, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is). Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Jonathan Bone

Object Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 502 

I am writing to you to express my objection to potential travellers sites in two locations and to detail the reasons why.

Coombe Farm (ref no 502)

1. The land is green belt land and therefore deemed inappropriate by national guidelines.
2. The site has no existing structures so will adversely impact the natural environment which is green belt protected.
3. The site is borders Lloyd Park nature reserve. Any overspill and increase in residents will have an adverse affect on the reserve.
4. There is no safe walking route to local amenities. Oaks lane has no pavement and the site is accessed via a busy single track lane (used by the sports ground and aggregate lorries)
5. The site will totally overwhelm near by residents on Coombe Lane and Oaks Road.
6. The site has no amenities near by - shops, post offices etc and none within walking distance which means a massive increase in traffic to the local area.

Both locations would massively change the local characteristics of an area of Croydon which is largely unspoilt by development in an area with very few local amenities.

Schooling is already an issue in this area. In my view Green Belt land is specifically created to prevent urbanisation of green spaces which this proposal amounts to.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr Jonathan Butcher

Object Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 502 

I object in the strongest possible terms to the Council’s proposal to build gypsy/traveller sites in Croydon!!!

We absolutely mustn’t lose our green open spaces. We have too few of them as it is.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Justified
3010/01/001/DM43.4/O Mr Joseph Rowe Object Soundness -
GYPSY/TRAVELLER SITES.
The Council has identified three location within 3 miles of our home for gypsy/traveller sites:
1. Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, which is proposed as a site for 15-20 pitches (pages 449-450, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 502).
I object to this proposal on the following grounds:
1.1 Coombe Farm is Green Belt Land. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly that “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. Previous use does not mitigate against this policy.
1.2 The proximity of this site to the Coombe Lodge Nurseries site, also proposed, would mean a total of up to 45 pitches on 2 sites within a very small area of the Borough.
1.3 The Croydon Local Plan paragraph 4.19 refers to the need for good access to roads, stating that Gypsies and Travellers “often need to move larger vehicles as part of their livelihood and way of life”. Coombe Road junctions with Oaks Road and Conduit Lane are busy and potentially hazardous intersections and are unsuitable for increased, safe movement and maneuvering of larger vehicles, especially entering and exiting these sites.
Oaks Road itself is a narrow rural road with a number of blind bends and an adjacent bridal way, making it unsuitable for large vehicles. The Local Plan has not taken sufficient account of the potential increased danger for motorists and pedestrians, horses and riders.
All of the three preferred sites are on Green Belt Land, contrary to Government Policy.
The close proximity of the proposed sites to one another has not been taken into account. All three sites are proposed for a small area in the South of the Borough where there seems to be a successful site in Purley Way which could be expanded.
None of the three sites proposed has Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
good access to schools, shops and other services. The consequent need for private transport goes against environment and climate initiatives. Government Guidelines ask that local planning authorities policies ensure that children can attend school on a regular basis. These three sites are well away from schools, particularly primary schools, and clearly do not reflect the aims of the Guidelines or facilitate regular school attendance.

The proposed plan does not take into account the need for good access to roads. The Croydon Local Plan paragraph 4.19 refers to the need for good access to roads. "Oaks Road, Coombe Road, Conduit Lane and Featherbed Lane are unsuitable for safe increased movement and manoeuvring of larger vehicles, especially entering and exiting these sites.

The number of Gypsy/Traveller sites in Croydon is to increase from 1 to 4, when our recent experience locally is of travellers responsible for damage, parking illegally, leaving piles of rubbish behind when they are moved on and even engaged in firearms confrontation with the police.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Object Description</th>
<th>Change Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3014/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Julie Lowe</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites - coombe farm off oaks Rd ref 502 - coombe lodge nurseries off conduit lane ref 661</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3015/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Julie Valentine</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the travellers permanent site in Shirley.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am emailing to object to the proposed travellers sites to be built in the Shirley/Croydon/South Croydon areas.

There are numerous reasons for my objections.
1. This is green belt land and should remain as such. We are lucky to have local green areas that I have enjoyed since my childhood and that my own family benefit from now. Green belt land is not appropriate for any form of dwelling. We need to preserve what we have in the area. Travellers are know to leave there mess around them, this is not what we want on our green belt land
2. There are insufficient local school places as it is. The children (including my own) in the area will be adversely affected by an influx of travellers who normally have large extended families
3. Travellers cause trouble, my son was set upon by a group of travellers in Lloyd's Park recently and we now avoid this area when the travellers are illegally staying there. I would like my children to be able to use the local parks and amenities without worrying about people who regularly do not abide by the law of the land.
4. My elderly parents who live in the Shirley Hills area are vulnerable victims of crime as it is. Do we really need to add to their fears by making the area less safe with a group of people who generally have no regard for the law?
5. Crime rates in Croydon are up as it is. Do we really need more residents for our already overstretched police force to watch over?
6. And finally, the clue is in the name. These people are travellers and therefore travel, meaning there is no need for a permanent dwelling for them.

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
The Council are proposing in total 45 permanent pitches. Both sites are some distance from public services. They should consider instead the expanding the existing site off the Purley Way. More importantly the Council are in breach of policy E Planning Policy for Traveller Sites published by the Government in August which clearly states: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". The Council have acknowledged both sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. The access to both Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge is totally inadequate and the additional traffic would be dangerous. The Council should be promoting the interests of the people of Croydon who they are supposed to represent.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Policy DM43, reference Site 502 Coombe Farm reference Site 661 Coombe Lodge Nurseries and reference Site 755 Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage. I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and Coombe Farm is on a site of an Archaeological Priority Zone and contains an area of Nature Conservation Importance. Such development is in breach of Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that "Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites by 2017 and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:-

• Coombe Farm off Oaks Road
  Reference Number 502
• Coombe Lodge Nurseries off
  Conduit Lane Reference Number 661

1. What is the Council's rationale for proposing Traveller Sites on the very land previous illegal incursions, fly tipping and theft have occurred?
2. On what basis has Croydon’s Labour Council rejected the prior Conservative Council’s proposal for a second Traveller site located on the Purley Way, Roundshaw Open Space?
3. Under the Freedom of Information Act, what is the total tax payer investment, Croydon Council has made over the last 5 years securing land, preventing and obstructing illegal incursions?
4. Council representatives are referring to Travellers (universally) as "homeless Croydon residents", yet they are of 'no fixed abode', not registered (with the Council) as homeless, not on the electoral role - let alone contributing to the use of local amenities. Please clarify the difference between a resident and a visitor.
5. Council representatives advise 'It is the right of a Traveller to live in a caravan and is part of their ethnic rights'. Has an Equality Impact Assessment (Government Planning Document) been conducted to ensure the rights of the settled community are not being infringed? (It is understood this is a requirement where there has been significant local opposition as in the case of Croydon).
6. Please confirm a) whether a traveller must reside within a given schools catchment area to attend and b) whether the proposed sites were selected with this in mind?
7. Actual number of fixed plots revealed during (verbal) consultation was 49, not 39 as documented, indicating likely expansion of a site(s) at later date. (See Dale Farm, Essex for unauthorised ‘sprawl’ beyond designated site)

https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dale_Farm
8. What consideration has the Council given to the societal impact of introducing both Romany Gypsy & Irish Travellers (known to feud) into two locations just 500m apart on local community?
9. Government planning for Gypsies & Travellers determined Green Belt Development as 'inappropriate'. (See Dale Farm, Essex eviction from Green Belt land). What is the rationale for Croydon looking at Green Belt vs. Brown Field?

9. Two of proposed sites in same Ward and the third in adjoining area, all held as Conservative seats with 2 locations less than 500m apart. Why are there no suitable locations in Labour held seats?

10. Croydon Council acknowledge these proposals will not prevent further illegal incursions, fly tipping, damage and theft at the resident/taxpayer’s expense, suggesting more fixed sites are not the solution. The current investments in the prevention of illegal incursions are working to protect the settled community.

11. Coombe Farm itself is a listed building, yet at least one other site was dropped from the shortlist for this very reason. Why has the evaluation criteria for site selection not been applied in an unbiased, uniform manner?

12. Note Basildon Council ended up “leasing” land they did not already own to accommodate travellers. If Croydon Council is blocked from using its own land for the purpose of a Traveller Site, can it be confirmed that the Council will uphold Green Belt planning restrictions and decline private planning applications for the same? (Ref: Dr A Ansari). Https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dale_Farm

13. ‘Homeless’ travellers evicted from Dale Farm returned to their “homes” in Ireland. (4:08 onwards. Http://youtu.be/T253zUOfXe0). What is Croydon Council’s position where a “homeless Traveller” owns property? What investigation is carried out into the legitimacy of their homeless claim?

14. Taxpayers in Essex ended up funding Traveller-only amenities such as a community hall. What societal integration studies have been completed for homes, schools & businesses adjoining Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries? Precedent suggests their needs are greater than just plots.

15. Why was Coombe Farm initially considered for both Residential and Traveller site prior to Consultation only to be changed to Traveller-only during Consultation?

16. The proposed Coombe Farm Traveller site is:-
   a) Green Belt
   b) A listed Historic Property
   c) Is within ‘panoramic view’ of
Addington Hills

d) Has a number of covenants on its usage dating back to the 1950's set by the Garwood Family.

17. On what basis has Croydon Council classified these Travellers as homeless? They have the means to purchase their own vehicles, mobile accommodation and plant machinery. Why wouldn't they register with Croydon Council as homeless (if that is indeed their claim) and be 'Means Tested'?

17 a) Council representatives (at the recent Consultation) deemed adding Travellers to the homeless register as 'unworkable' as the housing waiting list was too long. Does this mean Travellers are being given PRIORITY over legitimate refugees and asylum seekers who are already on the housing register?

18. The introduction of a single traveller site (let alone two) in the Green Belt Heathfield Ward will increase localised fly tipping (please see area immediately surrounding the existing fixed site. Latham's Way, CROYDON) and will therefore be in direct contravention to the NATURE CONSERVATION STRATEGY, Supplementary Planning Guidance No.5 for Croydon on the following grounds;

4.41 "Five of the 8 Golf Courses in Croydon (note; Shirley Park adjoins Oaks Farm) contain all or parts of Metropolitan Nature Conservation Importance in Croydon."

4.63 Problems - cites 'pollution' as one of 7 key problems identified which particularly apply to Croydon".

5.5 "66 sites in Croydon are outlined in the Ecology Handbook 32 'Nature Conservation Guidelines for London' (updated in 1994). The criteria have been used by the Council to protect sites from harmful development through the operation of its own town planning powers".

6.9 Have the "Wardens for the green belt" (a role within the Council) a) been appointed in line with this policy and b) been consulted on the potential impact?

6.6 - Access [to the countryside] for All: "There are physiological & physical barriers [...] putting the countryside beyond the reach of some residents [...] They may be restricted by [list of reasons] or of not feeling safe in the countryside." The presence of at least one Traveller Site will be viewed as a deterrent with valid concerns for the personal safety of local residents and visitors alike.

- What consideration has been given to existing Tree Preservation Orders, Ancient Woodland (Oaks) & Hedgerows both on the Coombe Farm site as well as the shared access? Development of the access
The new policy will help ensure that traveller sites are developed in appropriate places and not on Green Belt land, ensure planning policy is clear and consistent and thus can operate most effectively in a new localist planning system, and reduce community tensions that can arise over perceptions that planning policy for traveller sites is more lenient than planning policy for housing for settled communities. *Perception upheld.*

20a. During local Consultation, Counsellors advised repeatedly of a Central Government target being applied to Croydon for Traveller Sites. Excerpt from the 'Planning policyholders traveller’s sites - Equality Impact Assessment'
suggests otherwise; “Now the Localism Act is in place, the current policy points to a process that no longer exists for setting future traveller site targets because the Act removed the framework for regional strategies meaning that no further regional strategies can be created. The Government will expect local authorities to plan for strategic matters, including accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers, in their Local Plans. Through this process, local authorities will have to justify their policies for traveller site provision using robust evidence that will be tested at the Local Plan examination. However, it will not be clear if the circulars were left in place that local authorities should set targets as part of their decisions on the right level of provision in their areas. The new policy, therefore, asks local authorities to set targets based on their evidence of need and to bring forward land in their plans to meet these.”

21. Under the Freedom of Information Act, please supply burglary, assault, theft, disturbances, illegal incursion, damage and arrest data relating specifically to Travellers of ‘No Fixed’ address immediately following their arrival up to and including their eviction.

22. Under the Freedom of Information Act, please provide all Environmental Agency data relating to the treatment of Travellers waste during and after their occupation and specifically how a fixed site (providing basic sanitation & waste collection) will prevent illegally fly tipped builders waste all over the surrounding area. (See reports for all prior illegal incursions).

23. How has the London Borough of Croydon involved its Community in the planning of the Coombe Farm and Coombe Gardens Traveller Sites? What opportunity was given by Croydon Council for the local residents to put forward their own ideas and participate in the development of the Sites? See - London Borough of Croydon’s “Statement of Community Involvement - October 2012” (https://www.croydon.gov.uk/sites/default/files/articles/downloads/involvement-oct12.pdf). Reference 2.11 & 2.12 - these Guidance Rules have been ignored.

24. In the restrictive Covenants for Coombe Farm, (defined as 80 Oaks Road) which are for “the Settlers and their successors in title” states “No part of the Property shall be used for any offensive noisy, dangerous pursuit or occupation or for any purpose which shall or may be grow to be in any way a nuisance damage grievance or annoyance to
neighbouring properties or the neighbourhood."
25. There is no pavement access to either of the proposed sites therefore most travel to and from these sites to local amenities, (shops/schools) would be by vehicle – causing even greater traffic problems to the Coombe and Oaks Road junction.
26. If these proposals go ahead will the council be offering blight compensation to all of the affected local residents and businesses?
27. Will the travellers be required to pay council tax, rent, gas, electricity, and all other charges?
I look forward to your response to the above questions/concerns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30/28/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Nick Barnes</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 755 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Road. None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/29/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Paul Newton</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but will be objecting to building on precious open space. Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.</td>
<td>If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough – which I would question – they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a resident whose property borders Addington Hills, I am extremely concerned regarding the resulting detrimental effect of Travellers’ sites in the area. There have been numerous illegal instances of Travellers siting themselves in the car park adjacent to the restaurant in Addington Hills and also in the Sunken road making access to the tram stop impossible by vehicle as the entire road was filled with broken glass and metal and concrete. Building rubbish, human detritus, and many hazardous waste materials have been dumped in and around the Hills. If permanent legal sites are provided as proposed, the surrounding areas will be the perfect place for limitless dumping, it will in fact be their idea of utopia. I strongly object to this proposal and the inappropriate use of the Green Belt. This beautiful area of Croydon will be seriously changed for the worse for the many people who enjoy its unusual, unspoilt beauty.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I am writing to protest in the strongest possible terms to the council’s proposals to create traveller sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm. As you know, both of these sites are in the green belt, with one of them bordering a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, states: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the green belt are inappropriate development.”

The areas of Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm are not wasteland nor are they brownfield sites (as the current travellers’ encampment in Croydon is). Instead, they are precious stretches of green land well loved and well used by Croydon residents for sports and leisure activities. They also provide an invaluable habitat for wildlife, including deer.

I urge you to reconsider and will be continuing to campaign against this entirely inappropriate plan which will result in the desecration of two of Croydon’s valuable green spaces.
Object  | DM43.4  | The use of Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane as a location for a Gypsy/traveller site. (reference number 755) You know that this is Greenbelt Land. It is not appropriate for a site to be placed there particularly as you are planning to make it larger in the future and it has no local amenities close by. No transport links and already there is a vast amount of fly tipping in that area, which is a site of natural beauty with a scout camp nearby. Look at Policy E of planning policy for traveller sites published by the government which states that it is inappropriate development whether temporary or permanent. In all these areas I believe you should be looking at brownfield sites and not greenbelt, let us protect the little greenbelt we have left. | Change  | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use. |

Object  | DM43.4  | I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation. | Change  | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use. |

Object  | DM43.4  | I should like to protest against the site chosen for gypsy camps and a new secondary school being built on green belt. There must be better sites for them as we must protect our green belt sites. | Change  | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use. |

Object  | DM43.4  | I object to all the proposals set out for new housing and travellers sites in Shirley. I feel it will ruin the area by taking up all the open spaces. | Change  | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use. |
3074/01/002/DM43.4/O Christine Younger

Object DM43.4 502

I strongly object to this council building or using Green Belt sites for this and any other purpose. Also high rise flats will upset the balance of the areas. I do accept that we need more housing but these should be built on existing empty or land filled sites.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

3077/01/002/DM43.4/O Mrs Clare Gardner

Object DM43.4 502

I am writing to object to:

1. The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: -
   • Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661;
   • Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502;
   • Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference 756

   as all these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

   (If the Council really needs to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough they should look elsewhere, e.g., off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

3080/01/008/DM43.4/O Mr John Mills

Object DM43.4 502

I object to the use of the site for a gypsy and traveller site. As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". The Council's approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham).

Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Edward Hart</td>
<td>I wish to comment on the proposals for the following sites: Coombe Farm, Oaks Road (site 002) The proposal to use these sites as gypsy and traveller sites does not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Both sites are clearly isolated in respect of local services. Site 661 would be unsuitable for school use as it lacks access to nearby public transport. Both sites would be acceptable for residential development and at least would not be worse served than some other housing in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Elaine Grant</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site reference 661 – Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane and site reference 502 Coombe Farm off Oaks Road – both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. The proposals conflict with policy. The proposed options does not achieve sustainable development as it will compromise the ability of future generations to sustain Green Belt and SSSI as well as Nature Conservation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object  

Third, the Council has identified two locations on the edge of Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane. I am objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in Green Belt areas and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in Croydon why don’t you develop the existing site at Purley Way? It is an outrage that our diminishing open spaces will be turned into Gypsy sites. Coombe Road is so busy. It is the link between Shirley, Addington, Forestdale, Warlingham, Selsdon etc to central Croydon. It does not need more traffic nor traveller sites on it.

We should be trying to diminish traveller sites, not expanding them or using valuable land to allow for more. I currently work for the Department of Work and Pensions and we have a joint operation with the local Police and other local service providers in our area to reduce fraud, rubbish, fly tipping etc. and we have been very successful in concentrating our efforts on gypsy areas. I do not want that for Croydon, especially near to where I live and where my children will grow up. My husband has his own house removals business and the amount of families he is moving from Croydon to other areas in England is astonishing. These families are not just moving down the road to the next borough to get away from Croydon, they are moving to Sussex, Devon and Scotland etc. I wonder why??

Change  

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Coombe Farm is on the Green Belt.

Summary:
Not in line with Government planning policy on the Green Belt

Detail:
• Government planning policy with regards to traveller sites wants to ensure that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development.

• The proposal to create a permanent traveller site on land designated as Green Belt land is contrary to Policy E of the Planning Policy: “Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances.” There are no very special circumstances in this case.

• The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the “very special circumstances” justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt.

• The local character description is clearly at odds with the proposal.

• The justification acknowledges the Green Belt issue, though insufficiently, but relies on the fact that there are existing structures. These are not in fact substantial – being glasshouses – and could be said to be at least environmentally consistent with the Green Belt. But there is no very special circumstance justification proposed as required by Planning Policies.

• Approving the proposal would set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to be subject to similar development. It is not in the community’s interests to allow the erosion of the green spaces surrounding the community and we object to the impact this site could have on the environment and wildlife.

In the light of these issues, it is not appropriate simply to weight Green Belt as one of many factors to be considered, but rather it presents an overarching policy objection that cannot be over-ridden in the way proposed.

The decision making process is contrary to Government guidance.

NO - To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now
and we do not believe that the assessment and selection of sites for Gypsy and Travellers undertaken was credible.

Plan makers have not considered the time it will take to commence development on site:

- Need for infrastructure improvements (roads), need for local amenities improvement (primary school, doctor)
- Plan makers have not considered the time and necessity to show due diligence in assessing the sites:
  - Need for an Environmental Impact Assessment (this would be a schedule 2 development having significant effects on the environment and needing an EIA)
  - Need for a Local Biodiversity Action plan to determine the sensitivity of the location
- Plan makers have not ensured that the process has credibility and acceptance; the bases for site criteria weightings are unclear.
- Plan makers will need to provide robust, up to date evidence to support the deliverability of sites, ensuring that their judgements on deliverability are clearly and transparently set out.
- Plan makers have not taken the cost and time needed to mitigate the impact of the development on the site: Croydon Council has already recognised in its Development Management Policies document that the Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) which borders the Coombe Lodge Nurseries Site, Coombe Wood (List of Historical Park and Gardens 2008) would be negatively impacted by the proposed development.

Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present, without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

The proposed development does not meet the needs of the present (see further info in section 3):

- Gypsies and Travellers needs are not addressed: not enough local amenities, sites are too big, unfit local roads.
- The proposed development does compromise the future of the local area.
- Government planning policy is to ensure local planning authorities have due regard to the protection of local amenities and the local environment.
- It is likely the proposals will have an adverse effect on local businesses.
- Coombe Wood is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) (List of...
Historical Park and Gardens 2008) and would be negatively impacted by the plans. Croydon Council has already recognised this in its Development Management Policies document.

- The Borough Character Appraisal of 2015, the local area is listed as having special character. The proposed development is not sensitive to, and does not respect, this.

- From the Croydon Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment 2013, Gypsies and Travellers living in the Croydon area prefer small family sized sites, with smaller sized sites having fewer inter-family tensions. The plans clearly go against this.

- The proposed plan does not take into account the need for good access to roads. The Croydon Local Plan paragraph 4.19 refers to the need for good access to roads, stating that Gypsies and Travellers “often need to move larger vehicles as part of their livelihood and way of life”, – this may be an assertion relevant to the assessment of sites and the narrowness of Coombe Lane. The proposed sites are not suitable for traveller vehicles.

- It is very important that the site has a safe entrance and exit. There are very strict Highway regulations about visibility at the entrance/exit to sites to ensure there is no danger of accidents. This links into the insufficient local infrastructure and we know how dangerous the junctions Coombe Road/ Oaks Road/ Conduit Lane can be. Both sites are accessed by single lane roads and the proposed plans do not take into consideration the potential extensive alterations needed to the local road network.

- It is Government policy / guideline to have new sites near existing development. The proposed plan does not take this into consideration. Is there not scope for extending existing sites in the Borough to meet some of the need. It is not clear how much consideration has been given to this.

- The proposed plan highlights the benefit of close public transport to the sites but use of public transport amongst Gypsies and Travellers has been noted to be low.

- Gypsies and Travellers often need mixed-use employment sites (as they often run a business from the place where they live). The proposed plan does not address this in a Green Belt.
location where commercial activities on site could lead to substantial hazardous contaminants and waste materials escaping from the site.

• Gypsies and Travellers often express their preference to be within walking distance of shops, health centres, schools, and local amenities. The proposed sites are not close to any of these. The proposed sites go against Gypsies and Travellers preferences and against environment and climate initiatives by promoting the use of their own vehicles for daily life.

• From Government Guidelines, Local planning authorities should ensure that their policies ensure that children can attend school on a regular basis. The site is well away from schools (particularly primary school provision) and clearly does not reflect the above aim, or facilitate regular school attendance. Widely recognised by Government source that literacy can be an issue within the Travelling community, this would place even more pressure on local schools to provide for support of their needs. Recent studies suggest a greater proportion of ill-health amongst the travelling community, adding more pressure to local health centres. In addition to going against Government Planning Policy for traveller sites, the closest services will therefore have further demands placed on them.

• There is evidence of periodic overcrowding on traveller sites, throughout the year and at a peak during winter months. This would yet further increase demand on local services. The plan makers have made no indication that they would take this into consideration or look to limit overcrowding.

The prime objection can thus be summarised as being an inappropriate use of Green Belt Land, together with the lack of relevant amenities to hand.

30B/01/002/DM43.4/O Mr Paul Grant Object DM43.4
502

• Site reference 661 – Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane and site reference 502 Coombe Farm off Oaks Road – both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr Paul Simner

Object DM43.4

Travellers Site Coombe Farm, Oaks Road, Ref 502

Some years ago we had unwanted visitors camp on a plot of land in Oaks road adjacent to Shirley Park Golf club. At the time I was the junior organiser for the club and we had untold problems with these people, invading the course, stealing golf balls and trying to steal unattended golf clubs. There was constant abuse given to members who dared to stand up to these people and it came to the point that when they were camped in order to make sure the kids were not harmed or have their equipment stolen. Whilst I understand their need for permanent site I do think that this location could cause many problems to our membership and especially for the juniors who regularly play there. A golf course is a place for kids to enjoy themselves and a place their parents should feel confident they are in a safe environment. I would like to point out this is not in any way an attempt to discriminate against anyone but just my concerns, after first hand experience, the problems this could cause and mainly for the safety of our junior members.

Mr Ben Lynam

Object DM43.4

Policy DM43, reference Site 502 Coombe Farm reference Site 661 Coombe Lodge Nurseries and reference Site 755 Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage. I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and Coombe Farm is on a site of an Archaeological Priority Zone and contains an area of Nature Conservation Importance. Such development is in breach of Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that “Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites by 2017 and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough.

Mr Derrick Thurley

Object DM43.4

Locations for 15 to 20 gypsy/traveller sites at Coombe Farm off Oaks Road. These are both on Green Belt land which is in breach of Government policy which states as being inappropriate development. Existing site at Purley Way should be expanded

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr Varsha Patel
Object  DM43.4
502
Build a school please? School is a viable option as there are no schools in our area. The Plan makers have missed a big point that existing infrastructure cannot cope with the influx of additional population at such a fast pace. Also, it has to be planned over a few years. It should never be on a green belt attached to a green belt sites as it is disastrous for the environment. There are quite a few brownfield sites in Croydon. Those should be explored. What are the criteria behind selecting two sites within 1 mile of each other? The plan makers do not know the grass root situation. They have just assumed things without knowing the facts. This is a grave situation. There are quite a few public and independent schools in the nearby area. Building a new school will support the schools and nearby citizens. Besides we do not have a grammar school in Croydon. So it would be ideal if we build a grammar school in Croydon on one of the proposed sites. Existing infrastructure just cannot cope with additional population in Croydon:
1) We have to wait at least 4-5 days to get a drs appointment
2) We have wait for at least 15 minutes to get a turn to play swing/baddle for my son in any local park. The parks are so crowded during summer. Already children are getting very less exercise. If 40 families come over with more than 80 children then it would be extremely crowded.
3) There are not enough schools in the area. We should build more schools.
4) There is very limited green space in Croydon. Government policy states that you cannot build temporary or permanent sites on green belt.
5) Conduit lane is a no drive through zone. Increased traffic due to a planned school and travellers sites will cause traffic chaos.
6) We need green belts for good health of the citizens. Steps like these would encourage the encroachment of green belts. Build a school instead of a travellers site.

Mr Varsha Patel
Object  DM43.4
502
I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 502</th>
<th>Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 502 (Coombe Farm)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposals to locate traveller sites at Coombe Farm, Ref 502 and Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Ref 661, are both inappropriate. As the Council acknowledges, both sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development."

The Council's approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

The proposals to locate traveller sites at Coombe Farm, Ref 502 and Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Ref 661, if adopted, would compromise the ability of the current generation and future generations to enjoy these green spaces. Enjoyment of green spaces is a basic need of any community. This is particularly relevant given the redevelopment of Croydon and the fact that many more people will be living in the centre of Croydon and will want and need to use these green spaces ("green lungs") of Croydon. Companies looking to relocate businesses to Croydon do not only consider factors such as cost. Transport links and housing for staff - they also consider environmental factors. The damage to these two green spaces, which would inevitably arise should these proposals go ahead, would make Croydon a less attractive place to live in and would discourage businesses relocation to the area. This would reduce employment opportunities for Croydon's residents.

SP2.7 makes no mention of impact on the surroundings of the site or local residents. Accordingly, an additional criterion should be added as follows:

"1. Must be entirely acceptable in relation to its impact on nearby public spaces and residents and businesses in the area"

If this were included in the proposals, Ref. 502 Coombe Farm and Ref 661, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, would immediately be inappropriate. Coombe Farm is green belt land in Lloyd Park. Lloyd Park was left to the people of Croydon by the Lloyd Family. At present families enjoy the open space, children play in the play
area, joggers and walkers exercise, people walk their dogs, sports are played, and families snack in the café.

Coombe Lodge Nursery is by the lovely gardens of Coombe Wood with its popular tea room and wooded area. The proposals RE 502 and ref 661 if implemented would not be in accordance with the Green Grid concept (reference green Spaces 6.1, 6.15, 6.16) in that they would significantly damage these two valuable assets and discourage their use by the residents of Croydon. I note under the Plan: “Local Green Spaces which make a contribution to the borough’s heritage value, visual character, recreational opportunities, tranquility, and amenity qualities will be protected and safeguarded. These proposals would have exactly the opposite effect.

I would make the following comments on the "Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers":
A) The scoring system does not reflect the importance of the preservation of Green Spaces and is inconsistent with the Green Grid concept.
B) For both sites the scoring appears highly subjective.
C) In particular for both sites the scores for "green space", "impact on local character", "privacy", and "local character" need to be reconsidered - they are all quite clearly wrong.
D) Site 502 is on a single track lane with very narrow access to Oaks Road. It would be practically inaccessible for large mobile homes. This fact is not reflected in the assessment.
E) For both sites "GB/MOL" is shown as amber and should therefore be minus 5 not plus 5.
F) The "social deprivation" criterion is illogical as pressures on local services apply equally across Croydon. If one was considering a large area such as a Country Park it would make sense, it makes no sense at the borough level. This criterion should be removed from the assessment.

I would recommend that this Assessment be reassessed by an independent party. I am sure that such a reassessment would indicate the unsuitability of these two sites.

I value Lloyd Park and Coombe Wood very highly, as, I am sure, do many other residents of Croydon. Lloyd Park and Coombe Wood are important and irreplaceable assets of our town, to be cherished. They should not be damaged by proceeding with these proposals.
Mrs Michelle Sawyer Object DM43.4 502

It is inappropriate development to locate Travellers sites at Coombe Farm (502) and Coombe Lodge Nurseries (661) as they are both in the Green belt.

Dr Natasha Newlands Object DM43.4 502

1) The two sites are proposed to be in locations that are not in easy walking distance of everyday amenities such as shops, schools and health services. This means that the Travellers who move in to these sites will have to drive to use these services adding further burden to an already very congested main route in to Croydon, Coombe Road.
2) Local schools and health services are also already stretched in catering for the current local population.
3) I feel it is important to discuss these proposals with local residents as many are unaware of the plans, it may alter how residents and visitors use the park and also the developments are likely to have a significant impact on local businesses.
4) Coombe Farm is situated within Lloyd Park and any change in usage should comply with the conditions with which it was donated.
5) These sites are in Green Belt areas and government publications advise that Traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate developments - Ref: Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites.

Mr Dominic Quinn Object DM43.4 502

Object to the dedesignation of MOL around Shirley Oaks Village as it will change the character of the area. The Travellers site would be in breach of government guidance and there would be no services local to the area.
Object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:

Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661;

Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502;

as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b;

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Not in line with government planning policy on the Green Belt.

Detail:
- Government planning policy with regards to traveller sites wants to ensure that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development.
- The proposal to create a permanent traveller site on land designated as Green Belt land is contrary to Policy E of the Planning Policy. "Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances." There are no very special circumstances.
- The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that unmet housing need (including traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the "very special circumstances". Justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt.
- The local character description is clearly at odds with the proposal.
- The justification acknowledges the Green Belt issue, although insufficiently, but relies on the fact that there are existing structures. These are not in fact substantial, being glass houses - and could be said to be at least environmentally consistent with the Green Belt. But there is no very special circumstance justification proposed as required by the planning policies.
- Approving the proposal would set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to be subject to similar development. It is not in the community's interests to allow the erosion of the green spaces surrounding the community and we object to the impact this site could have on the environment and wildlife.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
The proposal to use two locations in Shirley for traveller sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road (pages 449-450, reference number 502) and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane (pages 468-469, reference number 661).

My main objections are:
Both sites are some distance from the nearest public services, making them inherently inappropriate locations for the purpose intended.
Increased congestion in the adjacent, and rather narrow, local roads. In turn, this will result in increased pollution and accident black-spots.
Both sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, states: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. If enacted, the Council would be in breach of that policy.

Conclusion
The proposals I have highlighted can only be viewed as negative. If adopted, they will increase the local population – and the density of that population – without providing any supporting infrastructure. The new residents from the planned apartment blocks and traveller sites will need additional public services such as schools, medical services and shops. Older residents will give way to young families who require greater social support, yet no additional resources are identified to help manage the changing demographic. Traffic congestion along already busy roads will increase, as will pollution and accident black-spots. The few remaining green spaces will disappear. Overall, the proposals signal a reduction in the quality of life for both the existing residents and the newcomer.

Mr Simon Smith
Object DM43.4 502
I want to object very strongly to the use of Conduit Lane (661) and Coombe Farm (502) being used as gypsy and traveller sites. It would be totally inappropriate for these greenfield, Green Belt sites being used for this kind of development. It would also be in contravention of other policies (SP2.7a and SP2.7c) which are there to protect the green grid.

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
With reference to the above mentioned document, I am writing to strongly object to the following:
The use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:
1. Coombe Farm off Oaks Road (reference no. 502)
2. Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane (reference no. 661)
The selection of these sites is clearly in breach of Policy E of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites - published by Government in August 2015, which clearly states;
"Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the green belt are in inappropriate development."
Can you please confirm why the Council is considering the use of Green Belt sites over Brownfield sites?
I live very close to the above mentioned sites and feel that this inappropriate development will destroy the local area and community. I have worked extremely hard to be able to afford to live in this area and would like the Council to re-consider their proposal.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites on Green Belt Land:
• Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502 1]. This site will very much change the character of the area and should be located on alternative disused industrial sites, not our precious green space.

When camped illegally near the hills, these people have shown no respect for local residents or our beautiful surroundings.
The children sped across Addington Hills on electric scooters and cars making it very dangerous for families, dog walkers and their dogs who have made good use of this location for many years.
The rubbish and excrement was abysmal.

The proposed locations of these sites will adversely affect the local businesses such as the Coombe Garden Café, as no doubt the parking bays will be in constant use by the travellers and not available to those people who frequently use the café but who have to drive to that location. It will make Conduit Lane and other local roads a hazard.
The local schools are also not within walking distance of these sites and as there is very little public transport nearby this will put more pressure on the already overcrowded trams.

As someone who has lived in Shirley for 25 years and a frequent walker in our surrounding area I see these proposals changing our local environment for the worst.

Please, please, please do not proceed with these sites but find alternatives away from our precious green space.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Gypsy / Traveller sites in Featherbed Lane and off Coombe Road / Conduit Lane / Oaks Lane - These areas are Green Belt so why would the Council consider these suitable for such developments when this contravenes the current legislation? Additionally, the areas currently have considerable residential and community leisure activities and facilities, so again why would the Council be wanting to destroy the environment to create these Gypsy/Traveller sites for persons of no fixed abode and who are temporary residents to the borough only. It strikes me that this is an imbalance of priorities over the current fixed residents of Croydon and a set of proposals that I object to most strongly.
Mr Leonard Gregory

Object  

DM43.4  502

May I register my strong objection to the proposal that Coombe Farm (an historic farmhouse, circa 15th Cent.) be turned into a site for Travellers. I have watched the deterioration of Coombe Farm over the last two decades as the grounds have been progressively turned into an ill legal recycling centre by the current owner (Anwar Ansari) and about which Croydon has done nothing, despite many complaints.

Surely, in the current climate where massive nationwide redevelopment is seen as the answer to the ever increasing pressure for social housing, not just for the indigenous population, but also to cope with the requirement of immigrants and refugees, we should be protecting what little beauty we have. There must be many other alternatives to using beautiful green belt land – such as expansion of the old airfield on Purley Way - and other under-used plots in Croydon?

Change  The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Carole Shorey

Object  

DM43.4  502

I am emailing to object to a number of the proposals.

My parents live in Forestdale so are close to Addington and Shirley and I worry for them if there are more gypsy sites located in the area.

My son was involved in a road traffic incident with a traveller from the Layhams Farm site, the traveller caused the accident by pulling out of the road next to the site in front of my son’s oncoming right of way car, he then jumped out of his car and ran from the scene and the police were too frightened to enter the site. My view of the police has been very jaded since this incident. My son could have been killed in this crash. If the police are too frightened to patrol these sites, these people are above the law, I definitely do not want to see more sites in or around my local area, I feel very strongly about this.

I basically do not agree with many of the plans listed in Gavins email. I do agree we need more housing but that is mainly because too many people are being let into the country in the first place, housing them all is not the answer as other amenities will not be able to cope even if we build more houses.

Change  The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Carolyn Heath

Object  DM43.4  502

I am writing to object to:
1. The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:
   • Coombe Lodge Nurseries (site ref 661)
   • Coombe Farm off Oaks Road (site ref 502)
   • Poppy Lane (site ref 12B)
   • Stroud Green Pumping Station (site ref 540)
   • Shirley Oaks Road/Beech House (site ref 541)
   • Shirley Oaks Road (site ref 542)
   • Honeysuckle Gardens (site ref 548)
   • Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Cottage (site ref 755)

All areas provide vital green space in already densely populated areas, and there is insufficient infrastructure to cope with the additional traffic/population. Some of these areas are in the Green Belt, others are in Metropolitan Open Land. They would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Change

DM43.4

502

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Caroline Kohn

Object  DM43.4  502

I am writing concerning the draft Croydon Local Plan. I have objections to the sites which have been designated for travellers sites including Coombe Lodge Nurseries Policy DM44 Site number 661, and Coombe Farm, Policy DM43, Site 502.

While accepting the need for appropriate sites for travellers and gypsies, I question the ability of the Council with current levels of resourcing to manage an increased number of sites effectively. In addition, this will be a new, permanent development on green belt land, which is against government policy.

Access to and from the site on a dangerous section of Coombe Road will impact on traffic flow and road safety. There is no access to local amenities at these sites, including shops, schools and doctors surgeries, something recommended for travellers sites. There is also a concern that there will be a negative impact on the environment of Coombe Woods, its biodiversity and the contamination of groundwater.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as travellers / gypsy sites:

- Coombe farm site (ref no 502)
- Coombe lodge nurseries (ref no 661)

Both sites are in a beautiful green belt area which the public use a lot. I believe national guidelines do not agree with the use of green belt areas for these sites.

There are covenants which bind Croydon council to use the Lloyd park area only for recreational purposes which does not include these proposed sites.

The lane from busy oaks rd to Coombe farm is very narrow with pot holes and no pavements. The lighting is poor and obviously this area is not suitable for lots of heavy traffic and caravans.

The families who would live on these sites would have children and need to use the lane to get to all needs facilities such as shops, schools, buses and trams etc.

There would be much coming and going along the narrow lane on to busy oaks rd and Coombe rd which are main thoroughfares to Croydon. This all creates a dangerous situation.

Nearby is Cedars school who use Lloyd park for rugby and other sports and this school is receiving more pupils in the future increasing the number of vehicle and people movement in the area of Lloyd park and the main roads to and from Croydon.

Large number of people use not only Lloyd park but also the nearby conduit lane these visitors need to park in conduit lane to go to Coombe woods and gardens and to the local cafe there.

School parties often visit these woods and have to use conduit lane and it would be crazy and dangerous to have gypsy travellers using this lane to get to a permanent site there.

All of us have seen the terrible mess that these travellers have created wherever they have been and the owner of Coombe farm has himself allowed rubbish accumulation on his land in Lloyd park which the public have had to complain about.

The Coombe farm and conduit lane areas are just not suitable for permanent gypsy travellers sites and the council should find more suitable areas with less problems.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Lisa Dinnick

Object

I live on the Forestdale Estate and thankfully our management committee via Gavin have advised us of the Councils plans to build three gypsy/traveller sites in the Green Belt. I totally agree with Gavin that these plans will completely change the character of parts of the borough, including where I live. As resident of Croydon and employee of Croydon Council I completely understand the need for more housing and I am looking forward to the regeneration taking place in the town centre over the next few years. However one of the reasons I love Croydon and continue to defend its negative reputation is the mix of city feel and countryside. If the Council continue with these plans you will effect the character of the area and you will ultimately fail in your efforts to change peoples perception of Croydon.

Mr David Perry

Object

I would like to register my objection to the proposal for a site for travellers which is being considered to be situated at the rear of Shirley Park Golf Club land.

I have been a member for over 20 years and there have been "visitors" on that land before - always causing problems for members and guests whilst playing golf. They have disrupted games (taking balls during games), the iron flag poles on holes have been stolen, members and guests have been verbally abused, some threatened and there has even been the disgusting habit of defecating on greens.

I pay a substantial amount in membership fees and do not want my golfing experience and that of fellow members/guests to be marred by a group of people with absolutely no respect for our club. Please keep me informed of developments ... a definite NO to this proposal.

Mr David Harwood

Object

I object to the following sites for use of Traveller sites at the following locations

Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3148/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Dawn Lambert</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I'm writing to protest about the Council's plan to designate two areas of Green Belt land (reference numbers 502, 661 and 775) suitable for gypsy/traveller sites. I acknowledge that such sites are needed but NOT on Green Belt land. I believe it is unlawful to build on such land and once this is ignored one wonders how far it will be allowed to encroach by default over the years. In fact I believe that Government policy states that traveller sites (temporary or permanent) I the Green Belt are inappropriate development.</td>
<td>Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3149/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Frederic Demay</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>The use of the following locations to be established as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; I believe both sites would be found an inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would be in breach of Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b, in addition to Policy SP7.2 and the protection of the green grid or with 6.15 Strategic Objective 10 relating to the green grid.</td>
<td>Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3161/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Jim Cowan</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I have read Gavin Barwell’s assessment of policies and proposals in the Croydon Local Plan and totally agree that if implemented would destroy the character of Shirley. The infrastructure in Shirley is already stretched to the limit and can not withstand any further burdens.</td>
<td>Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3182/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Rev Simon Foster</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 1. The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveler sites: • Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; • Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b, with Policy SP7.2 and the protection of the green grid or with 6.15 Strategic Objective 10 relating to the green grid.</td>
<td>Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Simon Taylor  
Object  
DM43.4  
502  
I am writing to object to the proposed new travellers site at Coombe Farm and Conduit lane.  
The siting of a permanent traveller camp will have a serious detrimental effect on the local areas Residents and Businesses, and our ability to enjoy safely the local area and amenities.  
The Premier Inn and Coombe Lodge are major draws in the immediate area adjacent to Conduit Lane and Coombe Farm. I have seen first-hand in areas in and around parts of Chelmsford where large groups of travellers have completely overwhelmed local businesses including bars & restaurants and leisure facilities rendering them unusable by anyone else unconnected with the traveller community.  
On a couple of occasions recently we have seen Travellers illegally set up camp in Sunken Road next to Coombe Lane tram stop. This road and the near surrounding areas become a ‘no go’ area with mountains of rubbish dumped in the road and in Shirley hills. We see youths riding around on motorbikes in the parks and woods without helmets apparently unchecked by the local Police force. This coincides with a rise in thefts from Gardens and Sheds in the area, as well as an increase in unsolicited and sometimes aggressive doorstep sales techniques for various building or landscaping works.  
We are absolutely positive that this area cannot support a large community of people that will not assimilate, and actively distance themselves from the wider community in this area.

Sheila Childs  
Object  
DM43.4  
502  
I attended the open meeting on Wed 25th in Selondon and wish to express my concern over the 3 proposed travellers sites. Whilst I understand the council have to provide these I have to ask why are they all within a few miles of each other and all south of the borough ? Indeed the Oaks Farm and Conduit Lane are only yard away. If you could address these proximity issues I would be pleased to hear why they cannot be more evenly spread and assume the plans will improve assess to them .
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3193/02/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Stan Minter</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I have major concerns over the planned development of the Shirley Area. This is currently one of the nicest areas of Croydon and you plan to swamp it with a number of housing developments and some travellers sites. This will be very detrimental to the whole area. I understand that nationally we need to have more accommodation for families. We need to achieve this with ought destroying the whole fabric of our society. This scale of development will transform the whole area into a old fashioned “Estate”. There are not sufficient services in the wider area to support such an influx of families. The road infrastructure already struggles at time and these developments will make the whole situation much worse.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3193/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Stan Minter</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I have major concerns over the planned development of the Shirley Area. This is currently one of the nicest areas of Croydon and you plan to swamp it with a number of housing developments and some travellers sites. This will be very detrimental to the whole area. I understand that nationally we need to have more accommodation for families. We need to achieve this with ought destroying the whole fabric of our society. This scale of development will transform the whole area into a old fashioned “Estate”. There are not sufficient services in the wider area to support such an influx of families. The road infrastructure already struggles at time and these developments will make the whole situation much worse.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3202/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Stephen Massey</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I would like to register my objection to the proposed pitches for travellers/gypsy sites (ref 502 &amp; ref 661). These are in an area of Green Belt and Metropolitan open land. As a resident of this area on Sandpits Road I strongly object these changes would massively effect the character of our area, the waste from when they have previously camped there was streen all over the neighbouring roads for weeks after they had moved.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Consistent with National</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr Stephen Smith</th>
<th>Objects</th>
<th>DM43.4 502</th>
<th>2. I also object to the use of locations at Coombe Farm and Coombe Farm Nurseries as gypsy/traveller sites.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Steve Thornton</td>
<td>Objects</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I will help any objections to this area being utilised as a site for travellers at Coombe Farm. It will have a seriously adverse effect on the local business’s there and will only bring (as has been seen in the past) conflict of interest between those who live and work in the area and travelers. Please note my objection to this proposal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mr Steve White | ASPRA | DM43.4 502 | 3. the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:  
  - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502;  
  - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; and  
  - Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 755; As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:  
  “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.  
  The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is); |

| Change | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use. |
| Change | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use. |

02 September 2016
3224/01/001/DM43.4/O Sarah Anderson

Object DM43.4 502

I would like to make my objection known regarding the proposed travellers sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane and Coombe Farm, Oaks Road. Detrimental to the amenities of adjoining owners, inappropriate use of green belt land. Sites that are located on the green belt, considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and against Government Policy (planning policy for Traveller sites DCLG, Aug 2015).

Lack of relevant Amenity close at hand.

Insufficient local infrastructure to accommodate the plans.

Selection of proposed sites should have a bias towards Brownfield or Industrial Land and not Green Belt. The two proposed sites are in very close proximity to one another. Imbalance across the borough with all sites being proposed in South Croydon.

Could the existing permanent Gypsy Site in Lathams Way be expanded?

If one has to select one of the proposed sites, the preference is for Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

3228/01/002/DM43.4/O Mr Paul Ashton

Object DM43.4 502

I would like to register my strong objection to the Council’s proposals for the consideration of Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries as gypsy/traveller sites (Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals).

The sites are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. The Government’s policy is I believe that traveller sites should not be located in the Green Belt, but that hardly needs stating, surely? I cannot imagine why such sites would be considered at all, or in preference to other, clearly more suitable and higher-scoring sites cited in Assessment and selection of sites for Gypsy and Travellers August 2015 – there appears to be no logic to this approach.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

3230/01/003/DM43.4/O Patricia Jakeman

Object DM43.4 502

I object to the proposal to create three gypsy/traveller sites reference numbers 502/661/755. All sites are in the Green Belt which makes them an inappropriate development. In addition they are some distance from schools, public services etc.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Additional Details</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3235/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Peter Kenny</td>
<td><strong>DM43.4 502</strong></td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gipsy/traveller sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502 Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661</td>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The location in Green Belt should preclude all development per se apart from GDO rights to the few existing dwellings at Coombe Farm. The Conduit Lane site has been rejected in the past as unsuitable. Such erosion of the Green Belt runs wholly against the interests of the local community. It would set a precedent that can be used to further erode local and national planning policy. The impact would be more pronounced on both sites as the subject Group need mixed use sites. This is because they often run businesses from where they live. This issue is not addressed by the Consultation. Such a mixed use requirement is wholly inappropriate on both sites. Both sites are not deliverable now. Each would require the construction of a new access road as a minimum particularly to Coombe Farm. The construction of a two lane highway here with footpaths either side is bound to change the semi rural nature of this location as the existing access here is a narrow lane. A new access at Conduit Lane might be shorter but would put further pressure onto an already dangerous staggered junction with Oaks Road. This is again contrary to current policy. The Coombe Farm site is bound to require the application of more scarce resources into the maintenance of Lloyd Park if a large number of new residents are located onto its edge. This is a facility that serves the whole Borough, not just the surrounding area. Any impact here due to the development will affect adversely many in the Borough. Coombe Farm is not immediately available and as such again puts it outside Government policy. The proposal highlights the proximity to public transport at both sites. This is a consideration of low importance here as the subject socio economic group concerned are known to be infrequent users of public transport. It ignores however the dear lack of local facilities nearby. The lack of local facilities goes against the stated preference of the particular Group concerned to be within a short walk of everyday amenities. These circumstances will promote the use of personal vehicles which is against environmental policy. The proposal mentions only the number of pitches at each site. No account is taken of the number of people who might use each site due to the tight knit nature of the subject community. The number of residents may therefore result in overstraining which will be difficult to control. This is detrimental to public health and so in breach of environmental policy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Object Description</th>
<th>Change Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3266/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Mark Ashley</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the proposed plans for two locations in Shirley to be used as traveller sites as detailed below: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, which is identified as suitable for 15-20 pitches (pages 449-450, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 502); Your proposal is in clear breach of Policy E of planning policy &quot;Traveler sites (temporary or permanent) in the green belt are inappropriate development&quot;. Croydon does not need it's own Dale Farm.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3269/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Matthew Searles</td>
<td>Object DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I am writing to object to: object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7c.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661, policy number DM44; and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502, policy number DM43; Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference number 755, policy number DM32. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites e.g. the site off the Purley Way or by smaller developments on the Croydon Airport site which is currently wasteland. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards. The current road traffic on Coombe Road is heavy and this will only serve to add to the congestion.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site as a traveller site.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3280/01/001/DM43.4/C</td>
<td>Tracey Hillier</td>
<td>Oaks Farm Weddings</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I want to object to the permanent travellers sight you are planning for Coombe Farm. I am an employee at Oaks Farm Wedding Venue, the next property along Oaks Lane from Coombe Farm. Over many years we have endured a continual problem with travellers taking over the field opposite Oaks Farm. When they are there we never get a new booking and the clients who have Weddings at that time are extremely worried. I am in no doubt the travellers sight at Coombe Farm will damage our business at Oaks Farm and all our suppliers of which there are many. It will also put my employment into jeopardy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3282/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr William Harland</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I am writing to object to: The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3289/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Matthew Dickson</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>It is absolutely crazy to allow or encourage development on green belt land and/or green spaces in such a built-up area as Croydon; people need green spaces for numerous leisure and recreation activities. From a general health point of view people need to be able to play sport or go for a walk. After the Paris summit isn’t it obvious that action is needed to arrest the damaging consequences of climate change. Green spaces absorb carbon dioxide, they are the green lungs of towns and cities. Allowing woods and trees to be destroyed is environmental vandalism and flies in the face of climate change science.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I strongly object to the Council’s proposals for gypsy/traveller sites at Coombe Farm (Ref 502) and Coombe Lodge Nurseries (Ref 661). Both these sites are in the Green Belt and the proposals are contrary to Government policy (Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller sites) which states “Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

The sites are also unsuitable as they are not near any public services and would completely change the character of the area in an extremely detrimental way.

If more space must be provided, why not expand the existing site off the Purley Way?

Mr Matthew Blanshard
Object Soundness - Justified
I am writing to strongly object to proposals to change Shirley regarding changes in green areas from MOL so it can be built on along with proposals to create traveller sites near Coombe gardens or the farm.

Shirley has always been a beautiful place with lots of green land, please don't ruin it.

Mr Barry O'Neal
Object
I object in the strongest possible way to the plans outlined for this development in my local area, Shirley and Addiscombe. In particular, I understand the Council has identified two locations on the edge of Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites. I object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough, I think they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).
In my years of dog walking at Lloyd Park, there has been a number of occasions where travellers have set up site for weeks at a time. They seem to have no respect for the park and leave rubbish and mess all around. Plus they do not clean up after their animals which is a hazard for my young children who often use the park. Another concern of mine is the impact which travellers will have on the ratings of local schools and also the decrease in house prices. It is exciting times for Croydon with the new building developments, including Westfield - much needed for the reputation of Croydon after the riots and fires of 4 years ago. I strongly urge you not to approve the proposals for the traveller sites at Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries. It will result in good families and people who care about the community moving away from Croydon.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Finally, the Council has identified two locations on the edge of Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites:

• Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, which is identified as suitable for 15-20 pitches (pages 449-450, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 502); and

• Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, which is identified as suitable for 15-25 pitches (pages 468-469, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 661).

I vigorously object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As you have to be aware, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

“Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.”

The Council’s approach is blatantly in breach of that policy. Both sites are a considerable distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question – there must be more suitable sites which are closer to local amenities (there is nothing in the way of shops or even a bus-stop at these sites, necessitating extra vehicular traffic on an already busy road at best or pedestrians attempting to cross at a very dangerous point with blind bends and junctions at worst). There have to be sites which are not in Green Belt land, perhaps even sites which already exist and could be expanded (such as the one on Purley Way).

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3337/01/007/DM43.4/O</th>
<th>Mr Roger Williams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Object</strong></td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DM43.4 502</strong></td>
<td>Happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but will be objecting to building on precious open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
<td>Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3338/01/003/DM43.4/O</th>
<th>Ms Maura Keane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Object</strong></td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
<td>I appreciate that we all need somewhere to live. However, I have had severe problems with gypsies in the past (criminal damage with police involved and, separately quite a lot of fly-tipping. As the 3 areas are generally quite attractive, I am loathe to have them destroying the ambiance; they certainly have a reputation for doing so (and of not paying Council tax, so I have been told recently).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduit Lane, near the award winning Coombe Woods would be too busy for others to park and enjoy the amenity, albeit the site is away from Coombe Road. The school would also create traffic in the Lane and on the very busy Coombe Road at specific times but, maybe, this would be a pleasant site for the children. Similarly, the site in Oaks Road would be spoiled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coming to Featherbed Lane: sadly, the place is already an eyesore. If planning permission carries with it a responsibility to improve the look of the place from Featherbed Lane, great. However, I doubt it can. What is needed here is a tidy up, not an increase in the mess. I suspect the Council has a duty to provide a site. If so, Featherbed Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I thought Metropolitan Open Land was protected, but then having said that the council are proposing building Gipsy encampments on Green Belt land - ridiculous, immoral and probably illegal! Has anybody in the council actually had first hand experience of a Gipsy Site - we have as we back onto Ashburton playing fields, and the last invasion of Gipsy's cost tens of thousands of pounds to clear up! Are the council going to keep these proposed sites clean and properly policed? Are the Gipsy's going to be charged a going rate for using these sites, or are we subsidising them out of our council tax? In short I am totally opposed to Green Belt land being destroyed in this manner, also I am opposed the proposed enlargement of the Shirley Oaks estate hence destroying the Metropolitan Open Land, for all the reasons stated above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Keith Povah

Object Consultation on Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals (Preferred & Alternative Options)

I am writing to register my objections for the following proposed sites for Gypsy and Travellers Sites:

- Coombe Farm, Oaks Road - Reference 502
- Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane - Reference 661

The Policies laid out on the Mayor of London - London Assembly website, and Policy 7.17 clearly states that the Mayor’s office truly supports the protection of Metropolitan Open Land, and indeed states that The strongest protection should be given to London’s MOL and inappropriate development refused”. The Policy lays out what needs to be established to designate an area as MOL, but does not make it clear how a Council can re-designate an area. I therefore object to any permanent Traveller site being constructed on MOL and especially if the area is simply going to be re-designated without any consultation with the local residents and businesses.

I object strongly that Croydon Council can re-designate Metropolitan Open Land or Green Belt land to suit their needs to accommodate a permanent pitch. I cannot see any Planning justification to change the designation, nor for the intrusion into the lives of the residents of Oaks Road and surrounding area. This will massively affect the urban attractiveness of the area and have both emotional and financial repercussions on many lives. Policy 7.18 relating to Protection of Open Spaces clearly states that open spaces in London must be protected, and any loss must be resisted. I cannot believe the Council would want to go against both of these policies laid down by The London Assembly.

I am a member of Shirley Park Golf Club, which not only provides sport and social activities to over 700 members in the local vicinity, but also provides an important ecological role in the area. The proposed site of Coombe Farm as a site for Gypsies and Travellers has come as a shock to everyone in the area, as borne out by the recent press coverage and attendance at the Consultation Meetings.

The history of unauthorised pitches in this area over the past few years has left a bitter resentment, especially in...
view of the residual mess and threatening behaviour that has always accompanied their trespass. On each occasion that Gypsies/Travellers have been in the area, the club members here have been threatened with physical and verbal abuse. This behaviour is totally unacceptable and despite the subsequent eviction of the Travellers on each occasion, the residual psychological effect on tax payers and constituents' lives cannot be trivialised.

I personally have experienced dreadful behaviour from the travellers. They have damaged the greens, used the golf bunkers as toilets, damaged course furniture & stolen equipment.

We also have a large Junior Section and children play the course during holidays as well as weekends. They are often unaccompanied and the parents need to know they are in a safe environment. This would certainly not be the case in the parents' minds if there was any chance of aggressive behaviour, as previously experienced, towards these children. I am certain that you would not wish to be responsible for putting children in any sort of potentially dangerous situation.

Surely these detailed real issues must be taken into account when determining any permanent site. I understand that the proposed sites are not within the required distance to both schooling and medical needs, therefore I also object on that basis. The land is in private ownership at Coombe Farm, and any funds spent on compulsory or otherwise purchase could surely be spent more wisely on behalf of the population of Croydon. No doubt Central Grants will be available, but Council owned land in an area that will not radically impact on established residents' lives would be a sensible and prudent choice.
Object
DM43.4
502

I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

I additionally comment that:

- The proposals are detrimental to the Amenities of Adjoining Owners
- Development is on Green Belt and would therefore require a change of land use
- The proposed Sites should be on Brownfield or Industrial Land not Green Belt
- There is an imbalance, with all sites being proposed in the South of Croydon
- Existing sites could/should be expanded
- If a new site is to be developed for the travelling community, I would express a preference for Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane. This already virtually developed to the point where there would be no further detriment if the site were to be developed.
- However, there is no proposal as to where the existing activity would be relocated to.
- The Pear Tree Cottage Farm site, provides ample space for all or most to the 39 additional pitches. Any remaining pitches could be located at other, brownfield, sites within the borough.
- If the nurseries site is to be redeveloped, it would be far better for this to be used for the relocation of a school, thus freeing up land elsewhere in the borough for housing.
- The travelling community are by definition mobile whereas the proposed development(s) are permanent and in built form. This is contradictory and may suggest that the council is considering further redevelopment at some future point. If so, the council should either be open about this or unequivocally deny it.

Other Sites that the Council should reconsider instead of both Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm are the following:

- 518 - Land adjacent to 103 Goodenough Way, The Admirals Walk, Old Coulsdon
- 536 - Land of former Croydon Airport runway, south of Imperial Way, Waddon
- 552 - Land adjacent to Ashburton playing fields at rear of 2-88

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr & Mrs Haslam

Object

DM43.4
502

I object The use as gypsy/traveller sites of Coombe Farm (502) and Conduit Lane (661) These are in the Green Belt and Government Policy (Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”) classifies traveller sites in the Green Belt as “inappropriate development.”

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Dr Bob Wenn

Object

DM43.4
502

I object to the use of any land in the Green Belt as gypsy/traveler sites

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr Rishi Gohill

Object

Soundness - Justified
DM43.4
502

Happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but will be objecting to building on precious open space. Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Joy Harris

Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 502

Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.

If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr Dan Camalich

Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 502

I am writing in order to object to the use of Green Land, especially in and around Croydon, for use as any kind of residential use, or any other kind of development for that matter. Such new developments, for Travellers or any kind of development, would be better made on non-green land, or in any suitable properties which are currently unused. Green land should be cherished and preserved because it takes a long time to become like that and there is less and less of it these days. The only real exception to that rule might be playgrounds for kids; but, even then, sensitivity to wild life, habitats and a location's general “greenness” should always be employed.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Karen Muldoon

Object DM43.4 502

I am very concerned about the plans to introduce traveller sites near Oaks road. Roads are already narrow and congested in this area. At peak times there are always queues in Oaks Rd and Coombe lane so I don’t believe adding the large entourage of vehicles used by travellers will be particularly helpful. We experience the mess left behind by travellers every year and this continually concerns me. I am not sure what happens at Coombe Farm but there is already a rubbish site building there on the edge close to Lloyds park. I know there have been campaigns for some time about this and it has not been closely monitored. I imagine this would also be the case if it became a traveller site. It seems to make far more sense that traveller sites be in open, easily accessible areas - not tucked away sites like Coombe farm.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/02/002</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Mr Amit Patel</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01/003</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Claire Rutland</td>
<td>As a shareholder of the open space in Shirley Oaks I would like to object to the proposals made in Policy Map 43. One of the reason I bought the property was for the nice open spaces that surround the houses. Building unnecessarily on this land will change the whole look and feel of the community of Shirley Oaks Village. We have one road in and out of the village and cramping in 700+ homes onto our lovely open space will also create congestion on the one road. Shirley Oaks is privately owned and we take pride in our village and how it looks and will fight against these proposals.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/002</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Alison Larmand</td>
<td>Please be advised that I would like to enter an objection to Croydon Council's plans to de designate several land spaces in order to enable the positioning of three gypsy/traveler sites in the green belt and also the development of homes on some of the green spaces. The proposed locations for traveller sites brings great concern as to what impact this will have on the area as the locations are not really close to any public services. I believe there is also some question about whether the areas being proposed for the traveller sites can be used for this purpose due to a Government policy that states traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. As a resident of Shirley for the past 20 years I would be extremely disappointed to see any of these proposed developments come to fruition. Whilst I welcome the development of new homes I think Croydon Council should look for alternative locations instead of green land. I do hope to hear from your office in due course as to what the future may hold for our lovely green spaces that provide fresh air and outdoor enjoyment for our family and many others.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Third, the Council has identified two locations on the edge of Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites:
• Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, which is identified as suitable for 15-20 pitches (pages 449-450, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 502); and
• Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, which is identified as suitable for 15-25 pitches (pages 468-469, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 661).

I will be objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

“Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.”

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

The purpose of Green Belt legislation has always been to preserve areas of amenity land for the benefit of local people, and other potential users, against any form of building development. I therefore consider it totally unacceptable, indeed absolutely incredible, that the Council would even consider designating areas of the Green Belt for potential gypsy/traveller sites as the Plan proposals for Coombe Farm, Coombe Lodge Nurseries and 2 sites on Featherbed Lane. The Coombe Lodge Nurseries site is especially inappropriate as it is very adjacent to Coombe Gardens, an important local amenity, and to the land along Conduit Land that has strong conservation value.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3380/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Sylvia Dibbs</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Council seems to be in breach of the Government’s Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites ie ‘…traveller sites…in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. None of the places in Shirley is appropriate, being Green Belt and one on the border of a Site of Nature Conservation Interest and public services are too far.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3390/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Adrian Cowie</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td></td>
<td>I object very strongly to the council proposals to create Traveller sites on Green Belt Land. I believe the Green Belt is a resource which should be protected at all cost. Our countryside is a precious resource which provides recreation for walkers, cyclists, horse riders and separates urban sprawl. It should be held in trust for the enjoyment of future generations. Once it is gone, it is gone forever! Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. The site is also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is). This area is one, which I regularly walk &amp; cycle a. Any development, such as the one above, would completely ruin the surrounding countryside. The proposals go against the government policies on Green Belt. Before any development of Green Belt, Brownfield sites should be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3394/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Alan Heathcote</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is to object strongly to your ill-conceived proposals for high density dwellings on greenbelt parkland, on existing semi-detached housing areas, and gardens in the Shirley Oaks / Library regions. Also for travellers sites in the vicinity of Coombe farm. All as outlined in Gavin Barwell’s email.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

02 September 2016  
Page 2163 of 4384
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 502</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, which is identified as suitable for 15-20 pitches (pages 449-450). Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 502); and Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms A Pavon-Lopez</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>Other sites the council should reconsider instead of both Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm are: Heath Clark playing fields, Stafford Rd, Waddon Timebridge Community Centre, Field Way, New Addington Land adjacent to 103 Goodenough Way, Old Coulston Wandle Road, car park, Wandle Rd, Croydon Land of former Croydon Airport runway, south of Imperial Way, Waddon Land adjacent to Ashburton playing fields at rear of 2-88 Coleridge Rd, Addiscombe By Pavilion Playing Fields, Purley Way Land south Of Threehalfpenny Woods, Kent Gate Way, Birtle Way Land west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, Elmside, Addington Cane Hill-south part, Hollymead Road, Portnalls Rd, Coulsdon</td>
<td>Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms A Cheetham

Object

DM43.4

502

I would like to object to the proposed plans to set up gypsy and traveller sites for the following reasons:

* It is an inappropriate use of Green Belt Land - this classification of land has been created to protect green areas, not to develop on them.
* Should have proposed Brownfield or Industrial Land NOT green belt
* Might set a dangerous precedent for more Green Belt land to be developed on
* It will be potentially detrimental to the amenities of adjoining owners - for example, the business of The Coach House Café.
* Sites that are located on the Green Belt, considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites and against Government Policy ("Planning policy for Traveller Sites", DCLG, August 2015)
* The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr Barnaby Powell

Object

DM43.4

502

I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502 as a gypsy and traveller site.

These sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b, with Policy SP7.2 and the protection of the green grid or with 6.15 Strategic Objective 10 relating to the green grid.

Rev B Warren

Object

DM43.4

502

Both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b, with Policy SP7.2 and the protection of the green grid or with 6.15 Strategic Objective 10 relating to the green grid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>SP0.2 makes no mention of impact on the surroundings of the site and nearby residents. Accordingly, an additional criterion should be added: &quot;Must be entirely acceptable in relation to its impact on nearby public spaces and residents and businesses in the area.&quot; If this were included the proposals Ref 502, Coombe Farm, and Ref 661, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, would immediately be seen to be inappropriate. Coombe Lodge Nursery is by the lovely gardens of Coombe Wood with its popular tea room and wooded area. Coombe Farm is green belt land in Lloyd Park, left to the people of Croydon by the Lloyd family and where families enjoy the open space, kids play in the play area, joggers, dog walkers and other walkers exercise, spots are played, families snack in the café and everyone feels reasonably safe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object DM43.4

3410/01/001/DM43.4/0

Mr B Chantler

Mr B Chantler

The grounds for my objection are:

1. The area has already suffered from illegal camps on several occasions.
2. The illegal camps have deposited substantial rubbish, including human waste, on each occasion.
3. The camps have been noisy and disruptive and thefts have occurred from my garden shed whilst the travellers were in occupation.
4. This area is Metropolitan Open Land and/or Green Belt and as such is protected from the proposed development. Such proposals are against planning policy at both local and national level.
5. Coombe Farm is a listed building and the proposed development would be entirely detrimental to its setting even if not actually within its curtilage.
6. Coombe Farm is within the panoramic view of Addington Hills which is subject to local planning policies.
7. All land in the area subject to covenants over the freehold titles set by the Garwood family which prohibit the proposed development.
8. There is little or no public transport provision, no shopping or schools within any reasonable distance of the sites. These are major requirements for any Gypsy and Travellers settlement proposals.
9. Why are no brownfield sites proposed which would be far more suitable, comply with planning policies and offer the amenities which are required to support the community of Gypsies and Travellers.
10. Why have Heathfield Ward been selected as the location for two proposed sites when it is on the fringes of Croydon with little amenity provision to support the Gypsy and Travellers sites.
11. The Local Plan sets no description of the council's statutory duties towards travellers. Do these proposals exceed the statutory responsibilities and, if so, what are the council's reasons since none has been provided in the plan or in any consultations. Given the funding cuts leading to threatened reductions in services to residents and tax payers has the council carried out any consultations or sought the views of residents as to the priority to be given to the provision of travellers' sites?

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
encampments. What measures have been considered to protect vulnerable sites in the area from incursion by travellers if the site are full 14 The area has a population of protected wildlife including deer, badgers, owls as well as an abundance of other wildlife. No measures are proposed to minimise the effect of the proposed developments nor any mitigation measures. 15 Traffic in the area is already substantial. The junctions at both ends of Oaks Road are congested at peak times and are dangerous for pedestrians at all times. The proposed sites will increase the existing problems. 16 Little or no consideration has been given in the plan to the protection of local amenity and the local environment quite apart from the other deviations from or contravention of local and national planning policy. 17 It is clear from the plan that the council has ignored many alternative and more suitable sites which do comply with local and national planning policies and do not infringe on Green Belt Land. The proposals are illogical, counter to any tenets of sustainable development and appear to be prejudiced against a single ward - as no other options for location of the sites have been explored or have been dismissed without reason.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3414/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Chris McInerney</td>
<td>Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 3416/01/006/DM43.4/O | C Mortreuil | Similarly a site for travellers with amenities which would prevent them from invading current green spaces is a good idea, but where to put it needs to be sensibly planned and the current proposal in my view is not adequate. |
|                     |              | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy/traveller sites should not be built on existing Green Belt land. This is totally inappropriate, as Green Belt is designed to remain undeveloped.</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 502

As a local resident I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as travellers/gypsy sites:

Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, reference number 502
Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, reference number 661
Coombe Farm site (ref. no. 502)

1. It is in a Green Belt area. National guidelines say that travellers/gypsy sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. Even if the properties are demolished to provide for the pitches there will still be a large spill over into the Green Belt. This means that planning permission should not be available.

2. The site is on a single track lane with a very narrow access into Oaks Road which the large mobile homes will not be able to access. The lane is also used by aggregate lorries which are smaller, local residents, members of the sports ground and teams and visitors to Lloyd Park, a much loved and used public amenity.

3. The site has no safe walking route to schools, shops, doctors etc. There is no pavement along Oaks Lane and very poor lighting when dark. There is only partial pavement along one side of Oaks Road. How will this be safe to accommodate a large number of people including children? This means that the incomers will have to use their own means of transport to access the basics of life.

4. The size of the pitches would accommodate a far greater number of caravans than can be controlled by planning restrictions. Even if the restrictions are adhered to, this means there could be as many as three families on each pitch. With planning for 20 pitches this would mean 60 families and 60 mobile homes, not to mention cars, trucks, vans and caravans in tow.

5. National guidelines state that the site should not overwhelm the nearest settlement. The residents of Oaks Farm, Oaks Road and Oaks Lane would certainly be overwhelmed, how would social cohesion be achieved with local residents and potential conflict between Travellers of different nationalities?

6. There has been a long history of planning application refusals and avoidance of planning permission at Coombe Farm and the reasons for this should be re-visited. There is a history of unauthorised "pitches" in areas of Croydon over the past few years that has left a bitter resentment, especially in view of the residual mess and threatening...
behaviour that has accompanied Travellers/Gypsies trespass. This behaviour is totally unacceptable and would not be tolerated in other groups in society. Despite their eviction it is the taxpayer who has to clean up their mess.

These two sites are totally unsuitable for Traveller/Gypsy sites and will be contravening National Guidelines on the use of Green Belt Land. This proposal has not been thought through in its effects on local residents and the needs of the Traveller/Gypsy community who will be abandoned on sites with no close amenities and very poor and unsafe access to their homes.

| 3428/01/006/DM43.4/O | Mr Daniel Nuthall | Object | DM43.4 502 | Also the proposal of a Gypsy site does not sit well with me at all. Firstly both the proposed sites ref 502 & ref 661 are in a green belt, a clear breach of policy. The site at Stroud Green is also liable to flooding together with the land being owned by Thames Water and who's offices are a listed building. | Change | This site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use. |
All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>Mr D Lane</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation. As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: &quot;Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development&quot;. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>Mr E King OBE</td>
<td>Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: &quot;Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
We strongly object to the disturbing proposals of Croydon Council to quadruple the area of gypsy sites in the Croydon area, in particular to sites regarding Reference numbers 502, 661 and 755. Green Belt areas are invaluable and should be protected as per previous acknowledgements (c.f. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August).

Also Croydon already has a bigger than average share of “problematic and challenging” social make-up than the rest of the country, and as such quadrupling gypsy sites in the borough seems a gross overreaction to pressure to ‘meet targets’. Policies and planning should focus on the development of an area rather than on enforcing undesirable land uses on the existing hard working population.

Existing traveller sites are appalling examples of living conditions, and building small blocks of flats in current sites could house a number of travellers either living there already or wishing to move to the borough.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I wish to log my objection to the borough-wide planned changes Croydon Council are proposing to make in their Local Plans for 2016-2036. These proposals are 750 new homes in Shirley Oaks and 35 new homes on the Shrublands Estate. Also the proposed work to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Coombe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Coombe Road.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object DM43.4

502

I object to the proposal to create three gypsy/traveller sites reference numbers 502/661/755. All sites are in the Green Belt which makes them an inappropriate development. In addition they are some distance from schools, public services etc.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object DM43.4

502

I strongly object to the following proposals which will have a negative impact on either green belt land or the character of an area. Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, which is identified as suitable for 15-20 pitches (pages 449-450, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 502);

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object DM43.4

502

I am writing to object to: The use of a site for Oaks Road as a traveller site (Coombe farm). Reference number 502 and Coombe Lodge Nurseries (ref 661) as gypsy/travellers site

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object DM43.4

502

I am writing to you to object to the use of a site off Oaks Road as a traveller site (Coombe farm). Reference number 502 and the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries, off Conduit Lane as a further travellers site. Reference number 661

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr Dennis King
Sanderstead Residents' Association

Soundness - Consistent with National Policy

The three locations earmarked for gypsy and traveller sites are all located on green belt land.

Conduit Lane
Coombe Farm off Oaks Road and Pear Tree Farm
Featherbed Lane

Policy E, Planning Policy for Traveller Sites published by the Government and also backed by the London Plan states that they are inappropriate development. On what basis therefore do Croydon consider they are better advised than more experienced authorities. They are high cost implications for Croydon should they proceed with this policy.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Depal Patel

I have heard of Croydon Councils proposals for Traveller sites within the borough. I understand that "favoured sites" are Conduit Lane, Coombe Farm and Featherbed Lane. As a resident of Croydon, I am extremely concerned that this green belt area is being considered for use as residence. Addington hills and Coombe woods are an area of outstanding beauty and home to the largest area of heathland in London. Locating Traveller's encampments sites right on the doorstep of this green belt area would undoubtedly have dire consequences for flora, fauna, the natural habitat and wildlife as a whole, leading to irreversible damage. Please could Croydon Council reconsider this issue and please consider not going ahead with this proposal. The consequences to the natural environment and the delicate socio-ecological balance that currently exists would be damaged permanently with travellers' communities housed in a wildlife locality. There are better options to house people in Croydon and right in the middle of a green belt area which the residents of Croydon hold a lot of regard and pride for is not one of them. I would strongly advocate considering urban areas of the borough which are fit for housing - such proposals must not be made or favoured without a thorough ecological and environmental impact assessment and evaluation. I am very concerned with this proposal also because Croydon Council is meant to work in partnership with the British Trust for Conservation (BTCV) and a regional office is located on the woodland premises. Scraping this proposal is the right thing to do and the right thing for Croydon.
The proposal to develop Coombe Farm, Oak Road as a residential development for a Gypsy and travelers site does not fall within the Strategic Objectives because:

Objective 2: This development will not Foster an environment where existing enterprise can prosper, but will reduce enterprise.

Objective 4: This development will not reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation. It will not reduce unemployment, improve skills and education and improve environmental conditions; the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Objective 5: This development is not of high quality and will not enhance the borough’s natural environment but will reduce the natural environment by turning a farm into a travelers housing site.

Objective 7: This development will reduce the area as a safe, healthy and cohesive community.

Objective 10: This development will reduce the quality and accessibility of green space and nature. This development will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The development will change the outlook and community within the Shirley area and future generation will suffer because of this. This proposed development of a travelers site within the Shirley area is not within keeping of the current development within this area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with out housing in the area. Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area. Building a travelers site will increase noise levels, and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area. Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. This development would diminish the striking view of the area of Addington Hills and Coombe Farm area.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
3485/01/003/DM43.4/O Mr Alnoor Visram

Object DM43.4 502

SP2.7 makes no mention of impacts on the surroundings of the site and nearby residents. Accordingly, an additional criterion should be added "f. Must be entirely acceptable in relation to its impact on nearby public spaces and residents and businesses in the area". If this were included the proposals ref 502, Coombe Farm, and Ref. 681, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, would immediately be seen to be inappropriate. Coombe Lodge Nursery is by the lovely gardens of Coombe Wood with its popular tea room and wooded area. Coombe Farm is green belt land in Lloyd Park, left to the people of Croydon by the Lloyd family and where families enjoy the open space, kids play in the play area, joggers, dog walkers and of other walkers exercise, spots are played, families snack in the café and everyone feels reasonably safe.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

3487/01/001/DM43.4/O Mr G von Gerard

Object DM43.4 502

I wish to register my objection to the proposed locations for traveller sites, namely Coombe Farm (Ref 502) and Coombe Lodge Nurseries (Ref 681) in the Local Plan proposals. These sites are in the Green Belt and, as the Government's policy (Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites) states, 'Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development'.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Objections raised to the use of the following locations as Gypsy/Traveller sites:-
- Coombe Farm off Oaks Road Reference Number 502
- Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane Reference Number 661

1. How has the London Borough of Croydon involved its Community in the planning of the Coombe Farm and Coombe Gardens Traveller Sites? What opportunity was given by Croydon Council for the local residents to put forward their own ideas and participate in the development of the sites? See - London Borough of Croydon’s “Statement of Community Involvement - October 2012” (https://www.croydon.gov.uk/sites/default/files/articles/downloads/involvement-oct12.pdf) Reference 2.11 & 2.12 - these Guidance Rules have been ignored

2. There is no pavement access to either of the proposed sites therefore most travel to and from these sites to local amenities, (shops/doctors/schools) would be by vehicle – causing even greater traffic problems to the Coombe and Oaks Road junction.

3. Residents call for an independent (i.e non-Labour) lead enquiry into the full extent Dr Anwar Ansari (owner of Coombe Farm, a proposed traveller site) has been able to influence Croydon Council specifically & Labour Government more broadly through financial bribery?

4. Under the freedom of information act, can you please confirm how planning applications Dr Anwar Ansari or a member of his family have submitted to Croydon Council and how many have been accepted/approved (including those with conditions).

Quote from the 2011 Localism Act;
“Through the Localism Act, the Government has abolished the Standards Board regime. Instead, local authorities will draw up their own codes, and it will become a criminal offense for councillors to deliberately withhold or misrepresent a financial interest.”

Tens of thousands of pounds including cash equivalent goods & services (e.g. supply of rent-free premises for council business, travel expenses and campaign donations) have been disclosed but misrepresented as donations. These are in fact bribes in return for planning leniency (see press article) - http://insidecroydon.com/2015/08/21/property-developer-ansari-donates-to-cooper-and-khan/4. Under the freedom of information act, can you please confirm how

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
planning applications Dr Anwar Ansari or a member of his family have submitted to Croydon Council and how many have been accepted/approved (including those with conditions).

5. the restrictive Covenants for Coombe Farm, (defined as 80 Oaks Road) which are for "the Settlers and their successors in title" states "No part of the Property shall be used for any offensive noisy, dangerous pursuit or occupation or for any purpose which shall or may grow to be in any way a nuisance damage grievance or annoyance to neighbouring properties or the neighbourhood."

3492/01/008/DM43.4/O Helen Silk
Object
DM43.4
502
I am writing to object to the plans to build gypsy/traveller sites in the area of Shirley and the building of anything on any area of green belt land, green spaces or back gardens

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

3495/01/003/DM43.4/O Mr Ian Harris
Object
DM43.4
502
I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; My objection is based on the fact that the use of both sites for such a purpose would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. To summarise my objections to the location of traveller sites at either (or both) Conduit Lane and/or Coombe Farm, these would be that:
• they would be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining owners
• it would constitute inappropriate use of Green Belt Land
• sites that are located on the Green Belt, considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) would be against Government Policy ("Planning policy for Traveller Sites", DCLG, August 2015)
• there would be a lack of relevant amenities close at hand
• there would be insufficient local infrastructure to accommodate the plans
• the selection of proposed sites should have a bias towards 'brownfield' or industrial land, not Green Belt

I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661
I would also ask:
• Why are the two sites in very close proximity to one another being proposed?
• What is the rationale for creating an imbalance across the borough with all sites being proposed in the South of Croydon?
• Why not expand the existing Permanent Gypsy Site in Lathams Way off Beddington Farm Road?
• If one has to select one of the proposed sites, the preference is for Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr Ian Harris
Object DM43.4 502
I would also ask:
Why are the two sites in very close proximity to one another being proposed?
What is the rationale for creating an imbalance across the borough with all sites being proposed in the South of Croydon?
Why not expand the existing Permanent Gypsy Site in Lathams Way off Beddington Farm Road?
If one has to select one of the proposed sites, the preference is for Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane

Mr Ian Leggatt
Object DM43.4 502
This site is in Green Belt and to create a Traveller site here constitutes “inappropriate Development” in contravention of Policy E of the Government’s Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. I object to the proposal.

Mr Ian Enlgeback
Object DM43.4 502
I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites at Coombe Farm off Oaks Road (reference number 502). These locations are designated Green Belt and close to sites of Nature Conservation Interest, allocation of such land to gypsy/traveller sites is in contradiction to established government policy as laid out in Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (Policy E).

Gaynor Lawrence
Object DM43.4 502
Please see this email as my objection to the proposed housing. This is ridiculous. The village is small and the road going through the village would NOT suffice the extra traffic. I pay a maintenance charge and moved here as it is a quiet location. I have been burgled a couple years back due I believe to the travellers that squatted on the land here and I do not want that fear again. Please rethink this crazy idea and let me know how I can further stop this.
Mr Gary Kenney

Object DM43.4 502

I am writing to show that I object to a number of your plans around the Shirley area. I contest that you need to build on our green sites and bring in new ‘traveler’ sites into Shirley.

On top of this I cannot understand the need to bring ‘medium’ high rise buildings in and around Shirley, including Devonshire way and the new proposals around Hartland way.

Please can you let me know if my objection has been noted and how I can make it more official?

Mrs Jolanta Berry

Object DM43.4 502

It has come to my attention, that the Council is currently considering to change the designation of areas of Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land, in particular, that of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane.

I am most surprised and disappointed, that people within the Council who have been employed to represent and implement the views and wishes of local residents, are pursuing such ideas.

I am very strongly objecting to the idea, and ask you to withdraw the proposals. They will have a detrimental effect on the quality of life for the local residents, and will forever change the character of the area for the worse.

I would ask you to withdraw any plans to change the current status, and to confirm in writing, that my objection and representation has been received, and will be given a due attention. As I understand, a large majority of residents are opposing the idea and expect that you will respect their wishes and views.

Jennifer Worstall

Object DM43.4 502

I urge the Council to re-consider allowing traveller sites in the former Croydon nursery in Coombe Woods and at Coombe Farm in Lloyd Park -- both unsuitable sites, as they are not near amenities such as shops/schools etc which travellers may need to access. The A23 offers a better location for these traveller sites and has better road access too.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katrina Neal</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I most violently object against the proposal for gypsy traveller sites on Coombe Farm off Oaks Road - ref 502. This is because I have been a victim of travellers and their general anti-social behavior/culture/damage/threatening behavior in the past...most recently when they illegally took over property in Wickham Road (the old La Rijoca site) in 48 hours you cannot believe the damage they did and how awful it was...I will object to anything that is EVER planned to house them near anywhere I live</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Hayden</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I strongly object to the use of either of these sites for gypsy/traveller sites. They are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a conservation site. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller sites, published by the Government in August, states unequivocally “Traveller site, temporary or permanent, in the Green Belt are inappropriate.” The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both of these sites are some distance from public services. There is an existing site off the Purley Way, could this site not be increased? The public services in this area are far better than by the other proposed sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a local affected resident, I am registering my comments and objections to the proposals as documented in the Croydon Local Plans CLP1.1 and CLP2.

6 Proposed Policy DM43 Creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites at Coombe Farm, off Oaks Road, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, off Conduit Lane and Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage, Featherbed Lane
As a local affected resident, I am registering my comments and objections to the proposals as documented in the Croydon Local Plans CLP1.1 and CLP2.

Policy DM43, reference Site 502 Coombe Farm reference Site 661 Coombe Lodge Nurseries and reference Site 755 Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage. I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and Coombe Farm is on a site of an Archaeological Priority Zone and contains an area of Nature Conservation Importance. Such development is in breach of Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that "Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites by 2017, and 39 by 2036 is extremely excessive and will have a significant adverse impact on the borough.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Both my wife and I formally wish to object to the councils proposals for development to the green belt at Coombe Farm and especially for the creation of Travellers sites to them.
I wish to voice my concerns regarding the following:

I totally object to any reduction of green space in the borough of Croydon in favour of development. I agree wholeheartedly with Garvin Barwell MP and wish to oppose any such plans. In particular, the idea of a travellers site at the suggested sites is preposterous.

There have been problems in this borough with 'travellers' for many years. To the extent that defences, barriers built up grass mounds, have been created to keep out such illegal encampments. Whilst what the Council are proposing is to legalise such sites, I have witnessed the conditions these area have been left in when travellers have moved on, piles of rubbish including human waste and damaged the area! This has been a massive expense to the council over the years. Areas around Coombe Gardens and Lloyd park are much loved and used recreational areas for the people of Croydon and surrounding areas. A gypsy encampment would be a disaster!

If there is an obligation for the council to provide facilities for travellers, any such area should be very carefully assessed and considered, taking into account all the attributes of the area and how such a camp would affect it. In this instance the suggested areas are totally inappropriate.
Object DM43.4

I object to the proposed sites of Coombe Lodge Nurseries 661, and Coombe Farm 502, being used as sites for gypsies and travellers because:

1. It will be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining owners.
2. It is inappropriate use of Green Belt Land. Sites that are located on the Green Belt are considered to be inappropriate for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and against Government Policy, “Planning policy for Traveller Sites,” DCLG, August 2015.
3. There is a total lack of amenities close at hand.
4. There is insufficient Local Infrastructure to accommodate the plans.
5. The selection of Proposed Sites should have a bias towards Brownfield or Industrial Land, not Green Belt.
6. Imbalance across the borough with all Sites being Proposed in the South of Croydon.
7. Why not expand of the existing Site in Lathams Way, off Beddington Farm Road.
8. If one has to select one of the proposed Sites, the preference would be for Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane.

Other Sites that the council should consider are:

1. 16 Heath Clark playing fields, Stafford Road, Waddon.
2. 120 Timebridge Community Centre, Field Way, New Addington.
4. 522 Wandle Road surface car park, Wandle Road, Croydon Opportunity Way.
5. 536 Land of former Croydon Airport Runway, south of Imperial Way, Waddon.
6. 552 Land adjacent to Ashburton playing fields, at rear of 2 - 88 Coleridge Road, Addiscombe.
9. 636 Land west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, Elmside, Addington.
10. 767 Cane Hill - south part, Hollymeak Road / Portnalls Road Coulsdon.
I object to plans to de-designate the metropolitan open land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village as it is Green Belt and precious open land. I also object to gypsy/travellers sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road (Ref No. 502), as they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a site of Nature Conservation interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Travellers Sites published by the Government clearly states: ‘Travellers sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The Council is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/travellers sites in the borough - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purely Way where the existing site is).

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr I Fuell

Object Soundness - Justified

5. The use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:

- Coombe Farm off Oaks Road; reference number 502; and
- Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane; reference number 661.

These are both in the Green Belt, where Policy E of Planning for Traveller Sites clearly says that “travellers sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

This is also likely to have a negative effect on the Site of nature conservation interest that one of the sites would border, and both sites are a distance from public services. It is also likely to create increased traffic problems in an area that is not best suited for such sites.

Consideration should be given to the refurbishment of the existing sites, or where this is not possible, alternative and more appropriate sites.

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr Martin Payne

I have been a Croydon resident for many years (over 47), and have watched Croydon wax and wane. In all those years, Croydon has often been regarded as rather down at heel and a bit of a joke; it has been misrepresented in the media too many times in my view. Croydon remains a vital communications hub, which seems only recently to have been recognised. Given all the development in and around East Croydon station, your plan for these improvements is beginning to take shape. As we all know, London Victoria in 20 minutes, London Bridge in 20 minutes; not to mention the east/west Tramlink which has become so popular that TfL decided to grab it! Croydon’s communications should be more widely acknowledged. You were elected on a ticket to not only improve Croydon for ALL its residents but also to preserve its assets such as the green belt and areas of special scientific interest. Imagine my dismay and great disappointment when I discovered in your proposal that you considered it perfectly legitimate to build on green belt – absolutely at odds with your manifesto. AND that you are prepared to ignore your promises in preserving Croydon’s assets to the very people who elected you. How can the electorate trust you in the future, especially at the next council election, if you blatantly disregard your election pledges and set about to destroy the green spaces enjoyed by many of Croydon’s residents? All green belt is part of Croydon’s assets, it represents the lungs of Croydon, benefitting all and in many cases providing a haven for migratory birds as they stop-over en route and indeed other wild life whose habitat is likely to be destroyed/diminished if the green belt is built on. Altering the status of green belt or areas of special scientific interest enabling it to be built on does NOT alter the fact that once built on it will never revert to green belt and therefore will be lost (to Croydon and its electorate), forever. I would urge you to reconsider you proposals to destroy part of the green belt and to maintain the status of the open spaces as is. Croydon occupies a vast area and I am certain you could find suitable alternatives for the travellers which met their needs of access to public transport and retail amenities without destroying the green belt or areas of special scientific interest if you tried hard enough. I am sure you are aware that Government policy states “Traveller sites temporary or permanent in the Greenbelt are
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3552/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Miss Lisa K Hall</td>
<td>Policy Change</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3563/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Michael Gorman</td>
<td>Policy Change</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3566/01/007/DM43.4/O | Maureen Wilcox | Object  | Soundness - Justified | 502  | Happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but will be objecting to building on precious open space. Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is). |
| 3568/01/004/DM43.4/O | Mr Mike Jones  | Object  | DM43.4  | 502  | Why build gypsy encampments? They are travellers and should be encouraged to continue travelling. If such land is available then it should be for social or normal housing                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| 3570/01/004/DM43.4/O | Mr & Mrs Adams | Object  | DM43.4  | 502  | It is entirely inappropriate to consider creating Gypsy/Traveller sites in these locations. Not only are these greenbelt sites, they are also very close to residential areas and several schools. In August, the Government published “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites” in which Policy E states: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. |
| 3574/01/002/DM43.4/O | Mr Peter Newsham | Object  | DM43.4  | 502  | I am a resident of Shirley and I wish to register my objection in the strongest possible terms to proposed developments in Shirley and to add my voice to that of my MP, Mr Gavin Barwell, whose views on this matter I echo.

The proposed Travellers’ site, ref. 502, contravenes present legislation because they are in the Green Belt and are therefore classed in Government documents as ‘Inappropriate development’. Does the Council propose to break the law as well as ride roughshod over massive public objection to this plan? |

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Road.

None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I wish to object to some of the proposals in the Croydon Local Plan as follows.

I object to the proposal (policy DM44.2 Table 11.17) to create a Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane next to Coombe Wood Gardens (site 661) and/or Coombe Farm (site 502). Policy E of "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites" published by the Government in August states that "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". This would not comply with Policy SPF:7a and SPF:7b. Previous scenes from Traveller sites demonstrate that they end up as dump; not the sort of image we want to portray for Croydon.

I object to the proposed loss of Green Belt status for (1) Coombe Playing Fields - (site ref 662) and object to the proposal for development in Policy DM44.2 Table 11.17 (2) Croham Hurst - this is a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation (3) Sanderstead Plantation. The de-designation of these sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

I object to the proposed loss of Local Area of Special Character protection for many roads such as West Hill, Campden and Spencer Roads, the Woodcote Estates and Hartley Farm. Loss of protection will open up these roads to inappropriate development. Roads, such as Oakwood Avenue in Purley should also be included as new Local Heritage Areas.

I object to the possible "Garden Grabbing" that policy DM2 will make much easier. National and London policy classifies gardens as green field, but the proposed new policy DM2 says that the Council will allow building on gardens. We need to keep our green spaces.

I also object to the proposed retail development of the old "Good Companions Pub" site in Hamsey Green, which the proposed policy DM4 1.3 table 11.14 (site 306) would allow. A retail outlet in such a location would cause traffic chaos. It will be far better to develop it as a residential site (with ample parking) and in character with other housing in the area - not a block of flats.
On the question of parking, I note that some new developments do not seem to cater for this. Green Dragon House being a typical example. All new developments should provide for ample parking for residents and their families.

Please take the above comments into account when assessing the proposed Croydon Local Plan.

Yours faithfully
All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. I am concerned that all three sites are also some considerable walking distance away from GP practices, shops, schools, public transport and other local services which would be contrary to the Council’s Health and Wellbeing Strategy.

Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Ms J Doran

Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 502

As a supplier to Oaks Farm I am objecting to the use of Coombe Farm as a Gypsy and Traveller site.

The site is in Green Belt and is contrary to national policy that says that Gypsy and Traveller sites are inappropriate development in Green Belt.

There is a long history of planning application refusals and avoidance of planning permission at Coombe Farm.

The access road is single track and not suitable for larger mobile homes, or trucks, cars, vans or trailers.

There is no safe walking route to schools, shops or doctors as there is no pavement and very poor lighting when dark. Local schools are oversubscribed and too far away.

The land is in private ownership and any funds spent on purchasing the site by Croydon Council could surely be better spent elsewhere on behalf of the population of Croydon.

Several businesses which make a big contribution to the local economy and provide much needed amenity to the public will be detrimentally affected by the site.

There could be up to three families per pitch as won't be controlled by planning condition and this would overwhelm the residents of Oaks Farm, Oaks Road and Oaks Lane and would not be cohesive to social cohesion.

Mrs J Horton

Object DM43.4 502

I wish to log my objection to the borough-wide planned changes Croydon Council are proposing to make in their Local Plans for 2016-2036. These proposals are 750 new homes in Shirley Oaks and 35 new homes on the Shrublands Estate. Also the proposed work to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Coombe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Coombe Road.

Ms J Fasham

Object DM43.4 502

I object to the use of these locations as traveller sites, as they are both in green belt land and one of them borders a site of Nature Conservation interest, this is clearly in breach of policy E. Both sites are some distance from Public Services and the road here could not cope with more traffic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3715/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Jenny Tighe</td>
<td>Object would also like to object to the following applications for traveller sites. Application numbers: 502, 661 and 755. All three are in green belt land and therefore inappropriate developments and should not be allowed to go ahead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3720/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr J Wilkinson</td>
<td>Object I would like to object to these proposals in particular as they seriously impinge on The Green Belt. They would be inappropriate development and not comply with relevant Policy. They are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Where I live in The Ballards Farm Area there is a significant number of development proposals annually - mainly back garden development - all with negative implications for the valuable Green Belt. Croydon needs more not less. “Protecting the borough’s open space and the (sic) distinctive heritage and character, alongside the necessary infrastructure to mitigate the impact of growth” is in everyone’s long term interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3723/01/008/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs J Middleton</td>
<td>Object I object to the use of the site for a gypsy and traveller site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3724/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Mike Marcroft</td>
<td>Object Please do not allow the above to settle on Green Belt land. There must be other sites in the Borough that can be made available. Our Green Belt land is precious to us all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3728/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Sarah McNamara</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3735/01/010/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Tim Duce</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3738/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Tina Ferron</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3739/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Tom Tannion</td>
<td>I wish to register the strongest possible objection to the specific proposals in the Croydon Local Plan proposing a school or gypsy site at Conduit Lane, and a Gypsy site at Coombe Farm. Regarding Conduit Lane, clearly, Niccolo Machiavelli would have been proud of the tactic of proposing a gypsy site or a school there. Presumably, the thought was that people are gullible enough to believe that these are either / or proposals!! They are certainly as different as chalk and cheese. I consider both options to be unhelpful, inappropriate and out of keeping with the current use of the area. I am also generally surprised that they are considered viable options worthy of serious consideration as they appear random in nature and devoid of any real local knowledge. Regarding both gypsy site proposals, neither are in keeping with the existing ‘texture’ of the areas. They add nothing to the quality of life of local residents (quite the contrary) and generally they are so out of keeping with the current general use enjoyed by those neighbourhoods that one is left wondering how they even made it into a plan?! Were the proposals drawn up by someone completely ignorant of the area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3743/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Bryan Baker</td>
<td>SP2.7 makes no mention of impact on the surroundings of the site and nearby residents. Accordingly, an additional criterion should be added. Must be entirely acceptable in relation to its impact on nearby public spaces and residents and businesses in the area. If this were included the proposals Ref. 502, Coombe Farm, would immediately be seen to be inappropriate. Coombe Farm is green belt land in Lloyd Park, left to the people of Croydon by the Lloyd family and where families enjoy the open space, kids play in the play area, joggers, dog walkers and other walkers exercise, sports are played, families snack in the café and everyone feels reasonably safe. I consider both Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nursery as wholly inappropriate places to locate gypsies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Objector</td>
<td>Soundness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/007</td>
<td>Diane Simpson</td>
<td>Justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01/001</td>
<td>Juliet Stevenson</td>
<td>Justified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Michael Eldridge

Object

DM43.4

502

I am making representations against the proposed Travellers' sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane, Coombe Road, South Croydon, CR0 5RQ (Site reference number: 661) and at Coombe Farm, Oaks Road, Shirley, CR0 5HL (Site reference number: 502). Both these proposed sites are within the Green Belt and the proposals are contrary to Government policy (Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites) which states that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.’ In addition the areas in question form a particularly precious ‘green lung’ not far from the centre of Croydon and any development would in my view be deleterious to this amenity. I cannot suggest alternative suggested sites but would prefer one that is not within Green Belt/Metropolitan Open land, of which I understand there are several in the Borough of Croydon.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Moyra Ruffell

Object

DM43.4

502

I am emailing you to express my concerns about Croydon Council’s Plans to build Gypsy/Traveller sites in Green Belt areas. I understand that there is a great need for housing in the Croydon area and that the number of homeless people in Croydon is high. However, I need assurance that in providing this need we do not destroy our few remaining green spaces as these are vital to the well-being of our environment and people’s health. When I received the information about these proposals from my MP and local residents’ association I had been away from home and so have not studied these plans in depth. However, with the information I have I cannot visualize how these proposals would work without destroying the character of the Shirley area and the destruction of our few remaining green areas.

In order for me to agree to these proposals I would not only require the assurance that these environmental issues were taken into account but the homes that are planned for were affordable to those who are in need of a home, and that they were of good quality, energy efficient homes. Finally, having lived in Shirley for many years I have seen the increase in traffic which has brought about an increase in air pollution which is detrimental to our health. This is another important factor that has to be borne in mind when increasing the density of the population of the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 502</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3754/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Myra Rand</td>
<td>I fully oppose the proposals to build on green land, especially for travellers' sites.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3756/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Neil Stevenson</td>
<td>I am objecting the following proposed sites:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Coombe Lodge Nurseries (Site Reference Number 661)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Coombe Farm (Site Reference Number 502)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The reasons for my objection are on the following grounds:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is an inappropriate use of Green Belt land and the proposals are contrary to the Government policy (Policy E of the Planning Policy for Traveller sites) which states that &quot;Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Selection of proposed sites should have a bias towards Brownfield or Industrial land not Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining owners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is a lack of relevant amenities close at hand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is a lack of local infrastructure to accommodate the plans and additional traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All the proposed sites are in the south of the borough with these two in particular being very close together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is already an existing permanent site in Latham's Way which could be expanded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3757/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Kavinda Pelpola</td>
<td>I live on Coombe Lane in Croydon and would like to formally object to the proposal to build traveller sites at Coombe Farm (off Oaks Road) and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane. I believe these proposals will change the character of this area which I live in significantly for the worse. I also understand that the proposals are contrary to Government policy (Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller sites) which states that traveller sites, temporary or permanent, may not be built on Green Belt land.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. It is in a green belt area. National guidelines say that travellers/gypsy sites in the greenbelt are inappropriate development.

2. There is a long history of planning application refusals and avoidance of planning permission at Coombe Farm. The reasons for this should be re-visited.

3. The site is on a single track lane with a very narrow access onto Oaks Road which is not suitable for large mobile homes, or the additional traffic from travellers’ trucks, cars, vans and trailers as well.

4. The site has no safe walking route to schools, shops, doctors, etc. There is no pavement along Oaks Lane and very poor lighting when dark. There is only partial pavement on one side of the road along Oaks Road as well.

5. The size of the pitches would accommodate far greater number of caravans than can be controlled by planning restrictions.

6. Even if the restrictions are adhered to, there could be as many as three families on each pitch, allowing for 60 mobile homes. This would totally overwhelm the residents of Oaks Farm, Oaks Road and Oaks Lane and would not be conducive to social cohesion.

7. The proposed site is not within the required distance to both schooling and medical needs. The closest schools are oversubscribed so would be unable to meet the needs of so many new children to the area.

8. The land is in private ownership at Coombe Farm, and any funds spent on “compulsory or otherwise” purchase could surely be spent more wisely on behalf of the population of Croydon.

9. Several businesses which make a big contribution to the local economy and also provide much needed amenity to the public will be detrimentally affected by the site.
Mr John Clarke

Object

DM43.4
502

Not in line with Government planning policy on the Green Belt Detail:
- Government planning policy with regards to traveller sites wants to ensure that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development.
- The proposal to create a permanent traveller site on land designated as Green Belt land is contrary to Policy E of the Planning Policy: “Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances.”. There are no very special circumstances.
- The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the “very special circumstances” justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt.
- The local character description is clearly at odds with the proposal.
- The justification acknowledges the Green Belt issue, though insufficiently, but relies on the fact that there are existing structures. These are not in fact substantial “being glasshouses” and could be said to be at least environmentally consistent with the Green Belt. But there is no very special circumstance justification proposed as required by Planning Policies.
- Approving the proposal would set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to be subject to similar development. It is not in the community’s interests to allow the erosion of the green spaces surrounding the community and we object to the impact this site could have on the environment and wildlife.
In the light of these issues, it is not appropriate simply to weight Green Belt as one of many factors to be considered, but rather it presents an overarching policy objection that cannot be over-ridden in the way proposed. To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now and we do not believe that The Assessment and selection of sites for Gypsy and Travellers undertaken was credible. Plan makers have not considered the time it will take to commence development on site need for infrastructure improvements-roads.There is basis for challenging the way in which this potential site has been selected.
Para 3.1: Green Belt sites included for review of eligible sites “to ensure that all locations for a site considered”, but at the same time...
"Exclusion of sites in Croydon Metropolitan Centre and within District Centres and Strategic Industrial Locations and Conservation Areas due to viability, deliverability and impact on heritage considerations". Is this even-handed? Para 4.1 sets out the criteria and weightings. As indicated above, Green Belt with no built form is given a weighting (-10) which, though high, is not very significant given that there are 29 or 30 criteria and can easily be outweighed by other factors that are less significant in policy terms.

SP2.7 on the Council's proposals to deliver 39 additional gypsy and traveller sites indicates that land will be allocated in accordance with the proposals, but that any ADDITIONAL sites that are not so allocated should meet some stated criteria, including good access to local shops and essential services and good transport access; these seem to be criteria that were excluded from the proposed allocation, suggesting that any alternative proposals would need to meet stiffer criteria. Is this fair and even-handed?

The bases for site criteria weightings are unclear. Note that paragraph 4.19 in referring to the need for good access to roads, states that "they often need to move larger vehicles as part of their livelihood and way of life" - this may be an assertion relevant to the assessment of sites and the narrowness of Coombe Lane.

The objections may be summarized as:

- inappropriate use of Green Belt land
- lack of relevant amenities close to hand
- adverse effect on neighboring businesses and leisure amenities
- site has a more appropriate use for a school

Mr & Mrs Chambers

Object

DM43.4 502

The proposed Traveller Sites are totally inappropriate developments for these Green Belt Areas. We strongly object to this part of the Croydon Plan.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Given what I have recently observed at an illegal Traveller occupation at the former Rioja Tapas bar just outside Shirley I object to the use of areas off Oaks Road and Conduit Lane as Traveller sites. References 502 and 661.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
We have lived in the Borough of Croydon for 30 years and value its vibrancy and diversity. As Croydon ratepayers we object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land generally, especially land detailed above, which will change forever Croydon’s character.

We would ask you to encourage policies/development to:

1. Build new housing on brown field sites by all means AND preserve invaluable green space for the benefit of the community of Croydon; 2. Protect green belt land and preserve the green corridors we desperately need for the benefit of wildlife and biodiversity; 3. Amend the tall buildings policy and keep the tall building zone where it is needed in the centre of town; 4. Use brownfield sites for new low-level housing only where it can be developed alongside new GP surgeries, schools and improved public transport; 5. Traveller sites are not appropriate in the green belt and is a clear breach of Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. When travellers camped on Addington Playing Fields in 2012/13 they left rubbish, debris, waste, and deterioration to a local green space. Sadly true of most traveller sites.

"Nowadays people know the price of everything and the value of nothing". Green Belt is vital and precious. Once lost for future generations and will not be replaced by developers.

We understand the need for housing, schools, hospitals and infrastructure. Are the Developers investing these also alongside their building investments?

Please protect our few remaining green spaces on the borough map, by making better use of brown field sites.
Mr & Mrs Wakelam

Object

DM43.4
502

A further inappropriate development of the Green Belt which would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b, and to which we also object, is the proposed use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502, as locations for gypsy and traveller sites.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr David Reid

Object

DM43.4
502

I am writing to object to:

Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502 for use as a gypsy and traveller site, as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b; or with Policy E of "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites" published by Government in August which states "Traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development";

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Jennifer Aarons

Object

DM43.4
502

Both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Jenny Greenland

Object

DM43.4
502

I object to the use of either of the two sites in the Shirley locations or Forestgate as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

"Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development".

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Can I remind you of the definition / meaning of "GREEN BELT": The Government formerly set out its policies and principles towards green belts in England and Wales in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: Green Belts[4] but this planning guidance was superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in March 2012. Planning Authorities are strongly urged to follow the NPPF’s detailed advice when considering whether to permit additional development in the green belt. In the green belt there is a general presumption against inappropriate development, unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated to show that the benefits of the development will outweigh the harm caused to the green belt. The NPPF sets out what would constitute appropriate development in the green belt. According to the NPPF, there are five stated purposes of including land within the green belt:

• To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
• To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another
• To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
• To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
• To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Once an area of land has been defined as green belt, the stated opportunities and benefits include:

• Providing opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population
• Providing opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas
• The retention of attractive landscapes and the enhancement of landscapes, near to where people live
• Improvement of damaged and derelict land around towns
• The securing of nature conservation interests
• The retention of land in agricultural, forestry and related uses.

This is a totally preposterous proposition and I am quite frankly astonished that such a ludicrous idea has been proposed.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.

If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Finally, the Council has identified two locations on the edge of Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites:

- Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, which is identified as suitable for 15-20 pitches (pages 449-450, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 502); and
- Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, which is identified as suitable for 15-25 pitches (pages 468-469, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 661).

I vigorously object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As you have to be aware, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

“Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question – there must be more suitable sites which are closer to local amenities (there is nothing in the way of shops or even a bus-stop at these sites, necessitating extra vehicular traffic on an already busy road at best or pedestrians attempting to cross at a very dangerous point with blind bends and junctions at worst), sites which are not in Green Belt land, perhaps even sites which already exist and could be expanded (such as the one on Purley Way).

Again, I stress that I am not opposed to development as such, and applaud the efforts that the council is making to build on the work of the previous administration and improve Croydon yet further. But these proposals go too far, and in my opinion they go in the wrong direction.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object DM43.4

Fourth, the Council has identified two locations on the edge of Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites:
- Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, which is identified as suitable for 15-20 pitches (pages 449-450, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 502);

and

I object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object DM43.4

We understand our local Member of Parliament, Mr Gavin Barwell, has produced a comprehensive assessment and objection to the Proposed Croydon Local Plan. We agree and support his objections.

In particular the proposed positions of the Gypsy/Travellers' encampments (Refs 502 + 661) would be in suburban residential/Green Belt areas and as such are totally unacceptable. The most suitable positioning could be near Recycling Centres and situated in commercial/factory estates where the Travellers' encampments would not impinge upon residential properties.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
It is in a green belt area. National guidelines say that travellers/gypsy sites in the greenbelt are inappropriate development. There is a long history of planning application refusals and avoidance of planning permission at Coombe Farm. The reasons for this should be re-visited.

The site is on a single track lane with a very narrow access onto Oaks Road which is not suitable for large mobile homes, or the additional traffic from travellers trucks, cars, vans and trailers as well. The site has no safe walking route to schools, shops, doctors, etc. There is no pavement along Oaks Lane and very poor lighting when dark. There is only partial pavement on one side of the road along Oaks Road as well. The size of the pitches would accommodate far greater number of caravans than can be controlled by planning restrictions. Even if the restrictions are adhered to, there could be as many as three families on each pitch allowing for 60 mobile homes. This would totally overwhelm the residents of Oaks Farm, Oaks Road and Oaks Lane and would not be conducive to social cohesion. The proposed site is not within the required distance to both schooling and medical needs. The closest schools are oversubscribed so would be unable to meet the needs of so many new children to the area. The land is in private ownership at Coombe Farm, and any funds spent on 'compulsory or otherwise' purchase could surely be spent more wisely on behalf of the population of Croydon. Several businesses which make a big contribution to the local economy and also provide much needed amenity to the public will be detrimentally affected by the site.

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 6 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I object to the use of the following sites as gypsy/traveller sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, which is identified as suitable for 15-20 pitches (pages 449-450, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 502); and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, which is identified as suitable for 15-25 pitches (pages 468-469, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 661).

I object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.” The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr Ian Leonard

Object

DM43.4

502

Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, which is identified as suitable for 15-20 pitches (pages 449-450, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 502); I object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.” The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough, which I believe is questionable, they should look elsewhere (for example, off Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mrs & Mrs Linter

Object

DM43.4

502

I object to Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, which is identified as suitable for 15-20 pitches (pages 449-450, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 502); I object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.” The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough, which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3821/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Richard Kellaway</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3824/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Stephen Lambert</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3825/01/006/DM43.4/S</td>
<td>Yasmeen Hanifa</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>I write to you having received this email from Gavin Barwell MP, the tone of which I find inflammatory and discriminatory towards the Gypsy and Traveller communities, and smacks of “not in my backyard”. I write as a resident of Addiscombe who recognises the huge problem of lack of affordable housing to buy and to rent in London promulgated by this Conservative government and the previous coalition government. I fully support Croydon Council’s proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3826/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms L Pinkney</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I write in objection to the following Policies and proposals in the draft Croydon Local Plan Ref. No 502 Coombe Farm Oaks Road - I object to the use of these locations as traveller sites, as they are both in green belt land and one of them borders a site of Nature Conservation interest, this is clearly in breach of policy E. Both sites are some distance from Public Services and the road here could not cope with more traffic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I would like to object to Policy DM 44 and DM 43 for proposing Gypsy and traveller sites on the Conduit Lane nursery and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road. Both sites are located on the Green Belt and clearly considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and against Government Policy. There are no very special circumstances that have been advanced by the council to allow the use of this land. It is not in the local community’s interest to erode the Green Belt and would set a worrying precedent for future planning applications. This is not deliverable on either sites and they are clearly not a suitable location for development and the council has not taken into account the time it would take to bring the plan to fruition. There is a lot of implications for the local area that don’t seem to have been taken into account: the road network is at capacity, local amenities are not ready to take an increase in demand (no space in local primary schools). The council has provided little credibility in the assessments that due diligence had been done regarding the sites; do we need an Environmental Impact Assessment to safeguard the local Coombe Gardens? How much would it cost to mitigate the impact of the sites on this local SNCI? Impact on Lloyd Park? These two sites are not sustainable in the fact that they do not seem to meet the Gypsies and travellers needs. There are not enough local amenities for this community (where are the local shops they can walk to? Where are the local doctors they can walk to? What school would the children go to?).

The proposed developments also compromise the future of the local area and are therefore not sustainable. There are an awful lot of issues that the council doesn’t seem to have taken into account when looking at both sites of Conduit Lane and Oak Farm. The sites seem to be too big for what the travellers community express preference for. The sites are too far for local amenities that they prefer to walk to. The local road network would not be safe for moving/larger vehicles. Coombe Lane is incredibly busy all day long and is too narrow to provide safe entrance and exit to larger vehicles. The visibility at the entrance and exit of the sites is not good enough to ensure there will be no accidents. The junction of Coombe Road / Oaks road and Conduit Lane is dangerous enough as it currently is.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
The council doesn't seem to have taken into account that travellers sites are generally mixed-use employment sites and does not address how commercial activities on site would be compatible with surrounding Green belt land and local SNCI. How can the council safeguard these local lands from waste materials and possible hazardous materials?
We believe that instead of both Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm, the Council should consider the following sites:

1. Heath Clark playing fields, Stafford Road, Waddon
2. Timebridge Community Centre, Field Way, New Addington
3. Land adjacent to 103 Goodenough Way, The Admirals Walk, Old Coulsdon
4. Wandle Road surface car park, Wandle Road, Croydon Opportunity Area
5. Land of former Croydon Airport runway, south of Imperial Way, Waddon
6. Land adjacent to Ashburton playing fields at rear of 2-88 Copley Road, Addiscombe
7. By Pavilion Playing Fields, Purley Way, Waddon
8. Land south of Threehalfpenny Woods, Kent Gate Way, Bridge Way, Addington
9. Land west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, Elsmore, Addington
10. Cane Hill-south part, Hollymeak Road / Portnalls Road, Coulsdon

Although a number of these following sites may be Green Belt / Metropolitan Open Land, this should not preclude them, as they could be re-designated.
- Where is the evidence that there is need for a site at these particular locations? This information has not been provided.
- When will the detailed site plans be made available? If not available at the start of the consultation period then this is surely a serious breach of government planning guidelines.

Ms M de Villiers  

Object Soundness - Consistent with National DM43.4 502  

I also object to the following policies in relation to Shirley (neighbouring area to where I live):

- Both proposed traveller sites are in the Green Belt and thus inappropriate as they are in breach on the Government Policy E, in relation to Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. They are also far from public services. I suggest the existing site on Purley way is reconsidered.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Lee Kirby-Walker  

Object DM43.4 502  

I am writing to object to:

The use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:

- Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502
- Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Cllr M Gatland  

Object Soundness - Consistent with National DM43.4 502  

I wish to object to the following:

The use of the following as traveller or gypsy sites Coombe Lodge Nurseries site ref 661 Coombe Farm. Site ref 502 This is inappropriate development on Greenbelt.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Sites are located on the Green Belt, considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and against Government Policy ("Planning policy for traveller sites", DCLG, August 2015): the proposal to create a permanent traveller site on land designated as Green Belt land is contrary to Policy E of the Planning Policy. Inappropriate development, harmful to the Green Belt, should only be approved in very special circumstances. There are no very special circumstances that have been, or can be, advanced to allow the use of this land (The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) does NOT constitute exceptional circumstance).

Inappropriate development is clearly harmful to the Green Belt. It is not in the surrounding community's interest for the Green Belt to be eroded - approving this application would also set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to be subject to similar planning applications. Negative impact on the local environment and wildlife. Inappropriate to simply weight Green Belt as one of many factors to be considered in the assessment process, rather it presents a policy objection that cannot be over-ridden in the way proposed.

To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, and offer a suitable location for development now. The site is clearly not a suitable location for development. Plan makers have not considered the time it will take to commence development on site. Need for infrastructure improvements (roads), need for local amenities improvement (primary school, doctor)

Plan makers have not considered the time and necessity to show due diligence in assessing the sites: need for an Environmental Impact Assessment (this would be a schedule 2 development having significant effects on the environment and needing an EIA), need for a Local Biodiversity Action plan to determine the sensitivity of the location. Plan makers have not ensured that the process has credibility and acceptance: the bases for site criteria weightings are unclear. Plan makers will need to provide robust, up to date evidence to support the deliverability of sites, ensuring that their judgements on Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present, without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

The proposed development does not meet the needs of the present: Gypsies and Travellers needs are not addressed: not enough local amenities, sites are too big, unfit local roads.

Government planning policy is to ensure local planning authorities have due regard to the protection of local amenities and the local environment. It is likely the proposals will have an adverse effect on local businesses. Coombe Wood is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) (List of Historical Park and Gardens 2008) and borders the proposed Coombe Lodge Nurseries site, and would be negatively impacted by the plans. Croydon Council has already recognised this in its Development Management Policies document.

The Borough Character Appraisal of 2015, the local area is listed as having special character. The proposed development is not sensitive to, and does not respect, this.

The site is not deliverable. The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsies and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
deliverability are clearly and transparently set out. Plan makers have not taken the cost and time needed to mitigate the impact of the development on the sites. Croydon Council has already recognised in its Development Management Policies document that the Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) which borders the Coombe Lodge Nurseries Site, Coombe Wood (List of Historical Park and Gardens 2008) would be negatively impacted by the proposed development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>DM43.4 502</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3858/01/04/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Nicholas Barnes</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3862/01/011/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr M Blount</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3868/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Angi Pyart</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Road.

None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.

I have considered details of the proposed Croydon Local Plan and have the following objections on the basis that they will: detract from the local areas, dramatically change the character of local areas, have a significant adverse effect on an already overloaded infrastructure, including roads, public transport, public open space, environment and emergency, health and support services.

5. I object to the three proposed provision of Traveller sites at Conduit Lane, Coombe Farm and Featherbed Lane.

I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
We understand that there are plans to change the designation of areas of Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land - in particular two areas identified as locations for gypsy/traveller sites at Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane. Such plans would fundamentally change the character of the area for the worse.

We wish to register our objections to these plans since the proposals are contrary to Government policy (Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller sites) which states that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.’

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Summary:
Not in line with Government planning policy regarding the use of Green Belt land.

Detail:
• Government planning policy with regards to traveller sites wants to ensure that plan-making and decision-taking should protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development.

• The proposal to create a permanent traveller site on land designated as Green Belt land is contrary to Policy E of the Planning Policy: "Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances." There are no very special circumstances.

• The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the "very special circumstances" justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt.

• The local character description is clearly at odds with the proposal.

• The justification acknowledges the Green Belt issue, though insufficiently, but relies on the fact that there are existing structures. These are not in fact substantial – being glasshouses – and could be said to be at least environmentally consistent with the Green Belt. But there is no very special circumstance justification proposed as required by Planning Policies.

• Approving the proposal would set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to be subject to similar development. It is not in the community’s interests to allow the erosion of the green spaces surrounding the community and we object to the impact this site could have on the environment and wildlife.

In the light of these issues, it is not appropriate simply to weight Green Belt as one of many factors to be considered, but rather it presents an overarching policy objection that cannot be over-ridden in the way proposed.

The decision making process is contrary to Government guidance.

To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now.

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
and we do not believe that the Assessment and selection of sites for Gypsy and Travellers undertaken was credible.

Plan makers have not considered the time it will take to commence development on site need for infrastructure improvements – roads
There is a basis for challenging the way in which this potential site has been selected.
1 Para 3.1 – Green Belt sites included for review of eligible sites “to ensure that all locations for a site considered”, but at the same time “Exclusion of sites in Croydon Metropolitan Centre and within District Centres and Strategic Industrial Locations and Conservation Areas due to viability, deliverability and impact on heritage considerations”. Is this even-handed?

4 Para 4.1 sets out the criteria and weightings. As indicated above, Green Belt with no built form is given a weighting (-10) which, though high, is not very significant given that there are 29 or 30 criteria and can easily be outweighed by other factors that are less significant in policy terms. Furthermore, Coombe farm has been weighted -5 for Green Belt, in recognition of the fact that there are some structures on the site, AND has been given 5 for the fact that (in the assessor’s view) such structures as there are can be converted to traveller use (if the buildings had to be demolished, on a green field site, this would have attracted -5).

1 SP2.7 on the Council’s proposals to deliver 39 additional gypsy and traveller sites indicates that land will be allocated in accordance with the proposals, but that any ADDITIONAL sites that are not so allocated should meet some stated criteria, including good access to local shops and essential services and good transport access; these seem to be criteria that were excluded from the proposed allocation, suggesting that any alternative proposals would need to meet stiffer criteria. Is this fair and even-handed?

2 The bases for site criteria weightings are unclear.

Inadequate Road Access which is an issue made particularly acute because of the current traffic issues in the area

10.14 Based on survey responses, most Gypsies and Travellers living in the Croydon area would prefer small,
family sized sites. Stakeholder comments suggested that smaller sites have fewer inter-family tensions and are therefore easier to manage.

10.18 The settled community neighbouring the sites should also be involved in the consultation from an early stage. There may be scope for expanding existing sites to meet some of the need. However, the preference is for smaller sites which tend to be easier to manage.

10.19 In terms of identifying broad locations for new sites, there are a number of factors which could be considered including:

- Social
- School catchment areas

10.21 Gypsies and Travellers undertaking the survey also suggested that it is important that new sites are located close to amenities such as shops, schools and health facilities – the current proposal does not meet the needs identified by this criteria.

10.22 CLG (2012) guidance suggests that Local planning authorities should strictly limit new traveller site development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements.

The Croydon Local Plan Note that paragraph 4.19 in referring to the need for good access to roads, states that “they often need to move larger vehicles as part of their livelihood and way of life” – this may be an assertion relevant to the assessment of sites and the narrowness of Coombe farm.

mixed-use employment sites restrict commercial activities on site.

Use of public transport amongst Gypsies and Travellers has been noted to be low, by providing sites in more accessible locations.

Pressure on public services, local school and medical facilities

other needs of Gypsies/Travellers are not met. particular concerns for the disabled and elderly, young people. A recent study states that: There is a greater incidence of ill-health amongst Gypsies and Travellers adequate services would not be are provided for Gypsies/Travellers. It is widely recognised by government sources that literacy can be an issue within the Gypsy/Traveller community, - extra pressure on local schools who are over-subscribed as it is
Some evidence of periodic overcrowding on site – year round and at peak in winter months - Scotland

gypsy-traveller.org - The best type of land is a ‘brown field’ site. The site should be close to local amenities. It is very important that the site has a safe entrance and exit. There are very strict Highway regulations about visibility at the entrance/exit to sites to ensure there is no danger of accidents and this is very important.

The objections may be summarized as:
- inappropriate use of Green Belt land
- lack of relevant amenities close to hand
- adverse effect on neighbouring businesses and leisure amenities
- site has a more appropriate use for a school
- critical increase in traffic harming the local area
- proposed site does not meet the criteria as set down in the guidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3874/01/003/DM43.4/O Carol Winterburn</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites (policy DM44.2, Table 11.17): Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; Both sites are on Green Belt land, in contravention of Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”, published by the Government in August, and in addition are in areas devoid of local amenities especially primary schooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3876/01/010/DM43.4/O Edwina Morris</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I object to the use of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road Ref: 502 as a gypsy/traveller site. The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3877/01/02</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Mrs Robin Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3878/01/02</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Imran Mahmood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3880/01/01</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Emma Bean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3881/01/02</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Mrs Julia White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3882/01/02</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Wendy Moulton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object in the strongest possible way to the plans outlined for this development in my local area, Shirley and Addiscombe. In particular, I understand the Council has identified two locations on the edge of Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites:

- Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, which is identified as suitable for 15-20 pitches (pages 449-450, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 502);

I object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

“Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough, I think they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 502</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I understand that Council has identified two new locations on the edge of Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites: - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, which is identified as suitable for 15-20 pitches. I object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the green belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’.

The Council's approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified DM43.4 502</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7c;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Ms M Bailey

Object

DM43.4

502

It is a green belt area. National guidelines say that travellers sites in the greenbelt are inappropriate development. Even if the properties are demolished to provide for the pitches there will still be a large spill over into the Green Belt. This means that planning permission should not be available. The site is on a single-track lane with a very narrow access onto Oaks Road that the large mobile homes will not be able to access. The lane is also used by aggregate lorries (shorter than mobile homes), local residents, members of the sports ground and opposing teams and visitors to Lloyd Park, a much loved public amenity. The site has no safe walking route to schools, shops, doctors etc. There is no pavement along Oaks Lane and very poor lighting when dark. There is only partial pavement on one side of the road along Oaks Road. How will it be possible to safeguard so many additional people including a great number of children? This development is unsustainable, as everyone will have to use cars to access the basic of life. The size of the pitches would accommodate a far greater number of caravans than can be controlled by planning restrictions. Even if the restrictions are adhered to there could be as many as three families on each pitch. With planning for 20 pitches this would mean 60 families and 60 mobile homes, not to mention additional caravans in two, trucks, vans, trailer and cars.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Jan Payne

Object

DM43.4

502

Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502; As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is);

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the landowners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We wish to object to the proposal to establish traveller sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries (site ref no. 661) and Coombe Farm (site reference 502).

Such use of these sites would, we feel, be inappropriate in the Green Belt, and contrary to Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b, and not consistent with Policy E of the Government's "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites".

The road hazards that would be associated with such use would require additional expenditure by the Council to resolve.
The sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Ms E Rudduck

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller site on Coombe Farm off Oaks Road Ref 502.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
1. Central Government is currently reviewing the approach to providing gypsy/traveller sites and so any proposals in the local plan should be subject to future government guidance.

2. Both sites are in the Green Belt and are contrary to Government policy which says that temporary or permanent gypsy/traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

3. Gypsy/traveller sites in both locations are completely out of character with the immediate surroundings - parkland, private schools, hotel, playing fields, golf course, middle/high value housing.

4. Access to public transport is poor - no buses and 15 minutes to the nearest tram stop.

5. Local doctors are difficult to get into.

6. There are no government schools nearby.

7. There are no shops within reasonable distance - closest are in Croydon town centre.

8. The evaluation system used to select the two sites is highly questionable and relies on LBCC views of the relative importance of each criteria and then the points given. This form of weighted scoring is useful in giving guidance but not in delivering precise conclusions. It appears as if the wishes of the gypsy/travellers have been given more importance than those of local people. It would be interesting to see which sites were selected if more weight had been given to local interests and therefore how robust the evaluation system is to changes in how the criteria are viewed and scored.

9. Both sites will inevitably have a negative impact on property values.

10. Both sites pose a perceived increased security risk in the area.

11. Re site 661 the local plan in its justification says "the gypsy and traveller site will provide no greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt than the existing buildings". Impact does not only apply to the visual impact. Even on this narrow criteria it is hard to envisage the development from gypsy/traveller sites having a similar impact as the existing use which is periodic during the day and very much related to nature. Using the site for gypsy/travellers would mean a much higher overall impact on the local area - regular access, high activity, and a use out of character with the surrounding area, particularly the Site of Nature Conservation Interest.

12. Re site 502 the comment re "no greater impact" also applies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 502</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3904/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Golbourn</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am writing to object to the proposed use of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road (reference number 502) and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane (reference number 661) as gipsy/traveller sites. I believe that both of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. We should not encroach on the Green Belt. Surely there must be brownfield sites that could be used instead.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3907/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Foggo</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td></td>
<td>We are writing to object to The use of the locations (Coombe farm ref 502 and Coombe lodge nurseries drew 661) as gipsy/travellers sites. It would drastically change the area's local character (policyDM31.4). We are very concerned by these plans and it is our opinion that these areas don't suit for travellers sites at all.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3918/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Willis</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td></td>
<td>I strongly object to these proposals as they would both be in the Green Belt and one of them borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: &quot;Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development&quot;. Therefore the Council's approach is clearly in breach of that policy. The Council should instead consider expanding the existing site off the Purley Way.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms L Chatfield</td>
<td>I am writing my objections development on the following sites as a resident as well as in my capacity as Warden of Croydon Ecology Centre. The sites are in areas that are essential foraging grounds for wildlife, including badgers, which are a protected species. I believe that they are also all on Green Belt Land. I realise that local authorities are being given new powers that allows them to build on parts of Green Belt Land, but I sincerely believe that this will be a terrible mistake, for which future generations will not thank us. These sites are also part of one of the very few large stretches of open green spaces so close to the centre of Croydon, which makes an huge difference to the air quality in our town and to the visual aspect thereof. There is ample evidence to prove that these green urban spaces are essential for the mental well-being of crowded cities. All the open green spaces are there for the benefit of all Croydon's residents and those visiting our Borough, by building on them you are taking away this right from people all over the Borough. Please think again and make use of brown field sites instead. By using brown field sites you have the opportunity improve those sites with well planned and laid out housing and amenities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr E Thompson</td>
<td>Soundness - Consistent with National</td>
<td>The Council's preferred option for this site would breach UDP Policies RO1 and RO2. It is also based on a points scoring system that affords insufficient weight to the protection and preservation of the Green Belt, and no weight to harm to amenity of the surrounding area, including impact on nearby public spaces, residents, schools and businesses. It would not comply with Policies B and E of Planning for Travellers Sites, the government guidance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
The site does have existing brick buildings including the grade listed Coombe Farmhouse. The proposed volume of 15 - 20 pitches, each individual pitch requiring a sizeable plot to accommodate a mobile home / touring caravan, a utility brick building and ample space for parking cars / vans. This would mean the proposed planning would exceed the current built on area and therefore, the Green Belt land would be lost. The Coombe Farmhouse is also noted in many historical books of Croydon. It is my understanding that the current owner has lodged numerous planning applications over the years which had been denied by the Council. Please can the Council clearly describe why they are now prepared to change the use of land for the gain of fulfilling their Traveller / Gypsy site quota? The site is also currently privately owned. In order for the Council to proceed with their plans they will need to purchase the site. I challenge this use of Croydon’s finance budget as, with all compulsory purchases; the Council should review the return of the investment on any such cost for the benefit of their tax paying community. Increase risk and detrimental impact to the local wildlife such as deer, badgers, newts, toads, hedgehogs, numerous bird life including woodpeckers, owls, herons etc. The range of flora and fauna including protected trees such as the large Oaks all of which form the beautiful unique Addington Hills Public Open Space and adjoining Green Belt area. The site is also situated near open land which has previously been victim to unauthorised Traveller and Gypsy encampments. A thorough review and statement regarding how the Council and Police propose to exercise control over any additional families encamping on unauthorised land surrounding the site must be produced. Through past experience it has been a difficult and lengthy process for the Police, Council and Local Residents. The general public have been denied safe access to public open land or intimidated when using the Tram or Bus stop during these encampment periods. The Council have to pay the Legal and Policing costs of the unauthorised encampment removal, the environmental cost to clean up the rubbish, the consideration of the impact to wildlife and the continued safety of the public to relax and enjoy the open countryside and public services. This site proposes a detrimental impact to local business.
revenue. This was proven during the periods of unauthorised encampments. Oaks Farm is an established countryside wedding venue situated next door to Coombe Farm. The local cafe and gardens have been enjoyed by local families together with some of the long established dining destinations in Croydon. The golf course next to Coombe Farm has also dealt with complaints of aggressive behaviour towards their junior members from unauthorised encampment dwellers so building trust and integration is an important consideration especially due to low levels of the Local Residential population. National guidelines state “that the site should not overwhelm the next nearest settlement”. The proposals clearly would overwhelm the entirety of the settled area and is, therefore, in breach of the guidelines. It is worth noting all the affected businesses rely and up-sell their countryside location as a key benefit to their business and service delivery. Increased traffic at the dangerous junction joining Oaks road and Conduit Lane onto Coombe Road the safety risk is further increased due to the Tram track / crossings situated yards from the junction. The suitability of this site access is limited via the single track road which would require reconfiguration for access to the site due to the type of vehicles used by the Traveller and Gypsy communities. The track road would also require additional lighting for safety of the site residents. Although the Traveller and Gypsy community are against CCTV coverage, the existing cameras on this road must be kept in place due to Croydon’s fly tipping issues. It is also worth noting the lack of immediate access to schools and Doctors surgeries are over a 20 minute walk which is too far in accordance to government guidelines. Coombe Farm should have been excluded due to its Green Belt status and recent planning applications by the current owner. I understand the pressure Croydon Council is under ensuring the regeneration programme goes to plan and budget. I also understand the need to fairly accommodate all communities within the town. However, to me the Councils plans are flawed and serve no good outcome for any party involved.

1. The two site locations are not ideal for the: Traveller / Gypsy Community, Local Residents or Local Businesses and also has a detrimental affect on the wildlife and breaks the policy of the protected green spaces.

2. It will fulfill the Croydon Councils target but if the outcome does not
satisfy any of the groups then the Council have failed in their duty.

3. Traveller sites are recommended to remain for a minimum of 10 years. Due to the increased risks and the close location of the two sites has the Council factored in the on-going additional legal, environmental and policing costs?

4. Coombe Farm's recent planning applicants have not been permitted, is this due to the potential compulsory Council purchase? If the Council do buy this land is it their ultimate objective to sell the land for a housing development? This brings me to question if the wildlife and countryside have to suffer due to the growing human population. Then the best use of purchasing Coombe Farm would be to covert the existing built-on land into a small housing development as part of the Council's housing quota, retaining the Listed Farmhouse. This proposal would provide social and private occupation in a sort after location. Certain risks raised above would still be applicable but a number would be resolved, mainly the Council's housing target and provision of a very good revenue return on the taxpayer investment.
This proposed site is in a green belt area, and national guidelines state that traveller/gypsy sites are an inappropriate development in the green belt. Even if existing properties are demolished to provide the pitches the site would still encroach on green belt land.

The site has no safe walking route to, and is not within a reasonable distance of schools, medical facilities, shops etc. and there does not appear to be any specific plans to increase the numbers of these amenities, nor is there the space to create such amenities in the local area. Oaks Road only has partial footpaths and increased pedestrian use without footpaths will undoubtedly lead to increased chances of road traffic incidents.

The plan is for 20 pitches but the size of the plot could accommodate three times as many unplanned, unauthorised pitches and planning restrictions would not be able to “police” this.

National guidelines also state that such sites should not overwhelm the next nearest settlement. Residents in Oaks Farm, Oaks Road and Oaks Lane will almost certainly be overwhelmed.

We understand that the Council has historically refused countless planning applications. At Coombe Farm yet seems keen to approve this one, the reasons for the refusals need to be addressed if this is accurate.

We feel that the adjacent businesses would be adversely affected by the introduction of this site.

The Council has spent, would assume, hundreds of thousands of pounds both removing unauthorised travellers and clearing the remaining detritus for many years at this and other areas such as the Sunken Road, yet now seems to feel it appropriate to create permanent pitches in the same locations. On a personal note the only time that we have felt intimidated or abused is by travellers illegally pitched in the Sunken Road, what measures and what costs are involved to Croydon Council Tax payers for the inevitable additional policing and refuse removal?

Adjacent to both of these sites are a beautiful landscaped park and an
area of outstanding beauty, home to many species of wildlife with unparalleled open green spaces sorely lacking in other parts of South East London.

We understand that there is an existing travellers site in the Purley Way that is underused and feel that the energy would be better expended in improving the facilities at this site, which is far better suited for public transport etc.

We strongly object to the plans for a permanent travellers site at both of the above locations for the reasons given.

3933/01/01/DM43.4/O Mr & Mrs Thacker

Object | Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502.
        | As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is);

Change | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

3939/01/002/DM43.4/O Seema Jain

Object | Incorrect calculation in selection criteria for site 661 and 502. If site is in Green Belt/MOL built form then site is marked as Amber/Orange which means a score of -5, +5 has been used which increase the rating by 10 points.

Change | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Coombe Farm off Oaks Road
reference number 502;
As the Council acknowledges, all
three of these sites are in the Green
Belt and one of them borders a Site
of Nature Conservation Interest.
Policy E of Planning Policy for
Traveller Sites, published by the
Government in August, says very
clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or
permanent) in the Green Belt are
inappropriate development”. The
Council’s approach is clearly in
breach of that policy. All three sites
are also some distance from public
services and they are all in the same
part of the borough (two are in
Heathfield ward, one just over the
border in Croham). Why has
Heathfield been singled out in this
way? If the Council really needs, as
it claims, to quadruple the number of
gypsy/traveller sites in the borough -
which I would question - they should
look elsewhere (for example, off the
Purley Way where the existing site is);

The site is in private
ownership and the land
owners have indicated they
would not be interested in
developing it as a Gypsy and
Travellers site. As the
deliverability of this site for
Gypsy and Travellers would
now be difficult it will no
longer be considered for this
use.

Coombe Farm off Oaks Road
reference number 502;
As the Council acknowledges, all
three of these sites are in the Green
Belt and one of them borders a Site
of Nature Conservation Interest.
Policy E of Planning Policy for
Traveller Sites, published by the
Government in August, says very
clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or
permanent) in the Green Belt are
inappropriate development”. The
Council’s approach is clearly in
breach of that policy. All three sites
are also some distance from public
services and they are all in the same
part of the borough (two are in
Heathfield ward, one just over the
border in Croham). Why has
Heathfield been singled out in this
way? If the Council really needs, as
it claims, to quadruple the number of
gypsy/traveller sites in the borough -
which I would question - they should
look elsewhere (for example, off the
Purley Way where the existing site is);

The site is in private
ownership and the land
owners have indicated they
would not be interested in
developing it as a Gypsy and
Travellers site. As the
deliverability of this site for
Gypsy and Travellers would
now be difficult it will no
longer be considered for this
use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the landowners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I wish to appeal against the proposed Traveller Sites in Coombe Farm, off Oaks Road, and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane.

As a resident of Oaks Road for over 20 years, I find this proposal extremely poorly planned. This is a Green Belt area, of which I believe building is not permitted. Also, an area of Nature Conservation Interest.

We have had the misfortune several times over the years, of travellers stopping in this area. We have had to put up with noise, litter, and general bad behaviour, including theft from our property. Since Labour have come into power at the council, the litter collection has been severely depleted, leaving our beautiful road a mess. I fear the unwanted traveller sites would only make things worse.

Has anyone checked that the entrance to the site from Oaks Road is extremely narrow, and NOT suitable for large caravans to enter or leave?

Also, the transport links from that area are poor. I suggest this is political, as the sites chosen are in a Conservative held part of the borough.

Please look again at your proposals, and not attempt to damage one of the few remaining green and pleasant parts of this borough.
The site is in a Green Belt area. Traveller/gypsy site are inappropriate in Green Belt areas as per national guidelines. Even in properties there will still be a large overspill in the surrounding Green belt area. The proposed site is off Oaks Road where access is via a very narrow lane. The lane is used by local residents, members of the sports ground and supporting teams and visitors to Lloyds park where the venue is used for charity events. Large mobile homes will not be able to access the site with ease. There is no safe walking route from the site to schools shops, Doctors surgery etc. due to lack of paving along Oaks road. The pavement is only there further up the road. The route is very busy during peak times and any development of this nature will add greatly to the congestion on Oaks road and Coombe lane. The site of the pitch will accommodate a greater number of caravans the controlled by planning restrictions. I feel the restriction will not be adhered to and if they were there would be three families per pitch and with planning for 20 pitches 60 families and additional vans, cars, trucks, trailers. National guidelines state that the site should not overwhelm the nearest settlement. The residents of Oaks Farm, Oaks Road and Oaks lane (all in isolated positions) would certainly be overwhelmed. How will cohesion be achieved with the local residents? I am in the vicinity of Oaks road and I am concerned about conflict between different Travellers. There is a long history of planning refusals and avoidance of planning permission at Coombe Farm. These reasons should be re-visited. The history of unauthorised pitches in neighbouring areas has left bitter resentment as there is a residual mess and threatening behaviour that has accompanied their trespass. I have a retail business in another area and whenever travellers come in they are a degree of pilferage and I can’t see this being any different. There would also be a big worry when pupils go to school and is the council going to take responsibility in case of a confrontation and thing getting out of hand. The proposed site is not within required distance for schooling and medical needs therefore I object on that basis. The land is in Private ownership at Coombe farm and any funds spent on “compulsory or otherwise” should be spent more wisely for the population of Croydon.
We are writing to object to:

1. The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:

   Coombe Farm Site, ref. 502

   This would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b:

   Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”

   The site is on a single track lane with a very narrow access onto Oak Road which the large mobile homes will not be able to access. The lane is also used by local residents, members of the sports ground and visitors to Lloyd Park, a much loved public amenity.

   The site has no safe walking route to schools, shops, doctors etc. There is no pavement along Oaks Lane and vary poor lighting when dark. There is only a partial pavement on one side of the road along Oaks Road as well. How will it be possible to safeguard so many additional people including a great number of children?

   The size of the pitches would accommodate a far greater number of caravans than can be controlled by planning restrictions. Even if the restrictions area adhered to, there could be as many as three families in each pitch. With planning for 20 pitches, this would mean 60 families and 60 mobile homes, if not more.

   National guidelines state that the site should not overwhelm the next nearest settlement. The residents would certainly be overwhelmed. Also, how will social cohesion be achieved with local residents?

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
### Mr N Robinson

Object Soundness - Justified  
DM43.4 502

I have received an e-mail from Steve Murphy regarding the proposed traveller's site close to Shirley Park Golf Club. As a member of the club for 31 years I have seen the rubbish and general mayhem the travellers cause. In the last few years they got into our course and we had children running over the greens and stealing flags. When they left the rubbish was terrible.

Whilst I appreciate they will be on a site you propose, you will not have the manpower to stop the travellers from entering our club grounds and doing anything they want to do.

Perhaps you would like to live near them and see what it is like, just look at the bottom of West Wickham High Street as a good example.

Therefore I am greatly opposed to them being anywhere in the vicinity of Shirley Park Golf Club.

### Ms S Ikpa

Object  
DM43.4 502

I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661, policy number DM44: and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502, policy number DM43 Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference number 755, policy number DM32. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP3.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites eg the site off the Purley Way. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Justified</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3979/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms Olive Anne Bowyer</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ref. 502. Proposed sites for gypsy/travellers in Green belt land. Government policy published in August says very clearly “travellers sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. This is in breach of this policy. Coombe farm and Ref. 755 Featherbed Lane (Pear tree Farm Cottage near to Hutchingsons Nature Reserve) are all Green Belt.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3989/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Thomas</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Consistent with National</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please can I object to the Labour Councils plans to build Gypsy/Traveller Sites in the Green Belt. Why is this Council determined to concrete over the leafy / green areas of Croydon ? We do not need Traveler encampments anywhere near Pear Tree Farm or in Featherbed Lane. There are enough brownfield sites in the Borough for these camps to be built.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3992/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Patricia Wood</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I also object to the proposed use of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference 502 and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661 as gypsy/traveller sites.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am formally objecting to:

3. the use of the following locations as gypsy / traveller sights:
   Coombe Farm off Oaks Road REFERENCE NUMBER 502;
   Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane REFERENCE NUMBER 661; and
   Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane REFERENCE NUMBER 755;

As the Council acknowledges all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders on a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites", published by the Government in August says very clearly

"Traveller Sites
(temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate Development"

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of the policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Healthfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Healthfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy / traveller sites in the borough – which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

---

We are writing to object to the following sites for housing and traveller sites.
(502)
Happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but will be objecting to building on precious open space.

Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.

If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

---

Object Conduit Lane and Coombe Farm sites are on greenbelt land. Government policy states "Traveller sites temporary or permanent in the Greenbelt are inappropriate developments".

As well as damaging the local environment, there are not sufficient local amenities to cope with two traveller sites in close proximity.

---

Object I would like to object to use of the following sites; Coombe Lodge Nurseries, site reference 661 Coombe Farm site reference 602. Both these sites are Green Belt. Also the whole character of the area would change. The doctors surgeries are already overcrowded as are dentists and hospitals. The schools in the area are at bursting point. I use the trams and they are also overcrowded especially during the rush hour.

If the Green belt site is de designated this could be the start of many more. There are other sites in Croydon that are not Green Belt. Why can't existing sites be expanded?

I hope you take my views into consideration as everybody that I know in the area is of the same view.

Yours faithfully,
Ms R Magee

Objective: Proposed Gypsy/Traveller sites proposed for Addiscombe and East Croydon, Addington, Forresdale and Shirley - This sounds like a dreadful idea. I strongly object to the above proposal – This is a dreadful idea and surely anyone with any love or concern for Croydon would also object strongly.

Mr R Appadu

Objective: Soundness - Justified

I would like to lodge my objection to the use of this location as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest.

Mr & Mrs Smith

Objective: I wish to object to the proposed 'Permanent Gypsy & Traveller sites in: Coombe lodge nurseries, conduit lane, coombe road, south Croydon – ref 661 & Coombe farm, oaks road, Shirley – ref 502

My main reasons for objecting are that this land is Green belt and we only recently moved to our home in this area due to the fact that we did have this open land, of which at least the green belt we had been lead to believe was 'protected' from development of or for other uses such as permanent homes or structures. I strongly believe that the proposals would be an inappropriate use of Green Belt land and would also actually be against the government’s policy for Traveller sites, DCLG aug 2015. I believe any site proposal should look instead at Brownfield or industrial land.

Alternatively, I feel it is much more logical to expand existing permanent Gypsy sites in Lanthams Way off Beddington Farm Road. Other alternatives which would in our view be much more appropriate use of land would be: the land of the former Croydon Airport runway south of Imperial Way, Waddon ref 536 or Cane Hill-south part, Hollymeak Road/Portnalls Road Coulsdon ref 767.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4022/01/006/DM43.4/O Mr &amp; Mrs Ewin</td>
<td>Objection to Croydon Council’s proposal to provide sites for travellers &amp; the building of houses, etc on green land in Shirley &amp; other areas.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4023/02/002/DM43.4/O Ms S Amin</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of the location of site 502 as a gypsy and traveller site. The site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms S Bailey

Object: DM43.4

I register an objection to both of these proposals on the following grounds. Both are acknowledged to be in the Green Belt and the proposal is contrary to Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites which was published by the government in August 2015, which says "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". One of the sites adjoins a Site of Nature Conservation Interest, which would suffer detrimentally as a result of this proposed development and the impact on such a site should be a criterion when assessing potential locations. A lack of suitable criteria, not to have an unacceptable adverse impact on biodiversity, have been used when looking at potential locations which has resulted in the rather perverse selection of two sites in the Green Belt. It seems turning green belt into a gypsy / traveller site can only have an impact on biodiversity. Additional criteria should also be utilised, including:

- Not in the Green Belt.
- Does not impact upon important open spaces such as a Sites of Nature Conservation Interest / Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty / SSSI's or other protected locations.
- Residential properties or other recreational areas, such as parks and gardens, will not be impacted by the "setting" of gypsy / traveller sites.
- Existing services (water, sewerage, highways) and other public services are already in place and easy to access.

Suitable alternatives have not been considered. Even a cursory drive around the area of the existing gypsy / traveller site will reveal much more suitable locations in close proximity to existing facilities.

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr S Dhanda

Object: Soundness - Justified

The use of land to provide pitches at Coombe Farm, Oaks Road or Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane is entirely out of keeping with the character of those areas. Why ruin such beautiful areas so close to central Croydon for future generations? Once gone, that land will be gone forever. We should treasure areas such as these and put them to a much more appropriate use in keeping with the use of similar surrounding land. Housing/Residential/Pitches are not good uses of this land.

The only real alternative if there has to be one is at Pear Tree Farm, Featherbed Lane where there already exists a large scale housing development and appropriate facilities including schools, transport and infrastructure nearby.

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 502</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4027/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Debby Stanhope</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4028/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs S Dixon</td>
<td>Soundness - Consistent with National DM43.4 502</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4029/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Islam Hameed</td>
<td>SP2.7 makes no mention of impact on the surroundings of the site and nearby residents. Accordingly, an additional criterion should be added 'Must be entirely acceptable in relation to its impact on nearby public spaces and residents and businesses in the area.' If this were included the proposals Ref 502, Coombe Farm, and Ref 661, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, would immediately be seen to be inappropriate. Coombe Lodge Nursery is by the lovely gardens of Coombe Wood with its popular tea room and wooded area. Coombe Farm is green belt land in Lloyd Park, left to the people of Croydon by the Lloyd family and where families enjoy the open space, kids play in the play area, joggers, dog walkers and of other walkers exercise, spots are played, families snack in the café and everyone feels reasonably safe&quot;</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a resident in the area, I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:

a) Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661
b) Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502

each site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7A and SP2.7B;

The de-designation of: Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation; Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

These proposals are clearly harmful for the Green Belt and would have a negative impact on the environment and wildlife in Coombe Wood, Shirley Hills and Lloyd Park. It would create a precedent for further erosion of our valuable local amenity. Coombe Road and Coombe Lane are already very busy roads and one of the main arteries into the town centre. The additional traffic emanating from these two sites, without significant road improvements, would exacerbate the traffic congestion, not to mention the additional pressure on the already stretched local services such as schooling and general practitioners. The access roads to these proposed sites are clearly unsuitable for the larger vehicles that this community use as part of their livelihood and way of life. The junctions at Coombe Road, Oaks Road and Conduit Lane are already dangerous for vehicles and this area has the potential with this proposal to become a major accident black spot without significant very costly improvements to the local road network.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the landowners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Ms S Wheeler-Kiley
Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 502

Happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but will be objecting to building on precious open space.

Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.

If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Ms S Rhys-Davies
Object DM43.4 502

Reasons for objecting:
1) It will be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining owners
2) It is an inappropriate use of Green Belt land
3) Sites that are located on the Green Belt are considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and are against government policy (Planning policy for Traveller Sites, DCLG August 2015)
4) There are a lack of appropriate amenities close at hand
5) There is insufficient local infrastructure to accommodate the plans
6) Selection of proposed sites should have a bias towards brownfield or industrial land, not Green Belt
7) the existing permanent site in Lathams Way off Bedding Farm Road could be expanded

Alternative suggestions for sites:
632, Land south of Threehalfpenny Woods, Kent Gate Way, Bridle Way, Addington

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Ms S Rhys-Davies

**Object Reasons for objecting:**
1) It will be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining owners
2) It is an inappropriate use of Green Belt land
3) Sites that are located on the Green Belt are considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and are against government policy (Planning policy for Traveller Sites, DCLG August 2015)
4) There are a lack of appropriate amenities close at hand
5) There is insufficient local infrastructure to accommodate the plans
6) Selection of proposed sites should have a bias towards brownfield or industrial land, not Green Belt
7) The existing permanent site in Lathams Way off Bedding Farm Road could be expanded

**Alternative suggestions for sites:**
Site reference no: 502: Coombe Farm, Oaks Road, Shirley, CR0 5HL

**Change**
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Ms S Rhys-Davies

**Object Reasons for objecting:**
1) It will be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining owners
2) It is an inappropriate use of Green Belt land
3) Sites that are located on the Green Belt are considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and are against government policy (Planning policy for Traveller Sites, DCLG August 2015)
4) There are a lack of appropriate amenities close at hand
5) There is insufficient local infrastructure to accommodate the plans
6) Selection of proposed sites should have a bias towards brownfield or industrial land, not Green Belt
7) The existing permanent site in Lathams Way off Bedding Farm Road could be expanded

**Alternative suggestions for sites:**
Site reference no: 502: Coombe Farm, Oaks Road, Shirley, CR0 5HL

**Change**
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr S Maniar

**Object**
I object as it would be: 1) Detrimental to the amenities of adjoining owners, 2) Insufficient local infrastructure to accommodate the plan, 3) Inappropriate use of green belt land.

**Alternatives suggested sites:**
1) S36: Land of Former Croydon Airport runway, South of Imperial Way, Waddon
2) T57: Cane Hill, south part, Hollymoor Road, Portnalls Road, Coulston.

**Change**
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I would like to register my strong objection to the Council’s proposals for the consideration of Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries as gypsy/traveller as stated in the above documents and reference numbers. The sites are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s proposals would be in breach of that policy. In addition to this policy breach, these sites are surrounded by parks which are regularly enjoyed by many local residents (including myself) for their natural beauty and relaxing environments. Their positive contributions to our well-being cannot be underestimated and will be significantly impacted by your proposals.

It is therefore hard to imagine why such sites have even been considered at all, or in preference to other sites in the Council’s document ‘Assessment and selection of sites for Gypsy and Travellers August 2015’. The scoring method applied is rather confusing. For example, the GB/MOL criteria in the table in section 4.1 has the possible scores of -10, -5 or +10, yet the two references above have been given a GB/MOL score of 5, which is detrimental to their overall score. I would be grateful if the Council could reconsider its plans. Please explain regarding the issues raised around the above objections.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I am grateful to the Council for consulting on the detailed policies and proposals that will make up the Croydon Local Plan. There is much in the document that I agree with, but some of the proposals would, in my opinion, change the character of parts of Croydon very much for the worse. I hope you will forgive me if I focus on these areas of contention. I am therefore writing to formally object to:

1. de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;

2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   - land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
   - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

3. the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:
   - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502;
   - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; and
   - Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 755.

As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Change. The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

“Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is);

4. Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too;

5. Policy DM2 on development on garden land, which is too subjective and therefore too weak. There should be a much stronger presumption against development on garden land; and

6. Policy DM28, which should allow higher levels of parking in developments of low public transport accessibility. Restricting parking spaces in such areas doesn’t lead to fewer people owning their own car; it just leads to greater competition for existing spaces.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>502</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4051/01/008/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Matt Knight</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site as a traveller site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4054/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Shah</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>We would like to notify you of our objection to the proposed traveller sites at Coombe Farm off Oaks Road and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, as described in your consultation on the detailed policies and proposals for The Croydon Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We understand that there are plans to change the designation of areas of Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. Specifically, we understand that the Council have identified two locations in the Shirley area for gypsy/traveller sites at Coombe Farm off Oaks Road and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane.

We wish to object to the Council’s proposals as both these sites are in the Green Belt and the proposals are contrary to Government policy (Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites) which states “Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. Clearly the Council’s approach is in breach of this policy.
We would like to notify you of our objection to the proposed traveller sites at Coombe Farm off Oaks Road and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, as described in your consultation on the detailed policies and proposals for The Croydon Local Plan.

We understand that there are plans to change the designation of areas of Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. Specifically, we understand that the Council have identified two locations in the Shirley area for gypsy/traveller sites at Coombe Farm off Oaks Road and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane.

We wish to object to the Council’s proposals as both these sites are in the Green Belt and the proposals are contrary to Government policy (Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites) which states “Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. Clearly the Council’s approach is in breach of this policy.

It is also our understanding that one of these proposed locations for gypsy/traveller sites borders a Site for Nature Conservation Interest. Also both these proposed sites are some distance away from public services.

It is our view that the proposals will change the character of our area very much for the worse.

In the circumstances, these proposals should not be approved.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4062/01/011/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Keith &amp; Susan Hobbs</td>
<td>Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502; As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4063/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Whitehead</td>
<td>We also wish to object to the plans for traveller sites around the Coombe Lane and Oaks Road areas. We have seen first hand what travellers have done to an area of land. In a matter of two days we had piles of rubble, plastic and human waste on the open land to the rear of us. The residents of Shirley Oaks were forced to pay for the cleanup, on two separate occasions. Groups have repeated this mess in numerous places around Shirley over the last few years and have no respect for the area, so why should we create space for them at our expense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4064/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Gregory Boyce</td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502; As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is); The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502, policy number DM43 as a gypsy and traveller site. This site is in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites eg the site off the Purley Way.

In additional sites 681 and 502 does not have easy access to local schools, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into these sites is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4067/01/011/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Marilyn Loader</td>
<td>Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502; As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4069/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Dr Kenneth Lim</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4070/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms Ann McEvaddy</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502 as gypsy and traveller site as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4071/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Tross</td>
<td>Given the existing levels of brownfield sites in the area, these should be exhausted before encroaching on areas that would significantly alter the character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Abia Afsar-Siddiqui</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Graham Lyon</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr S Litchfield  
Object  
DM43.4  
502  
Reasons for Objecting:  
- The development would cause a detrimental effect to the Amenities of Adjoining Owners in the local area.  
- The proposed development is on Green Belt.  
- Surely a sensible site should be on Brownfield or Industrial Land as in an ever increasing urbanised area where developments and buildings are being built at an alarming rate we are losing all green space.  
- To use the Sites would require a Change of Land Use.  
- Why on earth are two of the proposed sites in such close proximity from one another in an area the size of the borough of Croydon?  
- There is a complete imbalance across the borough with all Sites being Proposed in the South of Croydon.  
- Potential increased crime in our local area (this was highlighted only last week when the South Croydon area (Brighton Road and surrounding areas) came to a stand still and hit national press with the eviction of travellers found to have firearms. The local School I worked in had to lock its gates and not allow students into the surrounding area until the conflict had been dealt with) my young families security and happiness are paramount, hence the reason I chose South Croydon to live in and paid the large additional house price to ensure my family were free from this sort of activity.  
- My preference would be to simply expand the existing permanent Gypsy Site in Lathams Way off Beddington Farm Road, would this not provide a simple and cost effective option for the council and far less issues to a huge number of law abiding citizens in the Croydon Borough???? If the council is unwilling to do this then from the proposals then Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane should be one of the selected sites.

The alternative suggested site that would have far less impact on the local area and its residents (not all being on Green Belt either!!!!) in my opinion would be:

16 - Heath Clark playing fields, Stafford Road, Waddon  
120 - Timblebridge Community Centre, Field Way, New Addington  
518 - Land adjacent to 103 Goodenough Way, The Admirals Walk, Old Coulsdon  
522 - Wandle Road surface car park, Wandle Road, Croydon Opportunity Area  
536 - Land of former Croydon Airport runaway, south of Imperial Way, Waddon  
552 - Land adjacent to Ashburton playing fields at rear of 2-88 Colderidge Road, Addiscombe  
553 - By Pavilion Playing Fields, Purley Way, Waddon  
632 - Land south of Threshalhpenny Woods, Kent Gate Way, Bridle Way, Addington  
636 - Land west of Timblebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, Elmside, Addington  
797 - Cane Hill-south part, Hollymeaok Road / Portnalls Road, Coulsdon  

Change  
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Kaljit Gata-Aura  
Object  
DM43.4  
502  
Objection to the use of following locations as gypsy or traveller sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road - Ref 502  

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr & Mrs Belsey  
Object: DM43.4 502  
The area where the travellers site is being suggested is Greenbelt. We must not build on Greenbelt sites, as these are areas for relaxation, wildlife and nature. Again this will result in a decrease in wildlife and more flooding.

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Melissa Chu  
Object: DM43.4 502  
I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661, policy number DM44; and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502; policy number DM43. Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference number 755, policy number DM32. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites eg the site off the Purley Way. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards.

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Natwarlal Patel  
Object: DM43.4 502  
I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
4081/01/002/DM43.4/O Mr & Mrs Hyde

Object DM43.4

We object to:
- the proposed de-designation of Croham Hurst and Coombe Road playing fields as Green Belt.
- the proposed use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries (site 661) and Coombe Farm (site 502) as gypsy & traveller sites.
- These linked areas, which connect with Lloyd Park & Shirley Hills, contribute hugely to the amenity of the borough. This public continuum is precious to many from across Croydon and beyond. Development and traveller sites would change the character of the amenity, particularly the Conduit Lane footpath.

Change
- The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

4082/01/002/DM43.4/O Philip Jupp

Object DM43.4

I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

Change
- The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

4083/01/009/DM43.4/O Mr Reuben Gata-Aura

Object DM43.4

Object to The use of following locations as gypsy or traveller sites:
- Coombe Farm off Oaks Road - Ref 502
- Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane - Ref 661

Change
- The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

4087/01/001/DM43.4/O Kelly Welly

Object DM43.4

I have been advised by a neighbour that a rumour is circulating regarding a Travellers site being given planning permission on the Shirley oaks village (Primrose Land) green land! I am extremely concerned about this as my house backs onto said land. Can you confirm if this is true and if so confirm the exact location of the proposed site?

Change
- The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
the Council has identified two locations on the edge of Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, which is identified as suitable for 15-20 pitches (pages 449-450, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 502). “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr Vince Hemment
Object
DM43.4
502
I will be objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr Tim Newman
Object
DM43.4
502
I particularly object to Coombe Farm, Oaks Road (ref 502) on the edge of Shirley which the Council has identified for Gypsy/Traveller sites. Both of these sites are in the Green Belt and therefore inappropriate for development in my opinion.

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terrence &amp; Jacqueline Spriggs</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>Happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but will be objecting to building on precious open space. Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Chang</td>
<td></td>
<td>We read with dismay and grave concern about Croydon council’s plans to build three gypsy/travellers sites in the Green Belt of Shirley. This ill conceived act of allowing housing on some of our precious Green spaces and back gardens will totally decimate and change the character and the environment of this area. The traffic infrastructure will be totally inadequate with traffic problems already a big issue during peak hours as it is. It is already terrifying to see the number of tower blocks going up along East Croydon station resulting in the ever changing skyline of Croydon, turning the town into a massive concrete jungle. We sincerely implore you to reconsider your plans and not to destroy our beautiful green belt and protecting the environment in and around this area. We have lived in Shirley for forty years and over this period we have seen so many new buildings and green open spaces lost to developers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr V Bhuwanee

Object: Soundness

Soundness Justified

DM43.4

502

I would like to object to the proposed travellers sites for the following reasons which I believe are material grounds to refuse these plans:

• The Council has an obligation to consider all potential sites across the borough. It also needs to demonstrate this, and provide information that details what sites were considered (both private and publicly) together with full assessments on these sites. This I cannot see has been done.

• The suggested sites are in close proximity to each other in a huge borough. This cannot be correct. Fine, allow one - but all three? This is politically motivated.

• There is currently not enough amenities locally and no plans to increase them. School places and GPs are already full.

• Transport concerns. PTAL ratings or similar, where are they?

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Ms V Cruickshank

Object: DM43.4

502

I object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:

Coombe Farm off Oaks Road; reference number 502; and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane; reference number 661.

These are both in the Green Belt, where Policy E of Planning for Traveller Sites clearly says that “travellers sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

This is also likely to have a negative effect on the Site of nature conservation interest that one of the sites would border, and both sites are a distance from public services. It is also likely to create increased traffic problems in an area that is not best suited for such sites.

Consideration should be given to the refurbishment of the existing sites, or where this is not possible, alternative and more appropriate sites.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I have been made aware of the proposals for Site References 661, 502 and 755 for use as traveller sites. I object on the grounds that these are Green Belt sites covered by Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and are therefore unsuitable for traveller camps. I use both sites near Coombe Lodge fairly regularly and was frightened by loose and dangerous dogs when the site was being used illegally by travellers, and I noticed that the woods were being used as a toilet. The amenities of that area would be lost to everyone else if these proposals were to proceed.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502 as gypsy and traveller site as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site 502;

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
As a local Resident in the Croham Ward of South Croydon the subject area is well known to me and my family, and in my opinion its use as proposed, or indeed for any kind of development, is wholly inappropriate, and accordingly I object. I have carefully reviewed the documentation prepared by the Council, and specifically looked at the Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers. Whilst the document is very comprehensive, I am unclear as to whether or not it is a universally adopted one that is used for the whole Country, and in any event question the methodology with its use of selective criteria and the RAG scoring which is very subjective. I noticed that the scoring for the subject site includes a positive ±5 under the criteria heading of Green Belt/Metropolitan Open Land. This appears incorrect, and if I am reading and interpreting the document accurately then the score should be a negative -5. Assuming this is an error then it distorts the resultant figure by ten. Given this error, are there indeed others awry? I also noted in the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment prepared by Croydon Council that it highlights a substantially higher level of additional pitches required in the first five years (2013-2018) where 27 pitches are stated, whereas in the subsequent five year periods only 7 or 8 pitches are scheduled for each of the three periods through to 2033. I would suggest that these lower figures in the latter years are unrealistic and in all probability are likely to rise. If so, then the pressure to enlarge the overall area of the subject site will increase, and it will of course be easier for the Council to justify and probably win the argument because of the established use and precedent. Therefore, the size of the subject site and/or another one in the locality, will in all probability substantially increase. Fundamentally, this location is ‘Green Belt’ land and notwithstanding that it has some development and land use, the proposed use, or indeed for any kind of development, is wrong and in my opinion would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. It is also my understanding that under Central Government policy if such land is designated as ‘Green Belt’, then it should enjoy the protection from all forms of development and not favour any particular group or person within the community unless there are special circumstances. In this case there are no such special circumstances. If any private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
business person or organisation wanted to create a caravan and/or static home site in this location it would not receive Planning Permission - this is the ‘test’ for such a proposal, and we should not have differing sets of rules for the Council and the Public. In addition to the above I also note a list of other salient points as to why in my opinion the use of the subject land as proposed is inappropriate:
- Notwithstanding some nominal use of the area for local business, housing, and school purposes, the general locality is one of woodland, playing fields, parkland, and rural space. Any kind of use for more intense housing, and possibly associated businesses as well, for any sector of the community whether it be caravans, static homes, prefabricated houses, or traditional housing would be inappropriate.
- This area of Coombe is of some historical significance with several notable houses of architectural merit. Notwithstanding that some of the area and buildings have changed and indeed increased over the more recent decades, it still retains a relatively rural and spacious charm which should be respected and retained for current and future generations.
- More intense housing for any sector of the community will increase noise and light pollution and would be inappropriate.
- Local nature and wildlife is present in this area and as such should not be subjected to pressure from an increased resident population. Lloyd Park, Coombe Park, and the woods of Addington Hills which border and/or are in close proximity to the subject development site are of high public interest and could be negatively impacted by the proposals.
- The access road from Oaks Road that will form the route to the subject site is relatively narrow and already used by other residents and those accessing the playing fields. This road would need to be up-graded at considerable expense if the proposal were to proceed.
- Vehicle access onto Oaks Road is restricted with reduced visibility as well as being in very close proximity of the tram/road crossing.
- Notwithstanding the presence of the local Tramlink service, public transport is otherwise very limited and as such will force new residents to use private vehicles and thus cause more environmental pollution in an otherwise rural locality.
- Local amenities and facilities such as shops, health centres, possibly suitable schools are essentially non-existent and will force the residents to
use private vehicles unnecessarily.
- The proposed subject site is relatively large, and if approved, would potentially house a significant number of people and which may be further exacerbated by the possible location of another similar site in relatively close proximity. My understanding is that gypsy and traveller families actually prefer smaller sites.
- Development of this subject site with new and extended infrastructure in the form of services, sewage, power, fencing, roads, and hardstanding is likely to be very expensive, and indeed disruptive in providing.

Other locations, some thus far dismissed but there may be others, will almost certainly offer better use of the limited public funds available. Partial infrastructure may well be already in place or more readily available in these other locations and help to lessen the burden on the public purse. Also, in comprehensively reviewing other locations, it may be possible to address suitable brownfield sites that in all but easy situations private developers ignore and disregard, but which nevertheless remain a serious blight on the landscape of the Borough.

4121/01/003/DM43.4/O Janet Norris Object I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Farm, Oaks Road 502 as a gypsy/traveller site DM43.4 502 I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Farm, Oaks Road 502 as a gypsy/traveller site Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Whilst I agree that we desperately need new housing, it should be built on brownfield sites not our remaining precious green spaces! I understand the Council has identified two locations on the edge of Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, which is identified as suitable for 15-20 pitches (pages 449-450, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 502); and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, which is identified as suitable for 15-25 pitches (pages 468-469, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 661). I object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: 'Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development'. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I understand the Council has identified two locations on the edge of Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, which is identified as suitable for 15-20 pitches (pages 449-450, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 502).

I object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Janet Harding

I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road as gypsy/traveller site.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mrs S Rudduck

I object to the use of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road Ref: 502 as a gypsy/traveller site.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 502</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms S Rao</td>
<td>I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, (site reference 502 Policy DM43)</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs S Chandarana</td>
<td>Build a school please. School is a viable option as there no schools in our area. The plan makers have missed a big point that existing infrastructure cannot cope with the influx of additional population at such a fast pace. Also it has to be planned over few years. It should never ben on a green belt attached to a green belt sites as it is disastrous for the environment. There are quite a few brownfield sites in Croydon should be explored. What are the criteria behind selecting two sites within 1 mile of each other? The plan makers do not know the grass root situation. They have just assumed things without actually knowing the facts. This is a grave situation. There are quite a few public and independent schools in the nearby area. Building a new school will support Selsdon and nearby citizens. Besides we do not have a Grammar school in Croydon. So, it would be ideal if we build a grammar school in Croydon on one of the proposed sites. Existing infrastructure just cannot cope with additional population in Croydon: - We have to wait at least 4-5 days to get appointment at doctors many times do not get appointment - We have to wait at least 15 minutes to get a turn to play swing/slides for my son in any local park. The parks are so crowded during summer. Already children are getting very less exercise. If 40 families come over with more than 80 children then it would be extremely over crowded. - There are not enough schools in the area. We should build more schools - There is very limited green space in Croydon. Government policy states that you cannot build temporary or permanent sites on Green Belt. Putting the travellers sites near green belt will endanger. - Conduit lane is a no drive zone. Increased traffic due to a planned school and travellers sites will cause traffic chaos. - We need green belts for good health of the citizens. Steps like these would encourage the encroachment of green belts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mrs S Chandarana

Object

DM43.4 502

Build a school please. School is a viable option as there no schools in our area. The plan makers have missed a big point that existing infrastructure cannot cope with the influx of additional population at such a fast pace. Also it has to be planned over few years. It should never be on a green belt/attached to a green belt sites as it is disastrous for the environment. There are quite a few brownfield sites in Croydon should be explored. What are the criteria behind selecting two sites within 1 mile of each other? The plan makers do not know the grass root situation. They have just assumed things without actually knowing the facts. This is a grave situation. There are quite a few public and independent schools in the nearby area. Building a new school will support Selsdon and nearby citizens. Besides we do not have a Grammar school in Croydon. So, it would be ideal if we build a grammar school in Croydon on one of the proposed sites. Existing infrastructure just cannot cope with additional population in Croydon:
- We have to wait at least 4-5 days to get appointment at doctors many times do not get appointment
- We have to wait at least 15 minutes to get a turn to play swing/slide for my son in any local park. The parks are so crowded during summer. Already children are getting very less exercise. If 40 families come over with more than 80 children then it would be extremely over crowded.
- There are not enough schools in the area. We should build more schools
- There is very limited green space in Croydon. Government policy states that you cannot build temporary or permanent sites on Green Belt. Putting the travellers sites near green belt will endanger.
- Conduit lane is a no drive zone. Increased traffic due to a planned school and travellers sites will cause traffic chaos.
- We need green belts for good health of the citizens. Steps like these would encourage the encroachment of green belts.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr S Illingworth
Object
DM43.4 502

There has been a history of unauthorised "pitches" in this area over the past few years, in particular on the field adjacent to the practise area and 5th hole on the golf course. On each occasion these pitches have been accompanied by residual mess, threatening behaviour and mindless theft of golf club property. Each time that Gypsies/Travellers have been in the area, they have trespassed onto the golf course while club members are playing, threatening those members with physical and verbal abuse on numerous occasions. This behaviour is totally unacceptable and very demoralising, and should either of these pitches go ahead I am sure that it will have a serious detrimental affect on both the club and its members.

Mrs S Deshpande
Object
Soundness - Consistent with National DM43.4 502

I am writing to object to:
1. The use of the following location as a gypsy and traveller site:
   Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502
   as the site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.
   There is also an error in the calculation for the Green Belt score in the selection criteria. The site should be scored -5 for being in Green Belt and not +5.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I am grateful to the Council for consulting on the detailed policies and proposals that will make up the Croydon Local Plan. There is much in the document that I agree with, but some of the proposals would, in my opinion, change the character of parts of Croydon very much for the worse. I hope you will forgive me if I focus on these areas of contention. I am therefore writing to formally object to:

3. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:
   • Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502;
   • Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; and
   • Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 755;

As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the government in August, says very clearly:

“Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.”

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

We object on the basis that both sites are on Green Belt land and one is adjacent to a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. This proposed siting appears to be contrary to the Government’s published policy which says that such sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.
Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 502 Under no circumstances do we agree with a Gypsy and Traveller site at this location.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object DM43.4 502 I am writing to object to The use of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502; and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661 as locations for gypsy/traveller sites. Both sites are within the Green Belt, are a substantial distant from public services such doctors and schools and one is adjacent to a Site of Nature Conservation Interest.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object DM43.4 502 National guidelines clearly state 'Travellers Sites emporary or per,nanent) hi the Green Bell are inappropriate development'. The Council’s proposals, therefore, clearly breach such guidelines. Also, we question the Council’s assertion that it needs to quadruple the number of travellers/gypsy sites in the Borough. Apart from this major objection, the above sites identified for such use would have:
- poor access via narrow roads/lanes for large vehicles;
- consequent impact upon local traffic congestion with movements of large vehicles;
- no safe paved walking routes to schools, shops, doctors, etc.;
- additional requirement for services and facilities for hygienic occupation;
- increased pressure on local schools, medical facilities, waste disposal, etc.;
- impact upon local facilities and amenities of current residents. Also, we understand that the proposed pitches would accommodate considerably more caravans and associated vehicles than can be controlled by planning restrictions.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object DM43.4 502 am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4154/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4154/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 502 (Coombe Farm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4155/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4157/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
The GTANA report (2013) does not consider why there is a requirement to provide such facilities and refers to the CLG’s document Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (March 2014) which states that Local Authorities should in producing their local plans, consider joint development plans that set targets on a cross authority basis. This proposal seems to have been produced in isolation from other neighbouring councils even though the above clearly indicates that nearby councils such as Sevenoaks, Tandridge and Bromley have higher demand. Proposals in the Housing and Planning Bill 2015-2016 are to remove the statutory requirement on local authorities to assess the specific accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers - the emphasis being that when authorities are carrying out a review of housing needs that it considers the needs of all the people residing in their district, without any reference to Gypsies and Travellers. We hope this means that Croydon Council will consider our needs and the needs of our neighbours and local services and businesses as weighty as those of Gypsy and Travelling people. We understand that there is a lot of opposition to the proposed sites from people currently residing in the district due to the threat to the Green Belt, increased traffic and increased pressure on local services. Surely such low scores within the “Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers” (August 2015) should have resulted in an acceptance that none of the sites are really particularly suitable and that the council will need to liaise with other councils if determined to make provision. All three sites are in Green Belt land - Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites - traveller sites (temporary and permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. Further concern for the impact upon Green Belt is highlighted in the GTANA Stakeholder consultation. The sites are contrary to the Strategic Policies (April 2013) in terms of access from roads and proximity to bus routes; and access to essential services including health and education facilities.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

DM43.4

Object

502

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

DM43.4
Mr Trevor Watkins

Object

DM43.4

502

I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661, policy number DM44; and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502, policy number DM43; Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference number 755, policy number DM32. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites eg the site off the Purley Way. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Carol Holmes

Object

DM43.4

502

I am writing to you to object to use of Green Belt Land for gypsy/traveller sites (reference numbers 502, 661) Coombe Farm off Oaks Road (reference number 502) and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane (reference number 661) are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. These proposals are in breach of policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, which says that Traveller Sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. Alternative sites should be found.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr A Majeed

Object

DM43.4

502

The proposed Gypsy and Traveller site is contrary to government policy as it is in Green Belt. In addition, based on past experience of unauthorised encampments I think there would be a threat to the safety, security and well-being of my family.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 502</th>
<th>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4168/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr B Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4174/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the site being allocated for a gypsy and traveller site. It is in the Green Belt and one of the sites borders a Site of nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Travellers Sites published by the government in August says very clearly: &quot;Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development&quot;. The Council's approach is clearly in breach of this policy.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object

Mr Brian Mole

4178/01/001/DM43.4/O

DM43.4

502

It is in a green belt area. National guidelines say that travellers/gypsy sites in the greenbelt are inappropriate development. There is a long history of planning application refusals and avoidance of planning permission at Coombe Farm. The reasons for this should be re-visited. The site is on a single track lane with a very narrow access onto Oaks Road which is not suitable for large mobile homes, or the additional traffic from travellers trucks, cars, vans and trailers as well. The site has no safe walking route to schools, shops, doctors, etc. There is no pavement along Oaks Lane and very poor lighting when dark. There is only partial pavement on one side of the road along Oaks Road as well. The size of the pitches would accommodate far greater number of caravans than can be controlled by planning restrictions. Even if the restrictions are adhered to, there could be as many as three families on each pitch allowing for 60 mobile homes. This would totally overwhelm the residents of Oaks Farm, Oaks Road and Oaks Lane and would not be conducive to social cohesion. The proposed site is not within the required distance to both schooling and medical needs. The closest schools are oversubscribed so would be unable to meet the needs of so many new children to the area. The (and is in private ownership at Coombe Farm, and any funds spent on (compulsory or otherwise) purchase could surely be spent more wisely on behalf of the population of Croydon. Several businesses which make a big contribution to the Local economy and also provide much needed amenity to the public will be detrimentally affected by the site.

Change

DM43.4

502

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object

Krutika Patel

4184/01/002/DM43.4/O

DM43.4

502

I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
4186/01/002/DM43.4/O LB King Object DM43.4 I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation. Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

4186/01/007/DM43.4/O LB King Object DM43.4 Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 502 (Coombe Farm) Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

4188/01/002/DM43.4/O N K Shaikh Object DM43.4 I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation. Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

4189/01/006/DM43.4/O Mr Roger Bolton Object DM43.4 I am writing to object to: 1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 861; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

4190/01/002/DM43.4/O Mr Ronald West Object DM43.4 I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502 as gypsy and traveller site as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object | DM43.4 502 | I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation. | Change | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object | DM43.4 502 | I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502 as gypsy and traveller site as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b | Change | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object | DM43.4 502 | I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation. | Change | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object | Soundness - Justified DM43.4 502 | I object to 4. the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites a) Ref No. 502 — Coombe Farm off Oaks Road b) Ref No. 661 — Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane | Change | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object | Soundness - Justified DM43.4 502 | I am writing to submit my objection to: 5. The use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites: - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, reference number 502; and - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, reference number 661. | Change | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
4206/01/007/DM43.4/O Dr K Parka | Object DM43.4 502 | Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 502 (Coombe Farm) | Change | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

4206/01/002/DM43.4/O Dr K Parka | Object DM43.4 502 | I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation. | Change | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Such development is in breach of Policy EAT Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that ‘Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites now, and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough. If the number of Gypsy/Traveller sites really needs to be increased by this amount then a more appropriate location would be around the existing site at Purley Way. The positioning of a Gypsy/Traveller site adjacent to the car park for Coombe Woods, between the Chateau Restaurant and the Hotel/restaurant, would probably deter me from using any of these attractions.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I have restricted my objections to those plans that primarily affect the area of Shirley I which I live, but the same objections apply to other proposals in other parts of the borough.

DM43.4
5. Proposed Policy DM43 Creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites at Coombe Farm, off Oaks Road, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, off Conduit Lane and Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage, Featherbed Lane.

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Traveller site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4211/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>B Busa</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4211/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>B Busa</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 502 (Coombe Farm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4212/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Bhavil Vyas</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 502 (Coombe Farm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4212/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Bhavil Vyas</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object DM43.4

502

Proposed Policy DM43 Creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites at Coombe Farm, off Oaks Road, and Coombe Lodge Nurseries, off Conduit Lane. I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All these locations are within the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Such development is in breach of Policy EAT Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that ‘Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites now, and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough. If the number of Gypsy/Traveller sites really needs to be increased by this amount then a more appropriate location would be around the existing site at Purley Way. The positioning of a Gypsy/Traveller site adjacent to the car park for Coombe Woods, between the Chateau Restaurant and the Hotel/restaurant, is totally undesirable. As users of the restaurants, gardens, park and golf course it would be hard to imagine we wish to visit these attractions if it is blighted in this way. As members of Shirley Park Golf Club we have experienced threatening behaviour, trespass, verbal abuse and staining mess that travellers create. The golf club provides social and sporting activity for some 700 members and many visitors including junior players who play during school holidays and weekends. Their safe environment will be endangered. We understand that the proposed sites fail to meet criteria with regard to schooling and medical needs and it seems obvious that these proposals need to be scrapped as soon as possible.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object DM43.4

502

I am writing to object to:

1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
It is in a green belt area. National guidelines say that travellers' gypsy sites in the greenbelt are inappropriate development. Even if the properties are demolished to provide for the pitches there will still be a large spill over into the green belt. This means that planning permission should not be available.

- The site is on a single track lane with a very narrow access onto Oaks Road which the large mobile homes will not be able to access. The lane is also used by aggregate lorries (shorter than mobile homes), local residents, members of the sports ground and opposing teams and visitors to Loyd Park.

- The site has no safe walking routes to schools, shops, doctors etc. There is no pavement along Oaks Lane and very poor lighting when dark. There is only partial pavement on one side of Oaks Road as well. The safeguard of so many additional people including a great number of children must make this site un-feasible. This is unsustainable as everyone will have to use cars to access everything involved in their day to day lives.

- The size of the pitches would accommodate a far greater number of caravans that can be controlled by planning restrictions. Even if the restrictions are adhered to, there could be as many as three families on each pitch. This equates to 60 possible families, 60 mobile homes, with additional tow trucks, vans, trailers and cars.

- National guidelines state that the site should not overwhelm the next nearest settlement. The residents of Oaks Farm, Oaks Road and Oaks Lane (all in isolated positions) would certainly be overwhelmed. We are also concerned about conflict between Romany Travelers and Irish Travellers.

- There is a long history of planning refusals and avoidance of planning permissions at Coombe Farm. Reasons for this should be re-visited.

- Oaks Farm is the adjacent property to Coombe Farm and whenever travellers are in the vicinity this local wedding business is adversely affected. Local businesses should be supported in many ways including the surrounding environments use.

- Shirley Park Golf Club is another local business that I believe has been adversely affected by travellers' presence. In this instance through verbal and physical abuse to club members. This is not acceptable and must be considered as part of this objection. We understand the proposed sites are not within the required distance to both schooling and medical needs.
therefore am objecting on that basis also. The land is in private ownership at Coombe Farm, and any funds spent on “compulsory or otherwise purchase” could surely be better spent on behalf of the population of Croydon.

4218/01/001/DM43.4/O Mr & Ms Morgan & Mason

Object

DM43.4
502

I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

4223/01/007/DM43.4/O Mrs Mary Lane

Object

DM43.4
502

I object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502 - As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Putley Way where...
I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661, policy number DM44; and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502, policy number DM43. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites e.g. the site off the Purley Way. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object: Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

02 September 2016

Coombe Farm Site (ref. no. 502)

This is also located in a Green Belt area. Under National Guidelines, Travellers/Gypsy sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. Even if properties are demolished to provide space for the pitches, there will be a significant overspill into the Green Belt. This means that planning permission should not be granted.

2. The site is situated on a single track lane with a very narrow access onto Oaks Road which the large mobile homes will not be able to access. The lane is also used by aggregate Lorries (shorter than mobile homes), local residents, members of the sports ground and opposing teams and visitors to Lloyds Park, a much loved and cherished public amenity.

3. The site offers no safe walking route to schools, shops, doctors, etc. There is no pavement along Oaks Lane and very poor lighting when dark. There is only partial pavement on one side of the road along Oaks Road as well. It will not be possible to safeguard so many additional people including a great number of children. This development is unsustainable as everyone will have to use cars to access the basics of life.

4. The size of the pitches would accommodate for a greater number of caravans than can be controlled by planning restrictions. Even if the restrictions are adhered to, there could be as many as three families on each pitch. With planning for 20 pitches this would mean 60 families and 60 mobile homes, not to mention additional caravans in tow, trucks, vans, trailers and cars.

5. According to National Guidelines, the site should not overwhelm the next nearest settlement. However the residents of Oaks Farm, Oaks Road and Oaks Lane, which are all in isolated positions, would certainly be overwhelmed. It will not be possible to attain social cohesion with the local residents. Residents are also gravely concerned about conflicts between Romany Travellers and Irish Travellers.

6. There is a long history of planning application refusals and avoidance of planning permission at Coombe Farm. The reasons for this should be re-visited.

7. Oaks Farm is the adjacent property to Coombe Farm. The presence of Travellers in the vicinity has an adverse effect on the businesses located in that area and will also
adversely affect the numerous suppliers and staff that are reliant on those businesses.

B. Shirley Park Golf Club is also affected by these proposals and have written separately on many different aspects of flaws in the Planning proposals, including misuse of MOL Policies. They have also added this regarding both sites:

The history of unauthorised "pitches" in this area over the past few years has left a bitter resentment, especially in view of the residual mess and threatening behaviour that has always accompanied their trespass. On each occasion that Gypsies/Travellers have been in the area, the club members here have been threatened with physical and verbal abuse. This behaviour is totally unacceptable and despite the subsequent eviction of the Travellers on each occasion, the residual psychological effect on tax payers and constituents' lives cannot be trivialised. We also have a large Junior Section and children play the course during holidays as well as weekends. They are often unaccompanied and the parents need to know they are in a safe environment. This would certainly not be the case in the parents' minds if there was any chance of aggressive behaviour, as previously experienced, towards these children. I am certain that the Council would not wish to be responsible for putting children in any sort of potentially dangerous situation. Surely these detailed real issues must be taken into account when determining any permanent site.

I understand that the proposed sites are not within the required distance to both schooling and medical needs, therefore I also object on this basis. The land is in private ownership at Coombe Farm. Any funds spent on "compulsory or otherwise" purchase clearly could be spent more wisely on behalf of the population of Croydon. No doubt Central Grants will be available, but Council owned land in an area that will not radically impact on established residents' lives would be a sensible and prudent choice.
Object  
DM43.4 502  

5. Proposed Policy DM43 Creation of Gypsy Traveller sites at Coombe Farm, off Oaks Road, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, off Conduit Lane and Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage Featherbed Lane.

I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Such development is in breach of Policy Eat Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that ‘Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites now, and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough. If the number of Gypsy/Traveller sites really needs to be increased by this amount then a more appropriate location would be around the existing site at Purley Way. The positioning of a Gypsy/Traveller site adjacent to the car park for Coombe Woods, between the Chateau Restaurant and the Hotel/restaurant, would probably deter me from using any of these attractions.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I have restricted my objections to those plans that primarily affect the area of Shirley I which I live, but the same objections apply to other proposals in other parts of the borough.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 502</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4237/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Jagdish Patel</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4239/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Feast</td>
<td>Soundness - Consistent with National 1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oakes Road, site reference 502; because both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b; Both of these areas are used by people from far and wide who commute on foot and by bus, whilst others drive to the two carparks and then walk, jog and run through the area. Surely Croydon should encourage more people to get out and to take exercise rather than have them suffer the current growing problem of obesity. The attraction for so many of the people who avail of this attractive area is the feeling of getting away to open country.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4244/01/011/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Kellty</td>
<td>Coombe Farm off Oakes Road reference number 502; As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which we would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is);</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4245/01/008/DM43.4/O  Mr & Mrs Maguire  Object  DM43.4 502  I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation. These are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller sites, published by the Government in August states clearly “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. Both sites are also some distance from public services, schooling and medical needs. Coombe Park, a beautiful landscaped park, containing many war and family memorials will be completely overwhelmed by the enormous traveller development right next door and access to the parking bays will also be compromised. A preferred siting would be off the Purley Way where the existing site could be enlarged.

4254/01/007/DM43.4/O  Mr A Dawe  Object  DM43.4 502  Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 502 (Coombe Farm)

4254/01/002/DM43.4/O  Mr A Dawe  Object  DM43.4 502  I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

4257/01/002/DM43.4/O  Mr A Rulkalai  Object  DM43.4 502  I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

Change  The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Change  The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr A Rulkalai

DM43.4

502

Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 502 (Coombe Farm)

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I wish to strongly object to Croydon Council's proposal to site a Gypsy / Traveller site at Coombe Farm. There are numerous reasons for my objection, including:

- The Coombe Farm site is in designated Green Belt and as a result should not be developed. The Government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (published August 2015) states:
  - “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”
- The site is close to Coombe Wood and Park which is enjoyed by many visitors each day, including the very young. It has a very good Cafe. These tranquil amenities will be spoilt by the influx of Traveller/Gypsy families who would have access to the Park and Woodland making it a no go area for other Families.
- The site is close to the other proposed Traveller/Gypsy site 661 in Conduit Lane. This will attract an exchange of visits of the occupants from both sites, regularly visiting one another, and also increasing Traveller/Gypsy visitors to the Park.
- Potential for extra litter / fly tipping both in Oaks Road and in the Park/Woodland in Conduit Lane.
- Travellers/Gypsy’s form the 2 sites would dominate the current Parking Bays adjacent to the Park entrance making it impossible for the general public to park
- All three of Croydon Council’s proposed Gypsy / Traveller sites are within a 3 mile radius of one another and in adjacent wards. This is unfair and inequitable for those living in the area.
- There is already a shortage of local school places
- Doctor surgeries — same as above
- How will Croydon Council control & monitor official number of travellers — could easily be overrun
- How will they police the area as there is already very little police presence in the area (and even less going forward).
- The traffic using Oaks Road would increase causing additional waiting time to enter into Coome Lane and to cross over the lights at the Tram track junction.

Change:
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
4261/01/002/DM43.4/O Mr B Pope
Object DM43.4 502
I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.
Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

4265/01/006/DM43.4/O Mr D Anderson
Object DM43.4 502
I am writing to object to:
1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.
Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

4266/01/006/DM43.4/O Mr D Bigglestone
Object DM43.4 502
I am writing to object to:
1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.
Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

4267/01/001/DM43.4/O Mr D Gooch
Object Soundness - Consistent with National DM43.4 502
1. The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b;
4. Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane) and 502 (Coombe Farm) If a site is Green Belt UML - built form then it is marked as (Amber/Orange), which means a score of "-5", "+5" has been used which increases the rating by 10 points.
Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr D Nesterovitch

Object

DM43.4

502

I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661, policy number DM44 and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502, policy number DM43 Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference number 755, policy number DM32. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites eg the site off the Purley Way. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr D Patel

Object

DM43.4

502

I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr H Khandelia

Object

DM43.4

502

Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 502 (Coombe Farm)

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr H Khandelia

Object

DM43.4

502

I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr I Roberts

Object: I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

DM43.4 502

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr J Balcombe

Object: I am writing to object to:
1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:
   - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661;
   - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502;
   as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Incorrect calculation in the second criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane) and 502 (Coombe Farm) - if a site is green Belt/MOL - built form then it is marked as (Ambert/orance), which means it’s a score of “-5”. “+5” has been used which increases its rating by 10 points.
   Incorrect calculating site access for 661: there are cars parked on that road and the entrance is through a very busy main road. The site cannot have a rating of “+5”. It should be -2. That’s a difference of 7 rating points.

DM43.4 502

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr J Patel

Object: I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

DM43.4 502

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr J Pugh

Object: I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

DM43.4 502

Change: The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I object to Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, which is identified as suitable for 15-20 pitches (pages 449-450, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 502). I object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 502 (Coombe Farm)

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Such development is in breach of Policy EAT Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that ‘Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites now, and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough. If the number of Gypsy/Traveller sites really needs to be increased by this amount then a more appropriate location would be around the existing site at Purley Way. The positioning of a Gypsy/Traveller site adjacent to the car park for Coombe Woods, between the Chateau Restaurant and the Hotel/restaurant, would probably deter me from using any of these attractions.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I have restricted my objections to those plans that primarily affect the area of Shirley I which I live, but the same objections apply to other proposals in other parts of the borough.
Mrs Kathleen Swan

Object

DM43.4

502

I understand the Council has identified two locations on the edge of Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, which is identified as suitable for 15-20 pitches (pages 449-450, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies PADRA Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 502).

I object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mrs Rita Evans

Object

DM43.4

502

The proposals for two Gypsy and Traveller sites on Green Belt land at the periphery of Shirley is in direct contravention of the Government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites which clearly states that such are ‘inappropriate development’ in the Green Belt. It has been stated that any such sites must be for true Travellers. Planning Resource highlights that the new Planning Policy document published in August 2015 redefines Traveller to exclude those who no longer travel permanently, thus avoiding the need for static homes which has greatly reduced the number of pitches that Councils are required to provide. Could this be a long-term strategy to de-designate Green Belt land, then when it is under-used, claim it for housing?

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for site 502 (Coombe Farm).

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Incorrect calculation in selection criteria for site 661 and 502. If site is in Green Belt/MOL built form then list is marked as Amber/Orange which means a score of -5, +5 has been used which increase the rating by 10 points.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4320/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr N Turnbull</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Incorrect calculation in the second criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane) and 502 (Coombe Farm) - if a site is green Belt/MOL - built form then it is marked as (Amber/orangace), which means it’s a score of “-5”. “+5” has been used which increases its rating by 10 points. Incorrect calculating site access for 661: there are cars parked on that road and the entrance is through a very busy main road. The site cannot have a rating of “+5”. It should be -2. That’s a difference of 7 rating points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4327/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs J Fumanska</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I object to 4. the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites a) Ref No. 502 — Coombe Farm off Oaks Road b) Ref No. 661 — Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4330/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr K Shah</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4331/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr N Chauwana</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 502</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object DM43.4
502 Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 502 (Coombe Farm)

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object DM43.4
502 I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b;

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object DM43.4
502 I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661, policy number DM44: and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502, policy number DM43 Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference number 755, policy number DM32. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would be more appropriate to expand existing sites eg the site off the Purley Way. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Site Details</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4337/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr P Nesbeth</td>
<td>Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502 as gypsy and traveller site as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4339/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr R Indheuser</td>
<td>Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502</td>
<td>Incorrect calculation in selection criteria for site 661 and 502. If site is in Green Belt/MOL built form then it is marked as Amber/Orange which means a score of -5, +5 has been used which increase the rating by 10 points.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4340/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr R Spurgeon</td>
<td>Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4340/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr R Spurgeon</td>
<td>Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502</td>
<td>Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 502 (Coombe Farm)</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4342/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr R Patel</td>
<td>Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document ID</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4342/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr R Patel</td>
<td>Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 502 (Coombe Farm)</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4343/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr R Venuatkrishna</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4345/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Messrs Eccles &amp; Hivedess</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4347/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr S Patel</td>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4348/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr V Dawe</td>
<td>Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 502 (Coombe Farm)</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4348/01/002/DM43.4/O Mr V Dawe
Object DM43.4 502 I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.
Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

4349/01/007/DM43.4/O Mr W Whitehead
Object DM43.4 502 Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 502 (Coombe Farm)
Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

4349/01/002/DM43.4/O Mr W Whitehead
Object DM43.4 502 I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.
Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

4354/01/006/DM43.4/O Mrs L Bigglestone
Object DM43.4 502 I am writing to object to: 1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b
Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

4355/01/002/DM43.4/O Mrs J Dobbs
Object DM43.4 502 I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, Site 502 as a gypsy and traveller site.
Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4357/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms A Khandelia</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4357/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms A Khandelia</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 502 (Coombe Farm)</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4358/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms B Fontaine</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661, policy number DM44; and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502, policy number DM43; Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference number 755, policy number DM32. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy 5P2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites eg the site off the Purley Way. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4359/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms H Lishmund</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document ID</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4360/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Susana Winter</td>
<td>Gypsy and Traveller use is not appropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7. There is also an error in the scoring for this site in the evidence base. The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4363/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Sarah Moise</td>
<td>I object to the use of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, Site 502 as a Gypsy and Traveller site. This site could constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Policy DM43 Creation of Gypsy Traveller sites at Coombe Farm, off Oaks Road, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, off Conduit Lane and Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage Featherbed Lane.

We object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Such development is in breach of Policy Eat Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that ‘Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites now, and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough. If the number of Gypsy/Traveller sites really needs to be increased by this amount then a more appropriate location would be around the existing site at Purley Way. The positioning of a Gypsy/Traveller site adjacent to the car park for Coombe Woods, between the Chateau Restaurant and the Hotel/restaurant, would probably deter me from using any of these attractions.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I have restricted my objections to those plans that primarily affect the area of Shirley I which I live, but the same objections apply to other proposals in other parts of the borough.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 502</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Proposed Policy DM43 Creation of Gypsy Traveller sites at Coombe Farm, off Oaks Road, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, off Conduit Lane and Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage Featherbed Lane.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Such development is in breach of Policy Eat Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that ‘Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites now, and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough. If the number of Gypsy/Traveller sites really needs to be increased by this amount then a more appropriate location would be around the existing site at Purley Way. The positioning of a Gypsy/Traveller site adjacent to the car park for Coombe Woods, between the Chateau Restaurant and the Hotel/restaurant, would probably deter me from using any of these attractions.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I have restricted my objections to those plans that primarily affect the area of Shirley I which I live, but the same objections apply to other proposals in other parts of the borough.

| Change | The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use. |
Mrs Jennifer Farina

Object 5 Proposed Policy DM43 Creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites at Coombe Farm, off Oaks Road, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, off Conduit Lane and Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage, Featherbed Lane Policy DM43, reference 502 Coombe Farm reference 661 Coombe Lodge Nurseries and reference 755 Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage.

I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Such development is in breach of Policy B of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that “Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites now, and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough. If the number of Gypsy/Traveller sites really needs to be increased by this amount, then a more appropriate location would be around the existing site at Purley Way. The positioning of a Gypsy/Traveller site adjacent to the car park for Coombe Woods, between the Chateau Restaurant and the Hotel/restaurant, would deter me from using any of these local amenities.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet the Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I have restricted my objections to those plans that primarily affect the area of Shirley in which I live, but the same objections apply to other proposals in other parts of the borough.

Change The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4374/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Tracey Plummer</td>
<td>The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4375/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs J Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4376/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Angela Gill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4377/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Jennifer Carrozzo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4378/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Jennifer Carrozzo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502; and Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference number 755. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy 5P2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites eg the site off the Purley Way. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I object to the use of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road Ref: 502 as a gypsy/traveller site.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mr & Mrs Norman

Object

DM43.4

502

I am writing to object to:

1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mr Richard Herring

Object

DM43.4

502

I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Louise Norton

Object

DM43.4

502

I am writing to object to:

1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Dr I Jayamanne

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

502

I wish to protest vehemently about your plans to destroy Shirley which is a village by building hundred of homes and setting up a Gypsy and Traveller site. You will destroy the Green Belt and increase the traffic in the area thus polluting the environment and the air we breathe.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:
• Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502; and
• Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661;
These proposals will have a detrimental effect on the settled community and in no way do they take into consideration the 2008 DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites: Good Practice Guide, point 3.8, which states: Consideration must be given to the relationship of sites to the surrounding community. The last time travellers settled in that area my nieces and nephews were confronted by gypsy kids and my sister's property was trespassed by the gypsies who stole her kids’ bikes and scooters. So I can volúch for the fact that having gypsies permanently in the area is not good consideration of the relationship of the site to the community already living there.
Furthermore, if the Council were not willing to develop the Green Belt land to build more beautiful homes in line with the properties already in the area, how is it possible that there is now a proposal to create gypsy and traveller sites in the area and burden the area and the community there with all that comes with travellers such as anti-social behaviour and loud noise and to top it off destroy the current property prices?
I am strongly opposed to this proposal and feel that the gypsy site in Purley Way should be extended to house the more space needed gypsies and travellers there.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
The proposed use of land to create gypsy/traveller sites (reference 502 and 661) is particularly unwelcome. Residents and the council have bitter experience of disruption and the waste left by travellers when they have visited Croydon. Any encouragement of this situation should be avoided, as it will encourage additional travellers to come to our town.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I object to the proposed use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites; at Coombe Farm (off Oaks Road) ref Number 502 and at Coombe Lodge Nurseries (off Conduit Lane) ref Number 661. The areas proposed are completely unsuitable for the proposed purpose being adjacent to the Tram link, Lloyd Park, Golf Course, Recreational Woodland, Ornamental Park, School and Small Businesses. Both proposed the sites are in the Green Belt and one borders a Site of Nature Conservation interest. Government Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites states that "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development."

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

We have seen information suggesting that 3 Traveller sites maybe placed around the Forestdale and Shirley Areas, and also plans to Intensify the Housing of Forestdale! We believe the plans for Traveller sites are wholly unfair and building on land which is Green Belt is inappropriate development. Policy E of Planning for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August indeed states this also. The building of such sites would also be hugely detrimental to house values, and totally unacceptable. We completely object to this so these plans need to be scrapped NOW!

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

I wish to object to the use of the following sites: The use of Coombe Farm for a gypsy/traveller site. Such sites become eyesores and would seriously affect Coombe Farm as a useful wedding centre and to some extent the gold course (Ref 502)

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
Mrs L Woods

Object

DM43.4
502

In particular I have grave concerns about the choice of location for the proposed gypsy and traveller sites and also the building of 750 new homes at Shirley Oaks Village. The local schools are already struggling to cope with ever increasing numbers of children, and the journey from Shirley into Croydon can be extremely congested at peak times. The extra traffic generated by the proposals would cause misery in my opinion. The loss of green spaces in the proposed areas of development would also be most detrimental. I would therefore urge Croydon Council to consider and respect the very real concerns and fears of the majority of residents in the Shirley area.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Mrs Parveen Majeed

Object

DM43.4
502

I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502; and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; I am so upset to hear of these proposals for my family living close by to Coombe Farm. My daughter who lives in Scotland was also living close to gypsies and every single day she had a different problem. They steal, they fight, they make so much noise and they throw their rubbish all over the place and they have rough dogs who bark at everyone. We stopped visiting her because it was too much trouble. This area you are choosing is so nice and quiet, so clean and pretty. Why would you chose to ruin it with traveller sites. This is a most stupid decision and also very thoughtless to the people who live in that area. They will have to build 6 feet high walls all around their homes. Is the council going to pay for the extra security needed? I cannot stress enough how much I am against this proposal.

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:
• Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502; and
• Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661;
I am strongly against these proposals for a number of reasons. Both the proposed sites are on Green Belt land and as such are inappropriate and harmful to the land. The area is pretty and supports plenty of wildlife which we love discovering with the grandchildren. The effect on the community already settled in that area, which includes my daughter and grandchildren, will be detrimental in many ways. I fear for their safety and security if this proposal were to be passed as the gypsies have tried to settle there before. My grandchildren were bullied and my daughter experienced vandalism to her property and theft from the garden. I cannot begin to imagine what it might be like if the travellers became permanent residents in the Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge area. It would be disastrous. How can you think of placing a gypsy and traveller site in Conduit Lane, in the green belt, next to the award winning Coombe Wood Gardens? That place would be ruined within a very short space of time. If gypsies began frequenting the Coombe Wood it would mean that elderly people such as myself would no longer feel safe taking our grandchildren to the gardens and that would be a huge loss for us in so many ways. I urge you to re-think and place the gypsies and travellers in areas that would be better suited to them and would less infringe upon the lives of already settled and happy communities.

Change
The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
am writing to object to Reference Numbers 502 and 661—Location of Gypsy and Travellers sites in Coombe Lane and Coombe Lodge Nurseries. The reasons of my objections are as follows:

• They are being built in Green Belt areas.
• The sites are built on single track lanes but in your document you state "In addition Gypsy and Traveller sites need good access to the road network as they often need to move larger vehicles as part of their livelihood and way of life." Neither has good access especially for larger vehicles, if there are to be 39 pitches with at least 2 families on each pitch and an average of 3 vehicles per family that is 234 vehicles. I don’t think you could park that many vehicles in these sites let alone access on a one vehicle wide road.
• I really do not believe these pitches are within the required distance of schools, doctors, shops.
• I understand that Croydon wishes to increase Travellers sites fourfold yet I have seen no explanation why that number is used.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

We are objecting very strongly to a gypsy and traveller site in Conduit Lane and at Coombe Farm. Both sites are green belt and should not be used for any other purposes. You should listen to all the objections of all the people living around these sites. We can not understand why the council has to pick sites in South Croydon when other places would be much more suitable.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Oaks Farm as an alternative site situated between a public path and much loved public woodland is not much better than Coombe Lodge Nurseries as a site for Gypsy and Traveller pitches.

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

Object to the 1e Travellers site as it would be in be in a Green Belt and in breach of government guidance and there would be no services local to the area

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.
8822/01/010/DM43.4/O Mrs M Davies

Object DM43.4

I object to the following:
- The use of the site at Coombe Farm for a gypsy traveller site (502)
- The use of the site at Coombe Lodge for a gypsy traveller site (661)

Change

The site is in private ownership and the land owners have indicated they would not be interested in developing it as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As the deliverability of this site for Gypsy and Travellers would now be difficult it will no longer be considered for this use.

0115/04/008/DM43.4/O Mr Bob Sleeman

Object DM43.4

I am therefore writing to formally object to:
- the use of the following five sites for housing:- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

0120/02/025/DM43.4/O Addiscombe Residents Association

Object DM43.4

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, the five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces and not used for housing.

The site should be Local Green Space.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
I am therefore writing to formally object to:

1. de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;
2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   • land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   • Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   • land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   • land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
   • land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?
Object DM43.4

De-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land bordering Addiscombe Place (around Shirley Oaks Village) – OBJECT

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, the five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces and not used for housing:
Ref 128: Land at Poppy Lane
Ref 594: Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane
Ref 541: Land east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, Shirley Oaks Road
Ref 542: Land to west of Shirley Oaks Road, Shirley Oaks Road
Ref 548: Land to rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens

Designate as Local Green Spaces and not use for housing

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4

Whilst we welcome the approach to meeting these two Vision elements: A Sustainable City: A place that sets the pace amongst London boroughs on promoting environmental sustainability and where the natural environment forms the arteries and veins of the city
A Caring City: A place noted for its safety, openness and community spirit where all people are welcome to live and work and where individuals and communities feel empowered to deliver solutions for themselves

London Wildlife Trust is concerned at the assessment undertaken to identify potential new travellers’ sites (Assessment and Selection of sites for Gypsy and Travellers, Evidence for the Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (P&A Options), August 2015). It sets out criteria and scoring for the assessment of sites in Table 1.

For Green Belt/MOL:
- No built form -10
- Built form -5
- Not GB/MOL +10

There is no +5 score amber or green. Yet for the GB/MOL scoring of each site in Table 5, a score in amber of +5 is sometimes used. This is incorrect as it overscores sites by 10 points (i.e. +5 when it should be -5). Therefore the accumulated site For this site Green Belt/Metropolitan Open Land should be listed as a policy designation prohibiting further exploration of options. This means that for this site it should not have a positive score.

Change

The evidence base will be corrected, although this will not affect the preferred use of the site which was discounted on other grounds as being unsuitable for Gypsy and Traveller pitches.
Mr & Mrs K Davenport
Object
Soundness - Justified
DM43.4 504
I am horrified at the proposals regarding Shirley. There may be a need for more housing but there are alternatives and it is up to the Council to find these rather than making it easier and more profitable for builders which is what is now happening.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

A Arbisman
Object
DM43.4 504
I hereby inform you of my STRONG OBJECTION to allow development on the land noted on your Policy Map 43. Ref 541; Ref 542; Ref 548; Ref 128; Ref 504
This land forms the reason why I, along with the majority of my neighbors purchased our homes. As freehold property owners we each have a shareholding in the company owning the land and do not wish for this, OUR land to be built on. We also find it unbelievable that the Council wishes to have a legal battle against 800 of its residents who not just own the land but are determined that the land keeps its “Metropolitan Open Land” protected status. The idea of building on these main green spaces when the existing houses were built with minimal sized gardens is disastrous, such development would obviously not just spoil the look and value of the area but would damage the health of the residents. This is the land where the residents catch the summer sun, go for walks, jog, children play, and has the most amazing natural wildlife that we all enjoy.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Balvir & Shobhna Patel
Object
DM43.4 504
I as resident of Shirley Oaks Village am against any change of our Metropolitan Land (with protection to being built on) being allowed as acceptable for development. I have been living in the Village for almost 30 years and paying for this land to be maintained as grass areas. We own the land as shareholder in our management company (Once designated as Amenity Open Land and transference to our Management company.)
I strongly oppose any moves to develop on these grass areas.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
I am writing to express my objection to the planning proposals in the Shirley Oaks area. The land has been set aside for our use as we have very undersized gardens on the estate and we have also paid to keep those areas in a well maintained condition. The road around Shirley Oaks only has 2 exits as well, so would make it very congested as there are only 2 options for traffic to leave and enter and there are already a lot of problems at the Wickham Road end as people drive in and out.

I object to the following Ref Numbers:
Ref 541, Ref 542, Ref 548, Ref 128, Ref 504

I would appreciate any information you could send me in relation to upcoming meeting's about the proposals.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
1690/01/003/DM43.4/O Mrs Christine Clark

Object DM43.4 504

I am writing to strongly object to the development of land on Shirley Oakes Village. The land was shared between residents and in 1985 designated by Croydon Council as "Amenity Open Land" because of our undersized gardens. The land was transferred to the Management Company, with each property owner as a shareholder in that company. I intend to fight for the use of this land. My front garden is approximately 6’ x 4’, and the lawn in my back garden is only 6’ x 5’. Both my parents and I use the land for exercising dogs as the gardens are so small. This whole thing has come as a huge shock to all of us. With regard to the traveller site. Travellers move around the countryside so why put a traveller site in such a residential area? I appreciate the Borough needs affordable homes but the land on the estate is so restricted in size and the in and out roads to the estate are already extremely dangerous owing to the bends in the road. Health and Safety issues need to be addressed. I strongly object to this development and will explore every possible way to restrict the development of these homes.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

1691/01/002/DM43.4/O Daniela Reynolds

Object DM43.4 504

I wish to object the following planned proposals; ref:541, ref:542, ref:548, ref:128 and ref:504 These planned proposals will not fit within the current aesthetics of the estate so please accept this email as an objection to the proposal.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Re your development plans 541, 542, 548, 128 and 504.
Consultation. I am writing in response to your notices for development of the greenfield sites on the Shirley Oaks Village estate, changing the status of this land to allow development of around 700 new homes. When I bought my house here 18 years ago, it was on the understanding that this had been designated by Croydon Council as metropolitan amenity open land, an attractive feature of the original development, important not least due to the relatively small gardens of some properties, a mixture of unit sizes in an harmonious design. Thus there is a mixture of family unit sizes and age groups at home here. For many years, I and my fellow-resident members of the Shirley Oaks Management Ltd company have contributed regularly to First Port Property Services and their predecessors under our common upkeep obligation, including provision of boundary posts at various points of these areas to ensure that visiting Travellers could not reoccupy them. As I understand your plans, you now wish to "designate" this as non-metropolitan land, on which purchasers could build however suits their purposes. This does of course risk a complete change in the nature of our Village. I cannot pretend to understand how you can effectively cut a swathe through all of this, even if you do consider it justified. Some residents might I imagine now be considering the impact on their original investment and individual legal aspects. Against these general considerations, I would like to highlight some specific and practical concerns at the outset.

ROAD SAFETY
The perimeter road via Primrose Lane and Shirley Oaks Road is arguably no longer fit for purpose, increased car ownership and parking, fast through traffic including commercial and public transport all contributing. Buses on the 367 route for example frequently mount pavements to pass each other. There have been accidents, some serious, even fatal and involving elderly pedestrian residents. The road surface is nowadays subject to excessive heavy usage. Clearly, 700 new homes will surely accentuate these problems and dangers.

ENVIRONMENT
Your plans will effectively remove an important greenfield area and with it much unique wildlife. Residents will...
lose many of the valuable areas for walking, exercise and fresh-air, as will visitors. Any balanced village appearance and community feel to the estate will be consumed by so many new properties of different designs.

In summary many will surely feel betrayed by a Council which proposes removing green-fields against all promises. Some might also suspect that, whatever the social arguments, their interests are being sacrificed against political and ultimately commercial imperatives.

Once the area surrounding Shirley Oaks Village is re-designated the Council plans to build 751 homes on 5 separate sites. Supposing the average house is for 4 people, 3000 people in total will move to the area. The housing will attract families - potentially half being children. The Council mention no where in their 700 page document about the building of new schools (primary and secondary) nor the building of doctor surgeries, nor the expanding of the local shopping area let alone the already stretched local road infra structure. Our local area can't cope as it is - St John's primary school has applied for an extension to cope with the current demand on its places. During rush hour buses frequently don't stop at bus stops because they are full. Traffic is often diverted down our road, Shirley Church Road, if there is an accident on Wickham Road or Gravel Hill. The dual carriage way (Shirley Park) is crawling along during rush hour. The council are planning to add another 1000 plus cars to this equation. Shirley is often described according to estate agents as leafy, popular, excellent schools. Prices reflect this. Just walking around the area people look after their houses and take pride in living here. People pay more money to live in this area. By building 751 more homes the character of the area will change completely.

1713/02/003/DM43.4/O Alison Connor

Object Soundness - Justified
DM43.4

Once the area surrounding Shirley Oaks Village is re-designated the Council plans to build 751 homes on 5 separate sites. Supposing the average house is for 4 people, 3000 people in total will move to the area. The housing will attract families - potentially half being children. The Council mention no where in their 700 page document about the building of new schools (primary and secondary) nor the building of doctor surgeries, nor the expanding of the local shopping area let alone the already stretched local road infra structure. Our local area can't cope as it is - St John's primary school has applied for an extension to cope with the current demand on its places. During rush hour buses frequently don't stop at bus stops because they are full. Traffic is often diverted down our road, Shirley Church Road, if there is an accident on Wickham Road or Gravel Hill. The dual carriage way (Shirley Park) is crawling along during rush hour. The council are planning to add another 1000 plus cars to this equation. Shirley is often described according to estate agents as leafy, popular, excellent schools. Prices reflect this. Just walking around the area people look after their houses and take pride in living here. People pay more money to live in this area. By building 751 more homes the character of the area will change completely.

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Anne Thompson

Object to the travellers sites in Shirley as it is against government policy and inappropriate development in area which attracts many visitors.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Amanda Stretton

We are also writing to object to Croydon Council’s plans to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village, changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Your draft Local Plan identifies five sites:

1. the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, reference number 128);
2. Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, reference number 504);
3. land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, reference number 541);
4. land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, reference number 542);
5. land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, reference number 543).

Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 544).

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>Object Statement</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Angus &amp; Olivia Bloom</td>
<td>1762/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>As a resident of Shirley Oaks I am writing to object the proposals for housing development on the estate and surroundings. Having lived in Shirley all of my life I would be deeply disappointed to see it change unrecognisably. I envisage the property on Shirley Oaks Road will either be demolished or surrounded by high density housing. Either eventuality will be highly detrimental. I have viewed the Detail Policies and Proposals on Croydon Council's website and object the following plans, references - Ref 128; Ref 504; Ref 541; Ref 542; Ref 548; Ref 938; Ref 502; Ref 661</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Jane &amp; Paul Riley</td>
<td>1827/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am writing to object to: 1. THE DESIGNATION of the following five pieces of land as Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and their proposed use as housing: Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504.

There is only one narrow very winding road which runs through the village and this could not cope safely with any additional traffic. It is single file around bends as it is and the local road infrastructure would be over-burdened.

These open spaces are collectively designated as Metropolitan Open Land and it would be unacceptable to lose a link to this chain. Additionally, this area is a flood plain and there is a sink pond to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens. There would be a detrimental effect and potential flooding of existing and planned properties.

Stroud Green Pumping Station reference number 504 - this land is not only Metropolitan Open Land but it is owned by Thames Water and there is a listed building on the site currently used as offices by Thames Water.

In your consultation document ‘Assessment and Selection of sites for Gypsy and Travellers’ you have also referred to this land as suitable for a Gypsy site, page 15 reference number 504. In the column “use proposed for site or policy designation prohibiting further exploration of option” you have failed to mention that it is also considered a site suitable for 68 homes. Which is it? Is it suitable for homes or a Gypsy site? Surely it can’t be both? This is not only Metropolitan Open Land but has a listed building which Thames Water use as offices. It is also prone to flooding and in the Planning Policy for Traveller’s Sites published in August 2015 it clearly says in Policy B reference 13g: do not locate sites in areas at high risk of flooding, including functional floodplains, given the particular vulnerability of

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
I am writing to voice my full-throated objections to the above proposals because of the irreparable damage it would do to the character of one of the leafier, more pleasant, parts of the borough. The council seeks de-designation of Metropolitan open land that, as a homeowner in Shirley Oaks Village, I own a share of, and it is protected by covenant. Such thoughtless destruction of our precious little green space (we were granted this Amenity Open Land in 1985 by the council due to our undersized gardens) is obnoxious, ill-conceived and damaging to the value of our properties, as planning blight could linger for a decade. Myriad other neglected parts of the borough are far more appropriate for such massive development and would not stir up so much ire from the current residents, nor would they require the politically-expedient moving of goalposts regarding land use. Our village simply does not currently have the infrastructure nor the capacity to expand in order to cope with these proposals. There is barely enough parking space available in the village at present, so quite where up to 683 other families will park and seek recreation, I do not know. Quite how all the construction vehicles involved in such huge building works would access the proposed sites without further detriment to the quality of life of the residents is another issue I raise. We are served by one bus route that can only use small, single decker buses. The roads are too narrow for larger vehicles. How would this be overcome? Additionally, the fact that the council would seek to house the travelling community so close to the town centre, on land where in 2012 a group of them set up an illegal encampment and defecated in our woodland, beggars belief. If the council has an inexplicable legal obligation to designate land to travellers, then expand capacity at their existing sites in Beddington Lane and Featherbed Lane rather than dispersing them further across the borough into otherwise salubrious areas. I do hope that common sense prevails and that all five of the above proposals are quickly abandoned. I chose to live in this area precisely because it is not blighted by these hideous developments. I am sure that many other residents echo my sentiments.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
I object to the following specific proposals for the building of new homes on this site, as detailed in Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan, Detailed Policies & Proposals:

Policy DM43, reference Site 128 to build new homes at Poppy Lane
Policy DM43, reference Site 504 to build new homes at Stroud Green Pumping Station (including the conversion of the pumping station which is a locally-listed building)
Policy DM43, reference Site 541 & 542 to build new homes on land to the East & West of Shirley Oaks Road
Policy DM43, reference Site 548 to build new homes on land to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens

Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the local schools are over-subscribed as well as the already-stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
This land is owned by Shirley Oaks Management Limited (SOML). This is the management company for the estate whose shareholders are the home owning residents. SOML owns and manages the open spaces on behalf of and for the benefit of the residents for whom the land is ‘amenity open land’, i.e. communal, recreational space. The land was transferred to SOML’s ownership in 1985 whilst the estate was under development. I believe that the developer had infringed planning regulations by reducing the sizes of the gardens included with the dwellings that it was building in order to increase the density of the housing beyond that which had been agreed with the local planning authority. The open land, which is currently being scrutinised as part of the Council’s policy proposals review, was effectively, a penalty levied on the developer whereby an amount of green space was given over to SOML to own and manage as redress and compensation to the residents for skimping on the sizes of individual gardens. I am assured by a Director of SOML that the company has documentary proof of all of the above points. The residents pay a service charge that, inter alia, covers the cost of managing and maintaining these open spaces. SOML is bound by its covenants with the residents that this land shall be managed and maintained as communal open areas for the collective enjoyment and benefit of residents as long as the estate should be in existence. Thus, there is no scope on SOML’s part for participating in any effort to develop these spaces and any attempt to develop them undermines the importance of those spaces in providing amenity open land, as previously ordered by the local Council.
I am writing to object to the use of the following five sites for housing:
- Land at poppy lane reference number 128
- Stroud green pumping station, 140 primrose lane reference number 504
- Land to the west of shirley oaks road and to the rear of beech house and ash house reference number 542
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle gardens reference number 548

If the council will not keep them as metropolitan open land these five site should at least be designated as local green spaces.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

I hereby would like to register my serious OBJECTION to the councils proposal to build 750 new homes in Shirley OAK road and 35 new homes on shrub lands estate to create gypsy traveller sites. As I live on Devonshire I also have serious object to allow 4 storeys in this area.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Jane Anson

Object

DM43.4

504

I have just read a letter from Mick Hewish, Resident Director of Shirley Oaks Management Ltd and I would like to object to the proposals for developing areas around Shirley Oaks.

Those are as follows:

- Ref: 541 Shirley Oaks Road East side
- Ref: 542 Shirley Oaks Road West side
- Ref: 548 Land rear of Honeysuckle Gardens
- Ref: 129 Poppy Lane
- Ref: 504 Water Board HQ Primrose Lane

The high density of new homes would put considerable strain on the environment, including overcrowding, drainage, traffic and parking.

Objection to the allocation of Site 504, Land rear of Honeysuckle Gardens, for proposed development as the high density of new homes would put considerable strain on the environment, including overcrowding, drainage, traffic and parking.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Pamela Lees

Object

DM43.4

504

I strongly object to many of the proposed developments within the Shirley area. I believe that allowing low rise developments around Shirley library will alter the balance of properties in that area, which are mainly detached and semi-detached. People have moved to this 'sought after area' precisely because of its current character. I also object to the intensive developments proposed on the Metropolitan open land around Shirley Oaks. We need open land to reduce carbon emissions, for wildlife and for our own well being. Both of the above developments would put a huge strain on the services in the area, schools, doctors, buses and the already congested road system. I urge you not to progress with these proposals.

I also think that the two proposed travellers site in Shirley are inappropriate as they would be on Green Belt land, which is against your own policy and would be a blight on one of the few areas that are beautiful and wildlife friendly within Croydon.

I am always defending Croydon to those that mock it, saying that we have some lovely open spaces in which to walk and enjoy the diversity of nature. They only see the high rise blocks and litter. If these proposals go ahead, Croydon will have nothing left to commend itself.
1926/01/04/DM43.4/O Councillor Luke Clancy

Object Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

504

Site 504, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Primrose Lane.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

1942/01/003/DM43.4/C Margaret West

Object Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

504

Object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Land and proposed use for housing at sites 128 504 502 541 542 and 548. If development is allowed it will impact on the sense of community and have an adverse impact of trees and could be subject to flooding. It would also impact on access arrangements and the wildlife

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

1954/02/001/DM43.4/O John Coppard

Object Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

504

This land was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as "Amenity Open Land" because of our under-sized gardens & transferred to a Management Company, with each property owner as a shareholder in that company.

If the council will not keep it as Metropolitan Open Land it should at least be designated as Local Green Space.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

1993/01/002/DM43.4/O Graham & Kate Marsden

Object

DM43.4

504

Shocked at the scale of proposals for Shirley and will fundamentally change the nature of the area. Front gardens are an asset to the local street scene. The proposals for focussed intensification associated with gradual character of an areas local character under Policy DM31.4 put this stability at risk, and may have an impact on the services we all need from the Council. Object to the de-designation of MOL - at a minimum it should be designated as local green space. We object to this site being used for residential use as it would change the character of the area, overload the already difficult local road structure. It would damage the vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and reduce the habitat for wildlife.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>DM43.4 504</td>
<td>I have just received a letter about proposals to Shirley Oaks Village open land being built upon. We have lived here happily for 13 years. We want to say we don't want houses or a gypsy site down the road. I will be writing to my local MP Gavin Barwell to defend our way of life in Shirley Oaks Village. Leave our open / green spaces alone.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposal to build new houses in Honeysuckle Gardens does not fall within the Strategic Objectives because:

Objective 2: This development will not Foster an environment where existing enterprise can prosper, but will reduce enterprise.

Objective 4: This development will not reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation. It will not reduce unemployment, improve skills and education and improve environmental conditions, the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Objective 5: This development is not high quality and will not enhance the borough’s natural environment but will reduce the natural environment by turning a green area into housing.

Objective 7: This development will reduce the area as a safe, healthy and cohesive community and making the area overcrowded with residential property.

Objective 10: This development will reduce the quality and accessibility of green spaces and nature.

If this development is undertaken it will not deliver the strategic objective.

This development will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The development will change the outlook and community within the South Croydon area and future generation will suffer because of this. This proposed development of new housing in Honeysuckle Gardens is not within keeping with the current development within this area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with housing in this area.

Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area and is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Building a traveler’s site will increase noise levels and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area.

Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

This development would diminish the area of green fields and recreational land within the area.
Site 504, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Primrose Lane; No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Site 504, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Primrose Lane; No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Site 504, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Primrose Lane; No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

I and many residents in Shirley object to the following. 700 new homes to be built in Shirley oaks village with no provision for extra facilities like schools, doctors etc; No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
2128/02/002/DM43.4/O Cllr Steve O'Connell AM Object DM43.4 504

I object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land for the purpose of house building. My objection references MOL bearing the same protection from development as the Green Belt. If the Council will not agree to maintain the MOL status, designation as Local Green Space would lessen the negative impact on the local environment. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well-used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Primrose Lane.

The site should be at least designated as Local Green Space.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

2131/01/002/DM43.4/O Ronald H. Street

Object DM43.4 504

The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 504. If the Council will not keep the land as MOL it should at least be designated as Local Green Space.

I am particularly concerned about the effect of local roads that the suggested development will have as, when Heron Homes built the original development some years ago they were prevented by the local council form building the number of houses now proposed because of inadequate access roads onto the estate. Under present conditions the A232 Wickham Road is particularly subject to traffic delays especially in term time. Your proposed developments would also have a detrimental effect on our already crowded local schools and doctor's surgeries.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

2135/02/001/DM43.4/O Mrs Susan Lockyer

Object DM43.4 504

It is unrealistic to develop this land with a functional listed building in situ. The 'local character area' (in the borough character appraisal) is described as industrial estates - what does this refer to? I do not consider it deliverable therefore it will not meet the present needs, let alone future needs. There is mention of a gypsy site here - by definition of 'travellers' this is not a sustainable use of land. The transient nature means that this would be a temporary use not a sustainable one. It would have a negative impact of every single existing property thereby compromising on the needs of the current as well as future generations. This does not in anyway tick the sustainability box. Transport issues will arise with sprawl as well social problems.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

02 September 2016
2145/02/003/DM43.4/O Paul Vernon & Natalie Payne

Object DM43.4

504

I am writing to object to:

The de-designation of the five pieces of land as metropolitan open land and their proposed use of housing land at poppy lane reference number 128. I feel that building more houses on the green land would totally destroy the wildlife in the area and would run an area of beauty, and that the one road into the village wouldn't be able to cope with more traffic as it's already busy.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances.

2147/01/002/DM43.4/O Patrick Thomas

Object DM43.4

504

I am writing at this time to record my objections on the following basis - the use of this site, 504, for housing

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

2185/01/002/DM43.4/O Jonathan E Miller

Object DM43.4

504

I object to ref 504 - I am writing to you with regard to the recent changes in Planning policies by Croydon Council and their impact on the designation of grass areas in Shirley Oaks Village. These areas were formerly designated as Metropolitan Open Land and had protection form being built on. However my understanding is that these areas may now be changed to no Metropolitan Land thus allowing their use for future housing developments. As a resident of Shirley I would like to point out that our land was designated as 'Amenity Open Land' in 1985 by Croydon Council because of our undersized gardens and transferred to a Management Company, with each property owner as a shareholder of the Company. Whilst I fully accept the need for new housing in Croydon, in particular affordable housing for first time owners, it is clear the sheer scale of the proposed development and the resultant destruction of a precious greenfield site in Shirley Oaks Village that I object to. I would have no issue with a much smaller scale development of the village, as part of an overall plan for Croydon where new housing was primarily targeted toward development of brownfield sites under the council's jurisdiction. I urge you to consideration of my suggestions in the weeks ahead and look forward to receiving feedback in due course.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
2195/01/003/DM43.4/O Mrs Jane Smith

Object to development on these sites as they are MOL and amenity land used by surrounding residents. This would be detrimental to the area as the existing houses on the Estate have undersized gardens and would be obtrusive and lead to increase in traffic and access problems and noise issues.

No change

2301/01/004/DM43.4/O Breda Mohan

I object to the use of the Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504 for housing.

No change

2302/01/003/DM43.4/O Brenda Stratford

The use of the following 5 sites for housing; ref no. 128, 504, 541, 542, 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as local green spaces.

No change

2371/01/004/DM43.4/O Christopher Palmer

I object to the use of the Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504 for housing.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

No change
Mr & Mrs E Abdul-Nabi

Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 504

Object to the use of this site for housing.

If the Council will not keep it as Metropolitan Open Land it should be at least designated as Local Green Space.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Andy Stranack
Croydon Council

Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 504

Site 504, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Primrose Lane.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mr & Mrs Jeffrey

Object DM43.4 504

I thoroughly object to these proposals, the traffic has built up over time and I wouldn't even want to begin to imagine what Shirley Oakd would be like if another 600+ homes where to be built, that would be practically doubling the size of Shirley Oaks as it is at present.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mr & Mrs Jeffrey

Object DM43.4 504

I will be objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I will also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
We strongly object to Croydon Council’s local planning proposals and plans for development to the site being used for residential development. We strongly object to the de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village. No more housing should be built on MO land and it is inappropriate for development since it would over-stretch the local road infrastructure with the additional traffic. The road in and out of Shirley Oaks Village is very narrow and there is hardly enough room for the bus to get by. The increased volume of traffic and parked vehicles would be unmanageable bringing traffic in all directions to a complete standstill. We believe the council needs to rethink its proposals for the sites, but would hope that in any event, an overwhelming majority of homeowners living in the village will reject the council’s proposals. Not only would the area be an eyesore, but the proposal to build a whopping 700 new homes is unrealistic as the open green spaces are very small. You would also be destroying the wildlife by cutting down our precious trees and removing the open green spaces. It was agreed, and we believe documented, that after the build of phase 5 on Shirley Oaks Village that no more houses would be built, and this was a deciding factor when individuals bought their properties on Shirley Oaks Village. If over 700 new homes are built, it would no longer be a village but instead an ugly built-up housing estate, changing the character of the landscape completely. From our perspective, if the proposals were approved, we would have no choice but to move away from the area. It would be too upsetting to see our open green spaces developed to excess with over 700 new homes. I have no doubt that developing the land would also devalue the property prices in the future. We find the council’s proposals ludicrous and unreasonable. It is imperative that we protect the precious remaining green spaces around Shirley Oaks Village. On that basis, we vigorously object to the council’s proposal to develop the land.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2539/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Lydia Benady</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>02 September 2016 Page 2357 of 4384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2540/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Sandra Cooper</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>02 September 2016 Page 2357 of 4384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2541/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms Susanne Million</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>02 September 2016 Page 2357 of 4384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lydia Benady**

We strongly object to the changes to designations of our grass areas. As a resident and shareholder I point out that our land was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as Amenity Open Land because of our under-sized gardens. This land is for our use. Not only would building be detrimental to our health and well-being but also to the varied and protected wildlife that we have. There are plenty of rundown places in Croydon which should be regenerated and can be built on without impinging into our green spaces.

**Mrs Sandra Cooper**

I object to the designation of Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks enabling parts of this land to be used for housing and in particular site 548, with which I have an adjoining boundary. Should the Council not keep this land as Metropolitan Open Land these spaces should at the least be designated as Local Green Space.

**Ms Susanne Million**

I object to the use of the site for housing. If the Council will not keep this site as MOL, it should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2544/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>Sara Palmer</td>
<td>I object to the use of the Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504 for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport. I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2558/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>Miss Margaret A Williams</td>
<td>I wish to register my objection to the proposed plans for the housing development on the green areas around the Shirley Oaks Estate.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2560/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>M.K White</td>
<td>I strongly object to your proposed development plans for this site.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mrs Shirley M Kall

Object

DM43.4 504

Our Local Green Belt should remain as such and not dedesignated as Metropolitan Open Land which then could be used for new housing. Strongly object to this proposal. Plans for residential development:

Ref No. 128 - the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51-107 homes.

Ref No. 504 - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26-68 homes.

Ref No. 541 - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 26-68 homes.

Ref No. 542 - land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes.

Ref No. 548 - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes.

Development on any of these sites would change the whole character of the area, and surely add to the congestion of local roads, which would increase the risk of accidents.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Ms Karen Fletcher

Object

DM43.4 504

We wish to register our objection to the proposals to change the policy map 43 in relation to Metropolitan Open Land at Shirley Oaks Village. Like many residents we purchased our home on the understanding that the MOL was owned by the residents themselves and would not be developed. It was a strong factor in our decision to purchase our house. The land itself was transferred to the management company by a transfer dating 30 July 1991 made between Heron Homes Limited and Shirley Oaks Management Limited. The third schedule to this transfer contains restrictive covenants and I have attached the relevant clauses. These clauses that the land is to be used as open space so I do not understand how you can ignore this and grant planning permission to build houses. We understand the need for more housing but feel that this is not the way forward. It would be far better to look at the buildings/land owned by the London Borough of Croydon first to see which could be used as residential properties. The old Ashburton Library in Ashburton Park is such a building that could be redeveloped and used for housing and I am sure there are many more.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>I object to the use of the Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504 for housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please note that I wish to object to the proposals set out in reference numbers 504, 541, 542, 548 and 128, for the following reasons:

- There has been insufficient notice of the consultation period, and the proposals are not clearly set out as pertaining to Shirley Oaks Village.
- This land is designated as Metropolitan Open Land, and I do not agree that it does not meet the criteria, as it does contribute to the physical structure of London, and there currently are open-air facilities, which serve significant parts of London.
- Increasing the housing density in this development will have a detrimental effect on the overall environment, and will decrease the value of these homes, as the development contains smaller gardens than those originally planned, and the surrounding green spaces were left vacant to compensate for the lack of adequate open space.
- Any change in the restrictions will adversely affect the accessibility to nature and wildlife of the area, which contains features of metropolitan importance.
- There is inadequate infrastructure in the locality to accommodate such an increase in population.
- There has not been a true ‘fit for purpose’ investigation of the ‘brownfield sites’, which already exist in the borough, or of other open land which could be used without.

In view of the above please register my objection to all five proposals, and please acknowledge receipt of this email.

Please note that I wish to object to the proposals set out in reference numbers 504, 541, 542, 548 and 128, for the following reasons:

- There has been insufficient notice of the consultation period, and the proposals are not clearly set out as pertaining to Shirley Oaks Village.
- This land is designated as Metropolitan Open Land, and I do not agree that it does not meet the criteria, as it does contribute to the physical structure of London, and there currently are open-air facilities, which serve significant parts of London.
- Increasing the housing density in this development will have a detrimental effect on the overall environment, and will decrease the value of these homes, as the development contains smaller gardens than those originally planned, and the surrounding green spaces were left vacant to compensate for the lack of adequate open space.
- Any change in the restrictions will adversely affect the accessibility to nature and wildlife of the area, which contains features of metropolitan importance.
- There is inadequate infrastructure in the locality to accommodate such an increase in population.
- There has not been a true ‘fit for purpose’ investigation of the ‘brownfield sites’, which already exist in the borough, or of other open land which could be used without.

In view of the above please register my objection to all five proposals, and please acknowledge receipt of this email.

Please note that I wish to object to the proposals set out in reference numbers 504, 541, 542, 548 and 128, for the following reasons:

- There has been insufficient notice of the consultation period, and the proposals are not clearly set out as pertaining to Shirley Oaks Village.
- This land is designated as Metropolitan Open Land, and I do not agree that it does not meet the criteria, as it does contribute to the physical structure of London, and there currently are open-air facilities, which serve significant parts of London.
- Increasing the housing density in this development will have a detrimental effect on the overall environment, and will decrease the value of these homes, as the development contains smaller gardens than those originally planned, and the surrounding green spaces were left vacant to compensate for the lack of adequate open space.
- Any change in the restrictions will adversely affect the accessibility to nature and wildlife of the area, which contains features of metropolitan importance.
- There is inadequate infrastructure in the locality to accommodate such an increase in population.
- There has not been a true ‘fit for purpose’ investigation of the ‘brownfield sites’, which already exist in the borough, or of other open land which could be used without.

In view of the above please register my objection to all five proposals, and please acknowledge receipt of this email.

Please note that I wish to object to the proposals set out in reference numbers 504, 541, 542, 548 and 128, for the following reasons:

- There has been insufficient notice of the consultation period, and the proposals are not clearly set out as pertaining to Shirley Oaks Village.
- This land is designated as Metropolitan Open Land, and I do not agree that it does not meet the criteria, as it does contribute to the physical structure of London, and there currently are open-air facilities, which serve significant parts of London.
- Increasing the housing density in this development will have a detrimental effect on the overall environment, and will decrease the value of these homes, as the development contains smaller gardens than those originally planned, and the surrounding green spaces were left vacant to compensate for the lack of adequate open space.
- Any change in the restrictions will adversely affect the accessibility to nature and wildlife of the area, which contains features of metropolitan importance.
- There is inadequate infrastructure in the locality to accommodate such an increase in population.
- There has not been a true ‘fit for purpose’ investigation of the ‘brownfield sites’, which already exist in the borough, or of other open land which could be used without.

In view of the above please register my objection to all five proposals, and please acknowledge receipt of this email.
spaces were left vacant to compensate for the lack of adequate open space.
  • Any change in the restrictions will adversely affect the accessibility to nature and wildlife of the area, which contains features of metropolitan importance.
  • There is inadequate infrastructure in the locality to accommodate such an increase in population.
  • There has not been a true ‘fit for purpose’ investigation of the ‘brownfield sites’, which already exist in the borough, or of other open land which could be used without.

In view of the above please register my objection to all five proposals, and please acknowledge receipt of this email.

2573/01/003/DM43.4/O  Mr Keith Harris  Object  DM43.4 504  Development Reference Numbers 541,542,548,128,504  No change  The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

2574/01/006/DM43.4/O  Mr Lewis Reynolds  Object  DM43.4 504  I wish to object to planned proposals; ref 504. These planned proposals will not fit within the current aesthetics of the estate so please accept this email as an objection to the proposal.  No change  The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 504</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I am concerned about this proposal. When I bought my house in Angelica Gardens, Shirley Oaks Village, it was my understanding that I would also become a communal owner of the surrounding Amenity Open Land. This was guaranteed by each freeholder in Shirley Oaks owning a share of the Shirley Oaks Management Limited, which in turn owns and manages the Amenity Open Land.

Like many residents, I purchased my house partly due to the pleasant areas of green space available in my surroundings. I also think that the character of the current surrounding gives each property the value that it currently has.

I would also object to attempts by Croydon Council or other agencies to attempt to purchase the land from Shirley Oaks Management Limited in the future.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
I am emailing to outline my objections to the planning notices in relation to the above reference numbers which concern land near to Shirley Oaks Road, Honeysuckle Gardens, Poppy Lane and Primrose Lane.

I object to these proposed developments for the following reasons:

1. The move to unravel the protection of Metropolitan open land from significant housing developments is a disappointing and avoidable move by Croydon Council. This sets an unnecessary precedent. This land should be protected by its designation and the council has sufficient options elsewhere in the borough on land that has no such designation.

2. Much of the land concerned was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as "Amenity Open Land" because of the under-sized gardens of many of the Shirley Oaks property. I live with a young family on Shirley Oaks with a very small garden and object to the loss of this open land which is regularly used by young families and residents of the area who do not have large gardens or any gardens at all in some instances.

3. Such proposals will unduly change the character and desirability of the local area which is defined by its open space. Shirley Oaks remains one of the few genuine peaceful residential areas within the borough and such thoughtless development will threaten this.

4. The roads leading to Shirley Oaks are roads not given to significant volumes of traffic. Increasing the density of the population within the immediate area as substantially as you are proposing creates challenges for traffic and parking. The scale of the developments will exponentially increase the volume of traffic and create challenges for parking.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Sue Ridenton

Object

DM43.4 504

I would like to raise my objection to the proposed land changes for the Ref. 504 - Up to 68 new homes or GYPSY site at the water board HW, Primmrose lane

The land we are talking about above was designated by Croydon council in 1985 as Amenity Open Land, because of our under-sized gardens and transferred to the Management Company – with each property owner as a shareholder in that company.

No one in the village will want any more homes built, the open space keeps the village unique and a nice place to live

Any more homes will not enhance the village at all and of course will lower our house prices and a GYPSY site what on earth are the council thinking!!

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Ms Rachel James

Object

DM43.4 504

I object to the following proposal for Shirley Oaks Village. Ref: 541, Ref: 542, Ref: 548, Ref: 128, Ref: 504

I love my home currently on Shirley Oaks, our gardens are considerably small on the side and I daily take walks on to the land with have with my 2 children and husband. I feel this would depreciate the area and I wouldn't be happy with any of the above plans.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Helen Armstrong

Object

DM43.4 504

I am writing to register my household’s objection to the proposed developments in Shirley. The projected number of homes will impact dramatically not only on the existing residents and the open feel of the site, but essentially on the transport infrastructure. Wickham Road is a major route, prone to congestion at peak hours and any significant increase in road users will have a dramatic knock on effect not for residents and also for commuters in all directions. The Trinity roundabout is a major junction with many bus routes passing through, this would grind to even more of a halt. The potential number of proposed properties is unacceptably high.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Ian Broyd
Object DM43.4 504
If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, the five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces and not used for housing.
The site should be Local Green Space.
No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Miss P Jones
Object DM43.4 504
Having lived in Shirley for over 50 years I strongly object to Croydon Council plans to de-designate the Metropolitan open land so that most of this land will be used for new housing. At the moment it has the same Protection as Green Belt. Firstly, this would entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding area, changing the character of the area, more importantly the road infrastractive couldn't cope with the additional traffic. Try getting out to the Wickham Road from Orchard Avenue in rush hour.
No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Paul Sandford
Bourne Society
Object DM43.4 504
Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Primrose Lane.
No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mrs Y Sussey
Object DM43.4 504
Object to proposals at this site because of the increased risk of flooding and adverse impact on air quality. New Housing should be on brownfield sites.
No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Ms S Mawaziny

**Object**

I object to the use of the Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504 for housing.

**No change**

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mrs Penelope Perry

**Object**

I am writing to you in my capacity as secretary of the Addiscombe Woodside and Shirley Leisure Gardens Ltd, with the full endorsement of the Executive Committee. AWSLF is an allotment society comprising in excess of 400 plots, adjacent to Stroud Green Pumping Station and bounded by Primrose Lane, Poppy Lane and Glenthorne Avenue.

I am writing to object to two issues detailed in the above document which are relevant to our land.

De-designation of the following piece of land as Metropolitan Open Land and its proposed use as housing:

- Stroud Green Pumping Station 140 Primrose Lane ref 504
- Stroud Green Pumping Station is not only Metropolitan Open Land but is owned by Thames Water. There is a listed building on the site currently used as offices by Thames Water.

- In your consultation document "Assessment and Selection of sites for Gypsy and Travellers" you have also referred to this land as suitable for a Gypsy site - page 15 ref 504. In the column "use proposed for site or policy designation prohibiting further exploration of option" you have failed to mention that it is also considered suitable for 68 homes.

It is also prone to flooding and in the planning policy for Traveller's sites published in August 2015 it clearly says in Policy B reference 13g.2 do not locate sites in areas at high risk of flooding, including functional floodplains, given the particular vulnerability of caravans.”
Mr & Mrs Kellas  
Object  
DM43.4  
504  
I would say to the Council Croydon is full and kindly leave our precious Shirley open spaces and attractive streets alone, we don’t need an odd assortment of blocks of flats amongst the semi-detached and small detached properties here, or in similar Croydon suburbs - it would be an architectural disaster along the lines of the 1950s concrete jungle development of the centre of Croydon. And we don’t have the infrastructure to cope with more people, or the roads to cope with the traffic we already have. 
No change  
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mr Beresford Walker  
Object  
DM43.4  
504  
I object to Policy DM43, reference Site 504 to build new homes at Stroud Green Pumping Station (including the conversion of the pumping station which is a locally-listed building) 
No change  
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mr & Mrs Panagakis  
Object  
DM43.4  
504  
Object to the use of Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane (reference number 504) for housing 
No change  
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mr & Mrs C P Smith  
Object  
DM43.4  
504  
Object to this site as this land was designated to residents of Shirley Oaks village as amenity open land in 1985 because of the undersized gardens and transferred to the management company. This land should remain Green Belt 
No change  
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2721/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr A Zelisko</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM43.4 504</td>
<td>I object to the use of this site for housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2736/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Hunt</td>
<td>DM43.4 504</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr & Mrs Hunt

I am writing to object to:

- The use of the following five sites for housing:
  - Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128
  - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504
  - Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541
  - Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542
  - Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548

- The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
We are writing to object to the use of the following five sites for housing:
- Land at Poppy Lane, reference number 128
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, ref no. 504
- Lane to the East of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and ash House reference number 541
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, ref number 542
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeyuckle Gardens, ref number 548.

If council will not keep them as metropolitan open land, these sites should at least be designated as green spaces.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

I object to the use of the Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504 for housing.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Object this site as building on it would lead to a loss of greenspace between Shirley oaks and the surrounding area.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
I am writing regarding the Council's plans for a massive redevelopment in the Shirley Area. More houses mean more traffic on our already crowded roads. I no longer go into Croydon because of the journey times. How long would it be before the Council considered bringing in a congestion charge. When you build all these properties do you consider the local amenities and the effect that more people would have on these. Where are the school places for all of these children? Regarding doctors. Unless it is an emergency I have to wait at least a week for an appointment. This waiting time can only increase if there are more patients. Is it the Council's policy to build over green belt land to the detriment of locals? I sincerely hope not. I think you need to seriously reconsider these plans.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
These open spaces are collectively designated as Metropolitan Open Land. It would be disastrous to lose a link in this chain.

THE SHIRLEY GREEN CHAIN
The green open spaces of Shirley Oaks Village provide several links in the Shirley Green Chain. This chain starts at the South Norwood Country Park in the north and runs south through Ryland Fields, Long Lane Woods, Ashburton Playing Fields, the open spaces of Shirley Oaks Village, Trinity School playing fields, Shirley Park Golf Course and up to the Shirley Hills. From there the Green Chain continues through Heathfield, Bramley Bank Nature Reserve, Littleheath Woods and via Selsdon Park to Kings Wood at Hamsey Green. These open spaces are collectively designated as Metropolitan Open Land. It would be disastrous to lose a link in this chain.

Planning Policy Guidance Note 9
This guidance stresses the importance of nature conservation, not only on nationally important sites, but also suggests that many urban sites for nature conservation have enhanced local importance as a consequence of the relative lack of wildlife sites in built up areas. Statutory and nonstatutory sites which provide wildlife corridors, links or stepping stones from one habitat site to another, all help to form a network necessary to endure the maintenance of the current range and diversity of our flora and fauna.

The Green Spaces in Shirley Oaks Village were designated as Metropolitan Open Land and today still meet the criteria for this protection. The sites (1) contain conservation and habitat interest of value at a metropolitan level and (2) forms part of the Shirley Green Chain. These are two of the criteria for Metropolitan Open Land. The Green Spaces in Shirley Oaks Village were designated as Metropolitan Open Land and today still meet the criteria for this protection. The sites (1) contain conservation and habitat interest of value at a metropolitan level and (2) form part of the Shirley Green Chain. These are two of the criteria for Metropolitan Open Land.

These sites possibly have a section 52 agreement, and are part ownerships shared by each of the Shirley Oaks Village residents. Re-designation of MOL falls foul of

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
the London Plan.

Existing dwellings to be retained or demolished? If retained the Site Area should be adjusted to take account of the existing dwellings: The Lodge, Beech House & Ash House? On the East site And the Synagogue and the two house (can't read their names) on the West side.

Infrastructure not specified to support development.

Schools are oversubscribed; GP Surgeries oversubscribed

Road system could not cope with the increase in traffic during peak travel times

Area has high water table and is subject to flooding.

London Plan

POLICY 7.17 METROPOLITAN OPEN LAND

Strategic
A The Mayor strongly supports the current extent of Metropolitan Open Land (MOL), its extension in appropriate circumstances and its protection from development having an adverse impact on the openness of MOL.

Planning decisions
B The strongest protection should be given to London's Metropolitan Open Land and inappropriate development refused, except in very special circumstances, giving the same level of protection as in the Green Belt. Essential ancillary facilities for appropriate uses will only be acceptable where they maintain the openness of MOL.

LDF preparation
C Any alterations to the boundary of MOL should be undertaken by Boroughs through the LDF process, in consultation with the Mayor and adjoining authorities.

D To designate land as MOL boroughs need to establish that the land meets at least one of the following criteria:

a) it contributes to the physical structure of London by being clearly distinguishable from the built up area
b) it includes open air facilities, especially for leisure, recreation, sport, the arts and cultural activities, which serve either the whole or significant parts of London

c) it contains features or landscapes (historic, recreational, biodiversity) of either national or metropolitan valued if it forms part of a Green Chain or a link in the network of green infrastructure and meets one of the above criteria.
The London Plan 7.56

The policy guidance of paragraphs 79-92 of the NPPF on Green Belts applies equally to Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). MOL has an important role to play as part of London’s multifunctional green infrastructure and the Mayor is keen to see improvements in its overall quality and accessibility. Such improvements are likely to help human health, biodiversity and quality of life. Development that involves the loss of MOL in return for the creation of new open space elsewhere will not be considered appropriate. Appropriate development should be limited to small scale structures to support outdoor open space uses and minimise any adverse impact on the openness of MOL. Green chains are important to London’s open space network, recreation and biodiversity. They consist of footpaths and the open spaces that they link, which are accessible to the public. The open spaces and links within a Green Chain should be designated as MOL due to their London-wide importance.

2775/01/041/DM43.4/0 Cllr Tim Pollard
London Borough of Croydon

Object Soundness - Justified
Site 504, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Primrose Lane.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

2776/01/041/DM43.4/0 Cllr Helen Pollard
London Borough of Croydon

Object Soundness - Justified
Site 504, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Primrose Lane.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
The preferred approach is not the most appropriate for Croydon to help meet strategic objectives. No - the land is current Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land or otherwise designated green land and should not be built on.

I disagree that it "does not contribute to the physical structure of London". Just because it has no facilities does not mean that it is not an asset to the life of London. Yes, it is deliverable but should not be delivered on that land. No, it is not sustainable because it removes the need for green space for future generations. The building is locally listed so its curtilage should be protected as if it was a Grade II Listed Building.

Site 504, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Primrose Lane.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Site 504, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Primrose Lane.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Site 504, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Primrose Lane.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>DM43.4/504</td>
<td>Cllr Richard Chatterjee</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>Site 504, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Primrose Lane.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>DM43.4/504</td>
<td>Philip Talmage</td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential development on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and around Shirley Oaks Village (reference numbers 128, 504, 541, 542, 548 on Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals) This is Metropolitan Open Land which is accorded the same level of statutory protection as the Green Belt. Changing this designation in order to allow building amounts to an abuse of the planning process. The area is liable to localised flooding, which anyway makes it unsuitable for residential housing. There appears to be no provision for additional infrastructure which would support the building of up to 750 new homes. In particular, local roads are already inadequate; morning traffic queues are already common in this area, especially towards the town centre. The proposals cannot but fundamentally alter the character of this part of Shirley, again, for the worse</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>DM43.4/504</td>
<td>Mr Roy Saunders</td>
<td></td>
<td>object to the development at Stroud Green Pumping Station as it is protected land as MOL</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the use of the following five sites for housing:
- Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.
If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
I write concerning Croydon Council's proposals contained in the consultation document of the Croydon Local Plan that includes the re-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in Shirley and specifically within the confines of Shirley Oaks. I consider these proposals and others listed above to be inappropriate as they would significantly change the character of the area in which I have lived all 61 years of my life and I wish to add my voice to those already expressing concerns and objections about these proposals.

I strongly object to the proposal to re-designate Metropolitan Open Land to facilitate the building of new homes on land in Shirley Oaks and the provision of temporary or permanent traveller/gypsy sites in areas that are acknowledged by the Council to be in the green belt at Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries in Conduit Lane.

These proposals are totally out of keeping with the character of the area which predominantly comprise owner-occupied semi and detached homes. Surely areas considered to be brownfield sites are more appropriate than the unacceptable use of Metropolitan Open Land?

The proposals affecting the area surrounding Shirley Library are also of concern as this would adversely change the character of the area and potentially result in the establishment of additional unsightly car-parking sites on the south side of Wickham Road, similar to that at the front of the Shirley Medical Centre at 370 Wickham Road.
Mr Roohi F Khan

Object

This area is close to the exit from Primrose lane into Shirley Road, a heavily congested road. This exit is shared by the adjacent ambulance station and at present is marred by locals who park their cars to attend the Shirley Health clinic (proposed to be developed into a neighbourhood centre and therefore more parking) also by those who park daily to catch local transport to Croydon Centre and London and residents cars of the opposite social housing accommodation whose parking area is inadequate. This area also backs onto the Addiscombe and Shirley Woods leisure Garden Ltd which has an entrance onto Primrose Lane adjacent to this area. This proposal could make access to the Leisure Gardens difficult and could lead to increased criminal damage within the Gardens. Any residential building in this area will increase the congestion which is already evident at the exit into Shirley Road. The increase in parking and road usage would definitely be restrictive to the emergency exits of ambulances. It is noted that this area was accessed as a potential site for Travellers but not highlighted as a preferred site. ALL RESIDENTS STRONGLY OBJECT TO THIS

DM43.4
504

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mr John Newman

Object

I object to the use of the site for housing.

DM43.4
504

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mrs Carolyn Dare

Object

Soundness - Justified

I raise strong objection to the allocation of this site for development. I am a shareholder in Shirley Oaks Management Company which owns the land and maintains it. I pay a quarterly charge towards its upkeep. The traffic is already too much for the road through the village. Please do not allow our village to be destroyed.

DM43.4
504

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
I raise strong objection to the allocation of this site for development. I am a shareholder in Shirley Oaks Management Company which owns the land and maintains it. I pay a quarterly charge towards its upkeep. The traffic is already too much for the road through the village. Please do not allow our village to be destroyed.
The proposal to build new houses in Honeysuckle Gardens does not fall within the Strategic Objectives because:

Objective 2: This development will not Foster an environment where existing enterprise can prosper, but will reduce enterprise.

Objective 4: This development will not reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation. It will not reduce unemployment, improve skills and education and improve environmental conditions, the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Objective 5: This development is not high quality and will not enhance the borough’s natural environment but will reduce the natural environment by turning a green area into housing.

Objective 7: This development will reduce the area as a safe, healthy and cohesive community but making the area overcrowded with residential property.

Objective 10: This development will reduce the quality and accessibility of green space and nature. This proposed development of new housing in Honeysuckle Gardens is not within keeping of the current development within this area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with housing in the area. Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area and is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Building a travelers site will increase noise levels and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area.

Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. This development would diminish the area of green fields and recreational land within the area.

This development will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The development will change the outlook and community within the South Croydon area and future generation will suffer because of this.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
2974/01/004/DM43.4/O Jane Bowden Object Soundness - Justified

2) I understand that the Council are seeking to de-designate various pieces of land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and around Shirley Oaks village, so that it is no longer Metropolitan Open Land, with a view to potentially building between 304 and 751 new homes. (Reference numbers 128, 504, 541, 542 & 548).

Open, green land is essential to maintain a pleasant living area, and to maintain the character of the area. In addition, this number of additional dwellings would seriously overwhelm the local infrastructure. In particular, the local road infrastructure could not cope with the additional traffic.

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

---

3001/01/005/DM43.4/O Mr. John Helen Object Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 504).

I will be objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I will also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

I am happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but I will be objecting to building on precious open space.

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

---

3002/01/005/DM43.4/O Mr. John Hitchcock Object Our family has lived on Shirley Oaks Village approx 20 years ago and understood the village to be a Private estate and I am writing to object to the de-designation of the open land around the village and to the use of five sites for housing.

The land rightfully belongs to the residents, the area and roads will become congested and property values will decrease.

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Mr John Roberts

Object

DM43.4

504

I am writing to object to:
The use of the Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, reference number 504, for housing:

If the Council will not keep these areas as Metropolitan Open Land, these 5 sites should at least be designated as Local Green Space.

My objections are based on the following:

i. The change in local designation and subsequent development would lead to a material reduction to an important green space and amenity within a basically urban area,

ii. The effect and congestion on the local infra-structure which would be caused by the building of more housing to an already densely developed site,

iii. The effect on existing property values of property to Shirley Oaks and surrounding areas caused by the reduced amenity and congestion.

I urge that the Council should take these and other objections in consideration and not continue with their plans to re-designate the areas described above.

Mr Joseph Rowe

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

504

Land currently designated as Metropolitan Open Land at Poppy Lane, Stroud Green Pumping Station, to the east of Shirley Oaks Road, to the west of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens has been identified as suitable for up to 741 homes (pages 445-446, 451-452, 453-454, 455-456, 457-458 Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference numbers 128, 504, 541, 542 and 548).

I object to these proposals on the grounds that:

This land is designated as Metropolitan Open Land and there is no justification for re-designation. An increase of up to 741 homes on this land would put local services including schools, transport and already crowded roads under further pressure.
Once the area surrounding Shirley Oaks Village is re-designated the Council plans to build 751 homes on 5 separate sites. Supposing the average house is for 4 people, 3000 people in total will move to the area. The housing will attract families - potentially half being children. The Council mention no where in their 700 page document about the building of new schools (primary and secondary) nor the building of doctor surgeries, nor the expanding of the local shopping area let alone the already stretched local road infrastructure. Our local area can't cope as it is - St John's primary school has applied for an extension to cope with the current demand on its places. During rush hour buses frequently don't stop at bus stops because they are full. Traffic is often diverted down our road, Shirley Church Road, if there is an accident on Wickham Road or Gravel Hill. The dual carriageway (Shirley Park) is crawling along during rush hour. The council are planning to add another 1000 plus cars to this equation. Shirley is often described according to estate agents as leafy, popular, excellent schools. By building 751 more homes the character of the area will change completely.

No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

3028/01/005/DM43.4/O Mr Nick Barnes

Object Soundness - Justified

Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Road.

None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.

No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

3029/01/003/DM43.4/O Mr Paul Newton
Addington Village Residents Assoc

Object Soundness - Justified

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Sarah Minter

Object DM43.4

I strongly object to the proposed development plans for the Shirley Area. I have lived here all my life and have seen a steady influx of people, and a massive reduction in the green space in the area. The roads are already far too congested and the social infrastructure is already struggling to cope with the number of residents. There are many areas in the Croydon borough much more suited to such large scale development. I am thinking particularly of areas around Purley Way. There are also many brownfield sites in the borough that could be put to more effective use as housing without affecting the green areas. I guess the council prefers to redevelop the green areas rather than the brownfield areas due to cost. As I said I do not want my local area turned into a concrete jungle where there is nowhere for people to relax in the open.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances.

Mr Stuart Marsh

Object DM43.4

I object to the use of the site for housing.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
I am writing to object to all the proposed changes and plans affecting the Shirley neighbourhood as advised to me by Gavin Barwell and the Executive Committee of Spring Park Residents Association.

1) I object strongly to any plans to change the definition of existing land and use.

2) When dealing with the further extension of Shirley Oaks site I am disturbed by the fact there are just two access points i.e., Shirley Road and Wickham Road the latter being onto the A232 which is very busy all day and particularly during rush hour periods, when traffic backs up westwards to the Shirley Road roundabout and beyond.

3) The proposals for Shirley Oaks, given to me indicate land being suitable for between 304 and 751 additional homes. As many properties nowadays have at least one car this will have a serious additional congestion to Shirley and Wickham Roads.

4) Additionally, development of this size would have a serious demand on existing schools (primary particularly), doctors and other local services.
Object  DM43.4 504

I am writing to express my objection to the proposals of development to the Shirley oaks estate, on website www.croydon.gov.uk/policiesmap on "Changes to the policy Map 43" those being:-

Ref:541. Shirley oaks road East side, up to 215 new homes!!
Ref:542. Shirley oaks road west side, up to 236 new homes!!
Ref:548. Land rear of honeysuckle gardens, up to 125 new homes!!!
Ref:128. Poppy lane, up to 107 new homes!!!
Ref:504. Up to 68 new homes or gypsy site at the water board HQ, primrose lane!!!!!!!!

I brought my home on 5 Flag Close, Shirley Oaks, Surrey, CR0 8XT as it was on a green and pleasant estate and on the understanding this land was designated to us as because of our undersized gardens. We were told this land would never be built on and each of the properties on the estate are shareholders of this land as it was designated "amenity open land" by the Croydon council and transferred to our management company.

We are forming groups and seeking legal advice and looking into the legal implications and small print to your proposals and will not take this laying

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Object  DM43.4 504

I object to the use of the site for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3093/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Paul Grosser</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 504. I have friends who live in Shirley Oaks village and I know them and myself along with many others all object to the proposals to build on the green areas. This grass area is used by many and would totally change the area if built on and we don’t want it. Part of the charm of this area is those green areas and it has something that you don’t find often in Croydon so please let us keep the green areas as we all object to them being built on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3068/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Derrick Thurley</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>De-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village thus enabling the following sites to be built on: a) Policy DM43, Reference 128 Land to build 51 to 107 homes in Poppy Lane b) Policy DM43, Reference 504 Land to build 26 to 68 homes at Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Pimms Lane including conversion of the pumping station c) Policy DM43, Reference 541 Land to build 80 to 215 homes to the east of Shirley Oaks and rear of Beech House d) Policy DM43, Reference 542 Land to build 88 to 236 homes to the west of Shirley Oaks Road e) Policy DM43, Reference 548 Land to build 5 to 13 homes to the rear of 5 to 13 Honeysuckle Gardens. This entails loss of green space, changing the character of the area and local road infrastructure unable to cope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3102/02/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Richard Horton</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I wish to log my objection to the borough-wide planned changes Croydon Council are proposing to make in their Local Plans for 2016-2036. These proposals are 750 new homes in Shirley Oaks and 35 new homes on the Shrublands Estate. Also the proposed work to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Coombe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Coombe Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No change: The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

DM43.4
504
Object to the dedesignation of MOL around Shirley Oaks Village as it will change the character of the area if they are not MOL they should at least be Local Open Land. Building Houses on them would lead to the loss of a vital green corridor and set a precedent

No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

I am writing to lodge my objection to some of the proposals contained in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals. In particular:

1. Shirley Oaks
The proposal to re-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on Shirley Oaks Road and around Shirley Oaks Village so that it can be used for new housing (page 68, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Part Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals). My main objections are:
This would result in the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area. The local road network could not cope with the additional traffic. Insufficient local infrastructure to cope with the increased population. Conclusion
The proposals I have highlighted can only be viewed as negative. If adopted, they will increase the local population - and the density of that population - without providing any supporting infrastructure. The new residents from the planned apartment blocks and traveller sites will need additional public services such as schools, medical services and shops. Older residents will give way to young families who require greater social support, yet no additional resources are identified to help manage the changing demographic. Traffic congestion along already busy roads will increase, as will pollution and accident black-spots. The few remaining green spaces will disappear. Overall, the proposals signal a reduction in the quality of life for both the existing residents and the newcomer
Carolyn Heath

Object

DM43.4

I am writing to object to:
1. The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:
   • Coombe Lodge Nurseries (site ref 661)
   • Coombe Farm off Oaks Road (site ref 502)
   • Poppy Lane (site ref 128)
   • Stroud Green Pumping Station (site ref 504)
   • Shirley Oaks Road/Beech House (site ref 541)
   • Shirley Oaks Road (site ref 542)
   • Honeysuckle Gardens (site ref 548)
   • Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Cottage (site ref 755)

All areas provide vital green space in already densely populated areas, and there is insufficient infrastructure to cope with the additional traffic/population. Some of these areas are in the Green Belt, others are in Metropolitan Open Land. They would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mr David Harwood

Object

DM43.4

(1) I object to residential development at the following sites & to the policy of de-designate of metropolitan open land at the following:

Stroud Green Pumping Station reference number 504

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mr Jim Cowan

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

I have read Gavin Barwell's assessment of policies and proposals in the Croydon Local Plan and totally agree that if implemented would destroy the character of Shirley.

The infrastructure in Shirley is already stretched to the limit and can not withstand any further burdens.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
I am also objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

I have major concerns over the planned development of the Shirley Area. This is currently one of the nicest areas of Croydon and you plan to swamp it with a number of housing developments and some travellers sites. This will be very detrimental to the whole area.

I understand that nationally we need to have more accommodation for families. We need to achieve this with ought destroying the whole fabric of our society. This scale of development will transform the whole area into a old fashioned “Estate”.

There are not sufficient services in the wider area to support such an influx of families.

The road infrastructure already struggles at time and these developments will make the whole situation much worse.

I have major concerns over the planned development of the Shirley Area. This is currently one of the nicest areas of Croydon and you plan to swamp it with a number of housing developments and some travellers sites. This will be very detrimental to the whole area.

I understand that nationally we need to have more accommodation for families. We need to achieve this with ought destroying the whole fabric of our society. This scale of development will transform the whole area into a old fashioned “Estate”.

There are not sufficient services in the wider area to support such an influx of families.

The road infrastructure already struggles at time and these developments will make the whole situation much worse.
| 3204/01/003/DM43.4/O  | Mr Steve Hopkins | Object | DM43.4 504 | As a resident of Shirley Oaks from Day one, I totally oppose any new buildings to be approved or built on my private estate. | No change | The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall. |

| 3208/01/003/DM43.4/O  | Mr Stephen Smith | Object | DM43.4 504 | 1. I am writing to object to re-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and the intention to build on open sites at Poppy Lane (ref 128), Primrose Lane (ref 504), Shirley Oaks Road (refs 541 + 542) and Honeysuckle Gardens (ref 548). | No change | The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall. |
I am therefore writing to formally object to:

1. The de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;

2. The use of the following five sites for housing:
   - land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   - land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
   - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

---

We bought our property at the original building phase in Shirley Oaks many years ago and were informed that there would be no further development in this area and that all grassed areas were to remain undeveloped and were for the use of residents and local people at leisure, further to this we have paid yearly a maintenance cost to ensure these areas were up kept for this use. This is the main reason we invested in this property. The grassed areas are in constant use and development of these areas would change the natural village atmosphere that exists here and is one of the few areas of Croydon that there is an abundance of wildlife close to an urban area. The proposed development and designation of our grass areas is unacceptable and would infringe our rights as in our original contracts with Heron homes who built the site.

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane Reference number 504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542</td>
<td>Land to the West of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should be at least designated as Local Green Spaces.
Mr Matthew Carey

Object

The area of Shirley Oaks Village and its adjacent road infrastructure is already at breaking point. Any slight build up of traffic seriously hinders movement for residents. The 2 main arterial routes into Croydon or towards Bromley (being wickham road & lower addiscombe road) are extremely busy with traffic and often lead to extended journey times for those of us who wish to head in to one of these town centres or further afield in to London for work. As proven only yesterday when a traffic accident in the Shirley area led to a 3 hour journey home from bromley back to Shirley. The road network around here is poor. The interlink between Shirley Oaks village and its surrounding area is poor. To add hundreds of houses within this area will only lead to increased volume of traffic on the surrounding roads and leave Shirley itself in an almost permanent state of gridlock. Shirley Oaks Road is always busy with vehicles parked up. This is due to a number of reasons;
The excessive traffic on wickham road leading to people abandoning their vehicles to try and walk nearer to Croydon to catch a tram or bus. The unreliable 367 bus route which is often hindered by traffic or accidents outside of Shirley Oaks Village leading to people driving closer to other bus routes. The use of the local synagogue. Combine these issues above with the additional housing being proposed and the vehicles that come with them, Shirley Oaks will become even cut off than it already is. There are many elderly residents in this area that rely on carers (friends etc) being able to visit them. They often complain about the issues I have raised above and I can only see this getting worse should the proposals for Shirley go ahead.

Croydon is a massive borough so there must be other areas that these proposals could be met.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances.

Mr Terrence McCarthy

Object

I object to the use of the site for housing. If the Council will not it as Metropolitan Open Land, it should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on it would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
I object to the use of the site for housing. No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
To help you identify my specific objections, the five proposals mentioned so far and to which I wish to object as being detrimental to the character of the area are:

- the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 128);
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 504);
- land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80 to 215 homes (pages 453-454, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 541);
- land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88 to 236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542); and
- land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59 to 125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548).

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Mr Roger Williams
Object  Soundness - Justified  DM43.4 504
Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.
If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.
No change

Dr Bob Wenn
Object  DM43.4 504
I object to the site for use for housing.
No change

Mr John Mullis
Object  DM43.4 504
In response to your notices for the development of the greenfield sites on Shirley Oaks Village and the intention to change the status of this land, I make the following observations:
In 1985 Croydon Council designated land within Shirley Oaks Village as "Amenity Open Land" because our gardens were small due to the layout and construction of the area by Heron Homes. This amenity land is owned collectively by the property owners who own 1 share each. The shares are held by the current trust company - First Port, who also maintain this estate. Is compulsory purchase envisaged? If a total of some 700 homes the village would need vast changes to its infrastructure to accommodate these properties. The present main road - Primrose Lane/Shirley Oaks Road is barely able to cope now - with just a single-decker bus allied to a growing number of cars. There is a regular flooding problem during heavy downpours - particularly from Primrose Lane into Laburnum Gardens. The loss of a wildlife conservation area is surely against wider interests including many present owners.
No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

I strongly object to these plans as a resident of hazel close I am a shareholder of Shirley oaks management and feel strongly that the land be left as it is as we have very small gardens and pay for these open land areas to be kept and maintained for our use and enjoyment. Also these plans especially the ref 504 will devalue my property immensely and will downgrade the area dramatically.

To whom this may concern

Ref:541
Ref:542
Ref:548
Ref:128
Ref:504

I strongly object to these plans as a resident of hazel close I am a shareholder of Shirley Oaks management and feel strongly that the land be left as it is as we have very small gardens and pay for these open land areas to be kept and maintained for our use and enjoyment. Also these plans especially the ref 504 will devalue my property immensely and will downgrade the area dramatically.
One of the requirements of the Pitt review of 2007 was for the Environment Agency to provide some warning for surface water flooding, as was already the practise for river and coastal flooding. The result was the LIDAR returns which are provided on the Environment Agency’s website under what’s in my backyard. This shows clearly how the lie of the land amongst the Shirley Oaks Estate causes surface water to run from South to North joining another stream which runs in from the SW from Shirley road into Primrose Lane. On numerous occasions over recent wet winters we have had a constant stream of water running across the kerb into Primrose Lane which has on occasion caused substantial amounts of ice to form. No doubt your winter maintenance department could confirm this is an area where they have to regularly do spot treatments of rock salt- since they do Primrose lane as it is a bus route, when other parts of the network are totally dry and do not require treatment.

From the Pitt Review of 2007 -
RECOMMENDATION 7: There should be a presumption against building in high flood risk areas, in accordance with PPS2S, including giving consideration to all sources of flood risk, and ensuring that developers make a full contribution to the costs both of building and maintaining any necessary defences. Section 5.14 of the report reiterates that PPS2S applies to all sources of flood risk. This states that an SFRA (surface flooding risk assessment) should assess surface water flood risk and identify critical drainage areas. Good information is therefore needed from sewerage undertakers and other sources, including local knowledge, historic flooding and risk modelling. Local authorities should ensure that SFRAs carried out on their behalf adequately address this type of flooding. I find it difficult to believe this has been done as otherwise there would have never been a suggestion of using the remaining green parts of the estate in this way.

Any increase in the built up area around the estate would thus exacerbate the already on occasion saturated surface. Having investigated in detail the benefits in the reduction of flooding by the provision of trees, I have found that Oak trees can use up to 50 gallons a day and some trees on a hot day will utilise 150-200 gallons (wiki-answers.com). Trees admittedly are most effective when we are in the
growing season at excess water removal, but that is also when we tend to have the most extreme rainfall events. Having looked at 'Heavy falls in a day' and 'Heavy falls in short Periods' both produced in part for British Rainfall by the Met Office (my employer), I have found that invariably the most extreme rainfall happens in SE England between June and September. This is just when a tree is in full leaf so not only intercepts falling rain by the size of its canopy, but also as it is growing, that rain which reaches the soil is quickly extracted for use in the tree’s transpiration. Preliminary research results from the University of Manchester indicate that trees can reduce runoff by as much as 80% compared to asphalt. Thus the best way to alleviate summer extreme rainfall surface water flooding is not to remove trees.

The soil on which Shirley Oaks is located is of a clay type and is therefore impervious; another reason why it reacts to surface water flooding the way it does. The large area of grassland is ideal for ‘making room for water’ as a water storage area; thus to remove this pooling facility will mean the rain will have to find somewhere else to go, which would inevitably mean flooding for Shirley Oaks residents. Also I have learned, from Meteorological Office memorandum No 80—the properties of soils in NW Europe, that the root system of grassland provides a channel through which some rainfall does manage to slowly percolate through beneath the surface even with clay soils. However, without the grassland root system the water just tends to form bodies of water lying on the surface. This effect of our grassland is very helpful in alleviating the surface water flooding in winter, which occurs when prolonged rainfall totally saturates the area, and the trees are no longer as effective at its removal.

So in conclusion
- We need trees to mitigate effects of extreme rainfall in summer, something which will become increasingly frequent with global warming
- We need open grassland for water to accumulate in winter when trees are less effective at water removal from the system, whilst in addition their root systems help to aid percolation beneath the soil reducing surface flooding. Over the last 40 years winter rainfall has been increasing throughout the UK
- Soil behaviours also dictate risk of flooding. We have issues because:
1) We are on a clay soil type so low permeability and heavy rain does not soak in but floods.
2) We are on sloping ground with tendency for run off to flow south to north across the site.
3) We, also because of having a clay soil, have a high water table, so in winter many areas of the site are wet and all parts stay damp throughout. Thus water-logging very quickly occurs and there would with the proposed building work be less and less places for the water to flow to.

Mr. Stuart Day

I am writing to you to object to the council's planned proposals.

Ref: 541
Ref: 542
Ref: 548
Ref: 128
Ref: 504

I moved to the area with the understanding that the grass areas had protection from being built upon and I strongly object to the council proposing the new developments as referenced above. This will make the area I live in with my family crowded and I bought my property with the understanding that the grass areas would not be built on.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
First, the Council plans to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village (page 68, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals). Metropolitan Open Land has the same protection from development as the Green Belt. The Council is proposing to remove this designation so that most of this land can be used for new housing. The draft Local Plan identifies five sites:

- the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 128);
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 504);
- land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 541);
- land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542; and
- land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548).

I will be objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If
the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I will also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

3381/01/005/DM43.4/O Mr Daniel James

Object

I am writing to object to the Council's proposition to allow the development at the following sites: Ref: 541, 542, 548, 128 and 504 in Shirley Oaks Village. I have only lived on Shirley Oaks for 5 years, but one of the things I love the most is walking my children over to the grass areas so they can play. As you probably already know, our gardens are quite small so it's really nice to have space to take full advantage of. Another thing that disappoints me, is that one of the selling points of our house, is the fact that all the land around the estate is protected from building on. I strongly disagree with any of your plans to build upon this land, and along with other Shirley Oaks residents will do my best to get our voices heard.

3386/01/002/DM43.4/O Ms Aditya Doshi

Object

I believe that building of 68 new homes or a gypsy site on Primrose lane would be to the significant detriment of the local community and so should not be an avenue that is explored. The land on which this is being built had been designated by the Council in 1985 as 'Amenity open land' because of our under-sized gardens and to take that away would be unacceptable.

DM43.4

504

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 504</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3391/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms Aileen Deeney</td>
<td>As a resident of Shirley Oaks Village, I wish to register my objection to the above proposals to allow the development of new homes on the designated Amenity Open Land which is available for my use and that of my fellow residents. This use was allowed by Croydon Council because of the undersized gardens which is a negative feature of the current development and which hinders enjoyment and comfort of my property. For example, it is not possible for children to play with footballs/other toys (play noisily without disturbing the adjoining and physically very close neighbours). You are no doubt aware that there are no nearby children's parks. Also my garden can easily be overlooked by at least 4 sets of neighbours and which I believe is typical of the other gardens on the development. Having the Amenity Open Land available is some compensation for the above lack of privacy and if it was to be withdrawn it would have a detrimental impact on No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3396/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms A Pavon-Lopez</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing. No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3404/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Cyril Nazareth</td>
<td>As a resident of Croydon Borough and in particular Shirley Oaks, I am contacting you to voice my objection to the following development proposals: Ref: 504 Water Board HQ, Primrose Lane No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3414/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Chris McInerney</td>
<td>Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic. If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Daniel Nutthall

Object

DM43.4

504

I would like to object to the following Metropolitan open land proposals - Poppy Lane - Ref 128 - Stroud Green Pumping Station - Ref 504 - Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House - Ref 541 - Land to the east of Shirley Road ref 542 - Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens ref 548. The Metropolitan land provide several links in the Shirley Garden Chain.

Under the Planning Policy Guidance Note 9 the importance of nature conservation is stressed. This combined with the extra traffic seems unacceptable.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mr Donald Speakman

Object

Soundness

DM43.4

504

Site 504, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes. This land should not be desiganted as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space.

This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Primrose Lane.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
We wish to object in the strongest terms to the plans being discussed regarding the proposed development of land for new housing in the Shirley area, specifically the building of Gypsy/Traveller sites on our doorstep, and the inherent increase in crime and anti-social behaviour that always follows, and can be seen in many examples nationally. Not only this, but the whole ‘Village’ feel of the area will be completely obliterated, and the very things that attracted us to move to Shirley (off Orchard Ave) will be no more. Of course people need a place to live and raise families, but time and again we have seen the resultant decline of neighbourhoods, with rubbish, noise and theft frequent occurrences. We urge you to think again and take heed of Gavin Barwell’s very real concerns, and those of what I’m sure are many of his constituents, and other Shirley dwellers. We are particularly concerned that you should take into account the fears of ordinary hard working people like us, who want to enjoy life (we’re not ‘oldies’) in a pleasant community, and think again about the following proposals:

Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 504).

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
We object to the use of the following locations in Green Belt areas as travellers/gypsy sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road (15-20 pitches); Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane (15-20 pitches); Pear Tree Farm on Featherbed Lane (15-20 pitches). National guidelines clearly state 'Travellers Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development'. The Council’s proposals, therefore, clearly breach such guidelines. Also, we question the Council’s assertion that it needs to quadruple the number of travellers/gypsy sites in the Borough. Apart from this major objection, the above sites identified for such use would have poor access via narrow roads/lanes for large vehicles; consequent impact upon local traffic congestion with movements of large vehicles; no safe paved walking routes to schools, shops, doctors, etc.; additional requirement for services and facilities for hygienic occupation; increased pressure on local schools, medical facilities, waste disposal, etc.; impact upon local facilities and amenities of current residents.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Objecting to the use of Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane for use as housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances.

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Mrs E Thomas Object

I wish to log my objection to the borough-wide planned changes Croydon Council are proposing to make in their Local Plans for 2016-2036. These proposals are 750 new homes in Shirley Oaks and 35 new homes on the Shrublands Estate. Also the proposed work to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Combe Farm and the Combe Nursery of Coombe Road.

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mr & Mrs Proctor Object

We are writing to object most strongly to the Croydon Council's Local Plan for housing on Green Belt land, with particular reference to Shirley. Our Green Belt should be protected at all costs and brown field sites must be targeted. In this respect, we support our MP Gavin Barwell’s objections, which you will doubtless have received.

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mr F Kurum Object

I am writing to object to the use of the following five sites for housing: - land at poppy lane (128) - Stroud Green pumping station, 140 Primrose Lane (504) - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House (541) - Land to the west of Shirley Oaks road (542) - Land to the rear of 5-13 Honey suckle Gardens (548)

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mr & Mrs Hobbs Object

I am writing to you to object to the use of the following sites for housing development. • The land at Poppy Lane. Ref. No. 128 • Strudwick Green Pumping Station. Ref. No.504 • Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and rear of Beech and Ash House. Ref no. 541 • Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road. Ref no. 542 • Land to rear of part of Honey Suckle Gardens. Ref no. 548

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
| 3473/01/006/DM43.4/O | Mr Dave Brown | Object | DM43.4 504 | I object to the these proposals to build on the land ref 504. If the land should be left as it is | No change | The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall. |

| 3482/01/002/DM43.4/O | Sheila Desmond | Object | DM43.4 504 | Ref 541 Ref 542 Ref 548 Ref 128 Ref 504 I wish to lodge a serious objection to the proposals for the building of houses on Shirley Oaks Village That name speaks for itself. I have lived on Shirley Oaks Village for 30 years and during that time have paid the management company a contribution to maintain the amenity open Land. The residents each own a share of the Land and over the years the open areas have been enjoyed by families for games walking and enjoying the lovely trees not to mention the wildlife. When the land was sold by Lambeth in 1984 the intention was to create a village. Has any thought been given to the effect on the infrastructure by adding 751 properties? the pressures on the roads in particular. | No change | The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall. |
Object

DM43.4

504

The proposal to build new houses in Honeysuckle Gardens does not fall within the Strategic Objectives because:

Objective 2: This development will not Foster an environment where existing enterprise can prosper, but will reduce enterprise.

Objective 4: This development will not reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation. It will not reduce unemployment, improve skills and education and improve environmental conditions, the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Objective 5: This development is not high quality and will not enhance the borough’s natural environment but will reduce the natural environment by turning a green area into housing.

Objective 7: This development will reduce the area as a safe, healthy and cohesive community but making the area overcrowded with residential property.

Objective 10: This development will reduce the quality and accessibility of green space and nature. This development will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The development will change the outlook and community within the South Croydon area and future generation will suffer because of this. This proposed development of new housing in Honeysuckle Gardens is not within keeping of the current development within this area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with housing in the area. Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area and is not in keeping with the surrounding area. Building a travellers site will increase noise levels and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area. Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. This development would diminish the area of green fields and recreational land within the area.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3486/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Gary Stewart</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Re the above proposals with Ref nos 541, 542, 548, 504, and 128 I wish to object in the possible strongest sense. This land was not designated for this use and hence our homes all have very small gardens to protect this open space. We already have problems with the road through the estate and it cannot possibly take any more traffic. The allowed parking on this road particularly on the curves gives cause for real concern. I have avoided two accidents only by making a emergency stop. If the council goes ahead with these proposals then we will fight and please note we are depending on support from local councillors and our MP. Think again please</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3492/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Helen Silk</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the plans to build gypsy/traveller sites in the area of Shirley and the building of anything on any area of green belt land, green spaces or back gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3498/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Ian Marsh</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I wish to object strongly to the proposed developments at Shirley Oaks - Ref 504 68 new homes or gypsy site at Water Board HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3501/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Gaynor Lawrence</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Please see this email as my objection to the proposed housing. This is ridiculous. The village is small and the road going through the village would NOT suffice the extra traffic. I pay a maintenance charge and moved here as it is a quiet location. I have been burgled a couple years back due I believe to the travellers that squatted on the land here and I do not want that fear again. Please rethink this crazy idea and let me know how I can further stop this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Gary Smithers  
Object  
DM43.4 504  
The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 504  
I have friends who live in Shirley oaks village and I know them and myself along with many others all object to the proposals to build on the green areas. This grass area is used by many and would totally change the area if built on and we don't want it. Part of the charm of this area is those green areas and it has something that you don't find often in Croydon so please let us keep the green areas as we all object to them being built on.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mr Gary Kenney  
Object  
DM43.4 504  
I am writing to show that I object to a number of your plans around the Shirley area. I contest that you need to build on our green sites and bring in new ‘traveler’ sites into Shirley.

On top of this I cannot understand the need to bring ‘medium’ high rise buildings in and around Shirley, including Devonshire way and the new proposals around Hartland way.

Please can you let me know if my objection has been noted and how I can make it more official?

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mr John Albert  
Object  
Soundness - Justified  
DM43.4 504  
As a long term resident and shareholder residing in Shirlry Oaks Village, I and my partner object to the proposals to Changes to the Policy Map 43 - REF’S 541, 542, 548, 128 & 504. These areas have metropolitan open land and had protection from being built on!

Our land was designated by Croydon Council in 1985, as Amenity Open Land because of our under sized gardens and transferred to the management company whom we our shareholders of this land is for our use and want it to stay this way! Having lived here for 20 years we do not want it further condensed by more homes and totally not fit for purpose!

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Katrina Neal  
Object  
DM43.4 504  
As a long term resident of Shirley/West Wickham and one who has seen many changes over the years, I am strongly objecting to Stroud Green Station - ref 504 for housing use. If these are not kept as MOL then at least keep them as Local Green Spaces.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances.
Jenny Hayden

Object DM43.4 504

The proposals for Shirley will have a huge impact on the area, the current infrastructure is already at bursting point and the building of new homes on green spaces will add further stress to the current situation.

Ref nos. 128, 504, 541, 542, 548... these relate to the building of additional homes. From the information available in the Council's documentation, this could be up to 800 new homes. I would like to know what sort of homes these are likely to be... social, housing associations or private... I doubt that any of them would be affordable homes for first time buyers. How will the local roads cope with the extra traffic. There will be a need for more schools, doctors' surgeries etc to support the intended increase to the local population. I would therefore like to object to the Council's decision to use these five sites for future residential development. Apart from putting extra burden on the local roads, it would also mean losing valuable green spaces. I believe any new residential development should be on brownfield sites. The addition of so many extra homes would have an adverse affect on the character of Shirley, in my opinion.

Rhodri Flower

Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 504

I write with reference to your document 'Changes to the Policies Map (Policy DM43)', and in specific reference to sites 541, 542, 548, 128 and 504. These sites are all open space surrounding the development known as Shirley Oaks Village.

I wish to object to the proposals to reclassify the land and make it eligible for planning permission and the building of homes. In my opinion it is essential to preserve the open space for the use of local residents. It is well used for recreation, dog walking etc. It is also an important part of the character of Shirley Oaks Village and would change the nature of that development.

I bought a house on Primrose Lane in June 2015 and a large factor in my decision to buy was the amount of open space available locally. I understand that Croydon Council designated this land as 'Amenity Open Land' in 1985 because of under-sized gardens in Shirley Oaks Village and transferred it to the Shirley Oaks Management Company, which has maintained it ever since. As a house owner I am a shareholder in that company.

I strongly object to your proposals.
I refer to the proposed changes to the planning policies to allow Croydon Council to build new homes on the Amenity Open Land at the above. The Amenity Open Land was granted in part, due to the extremely small rear gardens. Also I and other people in the village for many years here contributed to its upkeep at no cost to Croydon Council. To lose this land will greatly impact on the peaceful enjoyment that I and my neighbours have in using this land as well as the general impact on the area of high density building, changing the character of our village forever.

No doubt this development will result in many trees and flowers being sacrificed which help to sustain the urban wildlife such as various birds, bats, foxes, badgers and bees etc.

There seems to be little consideration for this urban oasis!

Whilst I understand central government's drive for more houses, I find it hard to believe that Croydon Council needs this land in order to fulfill its housing quota, given the Westfield and other developments proposed in Croydon. There are also other lands, such as those owned by the local NHS hospital that would be suitable for development and at the same time give ready money to the NHS.

Furthermore, the existing main roads are already inadequate to service the village without adding a further 751 homes along with the years of road works that will be associated with upgrading the utilities, make traveling through the village more difficult and dangerous.

I urge you to reconsider your plans.

No change
Mr Mark Hawkins

Kindly note that as a homeowner (and shareholder) of Shirley Oaks Village, resident here for over 25 years, I am deeply concerned that Croydon Council seems to think it has the right to change the nature of the estate from being protected Metropolitan land to being unprotected land ripe for excessive building. Not only is the green space around the current estate, a much loved feature, it also provides a sanctuary for wildlife and allows for nice walks for local people. The road was built to be narrow and already there are problems with passing places for traffic to the hospital and synagogue. Last year the council allowed a resident to build a fence which obstructs drivers vision when turning out of Cornflower Lane and has caused several minor incidents. Simply put, the roads here were not built for traffic! The idea of ruining my neighbourhood by cramming more housing onto unsuitable roads, lacking shops and facilities whilst depriving me of the green spaces I love and part own makes me sick to my stomach. There are so many brownfield sites that could be built on and provide more suitable housing in and around Croydon that I feel that this attack on Shirley is politically motivated. I formally ask the council to re-consider the proposals.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mr I Fuell

I am writing to object to:
3. The use of the following 5 sites for housing:
• Land at Poppy Lane: reference number 128;
• Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane: reference number 504;
• Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House; reference number 541;
• Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road; reference number 542; and
• Land to the rear of 5 – 13 Honeysuckle Gardens; reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these 5 sites should at least be designated as local green spaces.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
I would like to raise my objection to the proposed land changes for the following references: Ref. 504 - Up to 68 new homes or GYPSY site at the water board HW, Primrose lane. The land was designated by Croydon council in 1985 as "Amenity Open Land", because of our under-sized gardens and transferred to the Management Company - with each property owner as a shareholder in that company. As for looking at a Gypsy site, you should have seen what a mess they made when they camped illegally at Shirley Oaks just over a year ago - it was disgusting!

DM43.4 504

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

DM43.4 504

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

The de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village in particular such as the use of the following for housing:-
- land at Poppy Lane Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane
- land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House
- land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens
Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. There is a lot of history around here and the loss of the Shirley Lodge in the late 1990s was a big mistake. Generally in Croydon there is no room for more traffic that new building will generate and judging from what I have seen around Croydon squeezed housing units with small garages not fit to store cars and little or no off street parking will only add to stress and problems in the future.

DM43.4 504

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Mr Peter Newsham
Object
I wish to register my objection in the strongest possible terms to the proposal for new housing, (ref. 504), in these areas of Metropolitan Open Land, which is essential for recreational purposes in an already overcrowded place, is unacceptable and the proposed re-designation of the land so that it can be used for high-density urban development will find no local support, but instead, a huge and vocal opposition.

No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances.

Mr Nick Barnes
Object
Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Raod.

None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.

No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mrs Margaret Hawkins
Object
Ref. 504 – Land at Stroud Green Pumping Station Development of this site as housing would be problematic and expensive. Is there any evidence that it will ever not be needed by Thames Water? It has also been referred to in your document “Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gipsies and Traveller” as suitable for a traveller site (page 15, ref 504). Use of it as a traveller site would be wholly inappropriate and inconsistent with preserving the locally listed status of the building. The site has a high water table, and the danger to life when caravans are flooded is well documented.

No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Cllr J Cummings
Object
Site 504, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would totally change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Primrose Lane.

No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Ms J Fasham

Object

DM43.4 504

I object to the Councils proposal to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land of Shirley Oaks Road and Shirley Oaks Village as the local infrastructure could not cope. No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances.

Ms J Stokes

Object

DM43.4 504

I object to the proposals to completely change Shirley Oaks Road which is a green lung for that part of the Borough. The amount of car ownership will rise significantly as the bus service is infrequent. The traffic will clog up the Wickham Road even more than now. St. John’s school has already plans for more classrooms and the intake will rise in all the local schools. Also pulling down established houses and putting up more flats is detrimental to the character of the area. We had a once in a lifetime chance to improve the look of Croydon, on a human scale. Instead of which we are building hideous tower blocks, while in other parts of the country they are pulling them down. Nobody should have to raise a family in a block 44 storeys high. They will eventually become the slums of the future. No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Jenny Tighe

Object

DM43.4 504

Development of these sites will have a negative impact on the local area by changing the character of Shirley, and well as being a loss of green space, wildlife habitat and a vital green corridor. No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mrs J Middleton

Object

DM43.4 504

I object to the site for use for housing. No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Miss Amanda Smithers Object DM43.4 504 The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 504 -My partner is a resident of Betony close Shirley oaks village and we definitely do not want the surrounding areas to be built on. No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Ms Jennifer Addis Object DM43.4 504 I strongly object to the development proposals by the council for the above areas on Shirley Oaks Village. All the gardens on our houses are tiny so this green land which was designated as 'Amenity Open Land' was supposed to be for the use of the residents. There are enough houses on this area already! This will have a huge detrimental effect on all the residents in the area. No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances.

Mr Tim Duce Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 504 I strongly object to any plan to build on Metropolitan Open Land. There are plenty of brown field sites available in Croydon and the MOL should be re-designated as Local Green Space. No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mr J Patel Object DM43.4 504 I am writing to record my objection to various planning as follows. Your Ref No: 128,504,541,542,548 and 938. I don't think it will be good for the area. No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances.

Diane Simpson Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 504 Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic. If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
| Mr K George | DM34.4 504 | I am also concerned that you consider there is space for up to 751 houses in the Shirley Oaks Road area. References 128. 504 541 542 548. This would lead to the elimination of green space in that area and therefore I think at least 3 of these areas should be Local Green Spaces if not Metropolitan open land. |
| No change | The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall. |
RE: LAND ON EITHER SIDE OF SHIRLEY OAKS ROAD, SHIRLEY OAKS VILLAGE, POPPY LANE, STROUD GREEN PUMPING STATION, COOMBE FARM, COOMBE LODGE NURSERIES off Conduit Lane, land west of Shirley Oaks Road, rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens OBJECTION TO DE-DESIGNATION GREEN BELT; SHIRLEY, NEW ADDINGTON, FOREST HILL

We have lived in the Borough of Croydon for 30 years and value its vibrancy and diversity.

As Croydon ratepayers we object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land generally, especially land detailed above, which will change forever Croydon’s character.

We would ask you to encourage policies/development to:

1. Build new housing on brown field sites by all means AND preserve invaluable green space for the benefit of the community of Croydon; 2. Protect green belt land and preserve the green corridors we desperately vital for wildlife and biodiversity; 3. Amend the tall buildings policy and keep the tall building zone where it is suited in the centre of town; 4. Utilise brownfield sites for new low-level housing only where it can be developed alongside new GP surgeries, schools and improved public transport; 5. Traveller sites are not appropriate in the green belt and is a clear breach Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. When travellers camped on Addington Playing Fields in 2012/13 they left rubbish, debris, waste, and deterioration to a local green space.

"Nowadays people know the price of everything and the value of nothing", Green Belt is vital and precious. Once lost for future generations and will not be replaced by developers.

We understand the need for housing, schools, hospitals and infrastructure. Are the Developers investing these also alongside their building investments?

Please protect our few remaining green spaces on the borough map, by making better use of brown field sites.
We are objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council will not keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. We are also objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development.

Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure could not cope with the additional traffic.
I am writing this email to voice my deep concern about the planned development in the private estate that I have lived in for many years, namely:

- Ref 541, Ref 542, Ref 548, Ref 128 and Ref 504 – all on Shirley Oaks Village private estate.

Firstly, it would have been nice to be informed about any planning ideas in writing rather than see small notices pinned to lamp post around the estate. I would also like to draw your attention that our land was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as ‘Amenity Open Land’ for the residents and for which we pay a quarterly fee for maintenance of the green open land, but more importantly can I bring to your notice that this land was transferred to the Shirley Oaks Management Company, with each property owner as a shareholder in that company. This land is for our use and not for developing a concrete jungle on every single green inch of land in Croydon.

The Shirley Oaks estate has a great community spirit and has become a real sought after location for families to live due to the community nature and the lovely open land that we have, by developing on this land you will be taking away all of the good that has been built up over the years by the many residents we have as well as making the village overcrowded, bringing in more traffic thus resulting in more danger on the main Primrose Lane for people crossing and driving, congestion for parking and so on. I can also bring to your attention that we have already had a couple of fatalities on that main road that runs through the village and this will make it worse for the safety of our kids.

I am sure you have now had many hundreds of emails from residents like myself voicing the same concerns with your planning proposals!

This land belongs to us as residents so I feel it’s harsh to take this away and start your own developments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Objector(s)</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3785/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Jenny Greenland</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of the site in Shirley as MOL. If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I enjoy this space every weekend and meet many like-minded people. I also be object to the site being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic so it struggles now. I am happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but I object to building on open space.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3789/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr. Paul Slaughter</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic. If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3790/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Derrick</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>To remove the protection of the Metropolitan Open Land from Green Belt status to build housing etc. is criminal and should be stopped by the law of the land. We live very close to Shirley Oaks Village and the Stroud Green Pumping Station (ref: No; 504) and no way can we entertain your proposals for these areas - you will destroy the whole region by your ridiculous proposals. Also the infrastructure of this part of Shirley is not built to withstand the increase in traffic. The whole idea of using this these areas in this proposed way does not meet with our approval.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3792/01/06/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Simon Bradley</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 504</td>
<td>To save you looking it up, and to help you identify my specific objections, the five sites mentioned so far and to which I wish to object as being detrimental to the character of the area are: Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 504); No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3793/01/05/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Stephen Barnes</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 504</td>
<td>Second, the Council plans to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village (page 68, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals). Metropolitan Open Land has the same protection from development as the Green Belt. The Council is proposing to remove this designation so that most of this land can be used for new housing. The draft Local Plan identifies five sites: - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 504); I object to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I also object to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3803/01/004/DM43.4/0</td>
<td>Mr Denis Perrott</td>
<td>DM43.4 504</td>
<td>I object to the use of the Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504 for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport. I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3804/01/042/DM43.4/0</td>
<td>Cllr L Hale</td>
<td>DM43.4 504</td>
<td>Site 504, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would totally change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Primrose Lane.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object

DM43.4

504

I write to you with my objections to the proposed Croydon Local Plan, specifically on the points below:

• the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 128);

• Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 504);

• land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 541);

• land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542); and

• land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548).

I object to the decision to designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I also object to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3809/1004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Mr Ian Leonard</td>
<td>Object Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 504); I object to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council will not keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I also object to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, thereby disastrously changing the character of the area, additionally, the local road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3820/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Mrs &amp; Mrs Linter</td>
<td>Object I object to Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 504);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3823/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Mr Ross Aitken</td>
<td>Object I would like to object to these proposals: Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I write to you having received this email from Gavin Barwell MP, the tone of which I find inflammatory and discriminatory towards the Gypsy and Traveller communities, and smacks of “not in my backyard”.

I write as a resident of Addiscombe who recognises the huge problem of lack of affordable housing to buy and to rent in London promulgated by this Conservative government and the previous coalition government.

I fully support Croydon Council’s proposals.

---

I object to site 504

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

---

I am resident at 35 Primrose Lane, Shirley Oaks Village, along with 4 other members of my family.

I am writing to express my objection/disagreement to the following:

1. de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village

2. The use of the following five sites for housing:
   - Land at Poppy Lane ref 128
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, ref 504
   - Land to east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beach House and Ash House, ref 541
   - Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, ref 542
   - Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, ref 548

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Lee Kirby-Walker

Object

DM43.4
504

I am writing to object to:
The use of the following five sites for housing:
• Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128
• Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504
• Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541
• Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542
• Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated a Local Green Spaces.

DM43.4
504

Mr M Foster

Object

DM43.4
504

I wish to lodge an objection to all five sites where the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open space land and to build housing open them, not only would we be losing vital open space and change the very character of the area, I believe the local road infrastructure would not cope with any more traffic, why must the council continual to try and run areas that people like.

At the moment this area as a rural feel to it, nice green spaces and a open aspect which we would loose if these plans were to go ahead.

I would ask the council to think very hard before implementing these plans before we have another area that people want to move out of instead of to, these plans will not improve the area quite the reverse, where at the moment people like to live here.
Miss Rebecca Thomas

I email to express my formal concern and objection to the proposal to build additional housing in the green areas of Shirley Oaks Village. I currently reside in Beckenham, 1 Hamilton House, Orchard Way, BR33ER, on the Shirley boarder, and was previously a resident of Shirley for 30 years. The addition of these houses will not only bring down the areas reputation, spoil views from current properties, but also cause additional congestion to an already busy area. We should be looking to preserve our green areas, and Shirley Oaks Village should remain just that, a village! I believe that the Wickham Road has already been flagged as one of the busiest roads in the area, with a fatal road accident occurring both this year and last. Additional housing/congestion will only add to this danger. This proposal will cause residents of the local area to be driven from their homes unfairly, I am sure that they did not purchase properties to be overlooked and to lose the view of the land that they have been paying to maintain for, in most cases, a number of years. I am contactable on my home address/phone should wish me to validate my views further.

Ms M Torres Ward

I am writing to express my objection to the planning proposals in the Shirley Oaks area. The land has been set aside for our use as we have very undersized gardens on the estate and we have also paid to keep those areas in a well maintained condition. The road around Shirley Oaks only has 2 exits as well, so would make it very congested as there are only 2 options for traffic to leave and enter and there are already a lot of problems at the Wickham Road end as people drive in and out.

Mr Nicholas Barnes

Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 755 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Road.

None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.
Mr M Lockeyear

I wish to register my objection to these proposals for the following reasons: I purchased my property on the understanding that all the open grassed land surrounding the village was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as "Amenity Open Land" because of our under-sized gardens and transferred to the Management Company, with each property owner as a shareholder in that company.

Edwina Morris

I object to the use of the Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, reference number 504 for housing.

Mrs Barbara Cumming

I object to the planned site being used for residential development in Shirley, Croydon. Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Whilst I agree that we desperately need new housing, it should be built on brownfield sites - not our remaining precious green spaces!

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Ms M Bailey

Object DM43.4 504

The Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks and all around Shirley Oaks Village should not be de-designated, but designated as Local Green space. It is very important that Croydon needs green spaces as these give the feeling of openness and a pleasant environment in which to live. Upwards of approximately 700 hundred odd homes could be built in this area which will lead to possible flooding of areas as rain water will not be able to drain away as easily as it would if it was left as a green belt area. Secondly the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic stemming from these additional homes, and this includes public transport. Thirdly are the NHS facilities in the area able to cope with this large influx?

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances.

Jan Payne

Object DM43.4 504

I object to the use of the site for housing.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Every year we get proposals and consultations for building more homes or structures on Shirley Oaks green land. But must admit the above proposal is the worst and the most ridiculous so far. From what we read, the proposal suggests to build around 750 new homes on what’s left of green patches in the village.

The village is already over crowded with Shirley Oaks road and Primrose road looking like a huge PARKING LOT throughout the day. One cannot begin to imagine what it would like with more residents and obviously with at least double the number of cars to that of the number of the new homes proposed.

We bought our property back in 1989, paying above market value at the time, for the sole purpose that the village is quiet and has some green land. Our home was one of the last phases of any buildings to be erected in the village, or so we were promised and confirmed in writing. Since then, a synagogue was built, bus 367 goes through the narrow winding road, every year for the last few years we get proposals to use our green land for one suggestion or another and now this proposal.

We completely oppose this proposal and hope that the council will appreciate that it’s not all about the money and just building more houses, but quality of life matters just the same. On one hand the government and councils encourage and push people to plant more trees, grow their veg, recycle etc... Yet on the other hand come up with proposals to use every last green patch to build more structures and homes. Doesn’t make any sense.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Ms E Rudduck Object

I object to the use of the Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504 for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

Mr & Mrs Frederick Banjo Object

As property owners/Residents and shareholders in the company that manages Shirley Oaks Village, we are writing to state our objection to the above mentioned proposal. The land/s in question is designated as 'Amenity open Land' for the use of the property owners and residents of Shirley Oaks Village and must not be built upon. The proposal to build on these lands will simply destroy the peace & tranquillity of the village. The enjoyment of the open land by residents will be lost not to mentioned the increased traffic situation amongst other things. We strongly object to these proposals to build upon these lands.

Mr & Mrs Ishaq Object

I would like to object to the use of Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504 for new homes or Gypsy site.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land. It has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land. It has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land. It has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name &amp; Relationship</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3923/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms A Smithers</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 504 - I object to this as Shirley Oaks village and surrounding areas are lovely and people go there for their green space to walk their dogs and have a nice time. This would ruin the whole area and what it currently stands for and I amongst many will be upset if the green areas are built on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3926/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Peter &amp; Brenda Mullings</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>We object to the proposals for this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3933/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Thacker</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3942/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Scott Hunter</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Mr Steve Murray

Object

I object to the use of the site for housing.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mr C Rudduck

Object

I object to the use of the Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504 for housing:

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mr K Rudduck

Object

I object to the use of the Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504 for housing:

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
I am a resident of Shirley and strongly object to the current proposals to build on green belt land on the Shirley Oaks and surrounding areas. There are plenty of brown sites that are unoccupied and could fulfil the purpose of providing new homes. Shirley is already tight for school places. St John's, in Spring Park Road, is increasing to 2 form entry already with the number of children living locally requiring education. The 367 bus serving the Shirley Oaks Village is infrequent and much more transport will be required. Parking is already a nightmare and with the lack of parking contemplated with the new build supply the problem will only get worse. There will be an incredible build up of traffic on the already congested Wickham Road and other local roads. I believe this proposed building of traveller's sites and homes will change the whole ethos of Shirley and cause resentment and the lowering of living standards. This is a particular area of standard housing and should not be changed by the building of blocks of houses. Garden land should not be built on and this is an inappropriate development and should not be allowed to go ahead. Metropolitan Open Land has the same protection as the Green Belt and the rules should be followed accordingly.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Having lived on Shirley Oaks for almost 30 years, I strongly feel that any changes to the current planning policies would have serious and negative consequences for the current residents. Not only would properties lose significant value, the estate would also lose its 'village-like' feel that lead us to move there in the first place. We were also told at the time of purchase that Shirley Oaks would always remain as metropolitan open land, and this also heavily influenced our purchase. To add to this, there is also the issue of increased traffic through the estate. There was a fatal accident only a couple of years ago by the bend of Poppy Lane and I feel that with the prospect of even more houses being added to the estate there will be a significantly higher risk of further accidents.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
I object on the grounds of appalling overcrowding, your plan would bring at least 2000 more vehicles onto the estate. It is already nearly impossible to get in and out of the estate by car at rush hours. The roads on the estate can barely cope as it is with the bus route. The extra vehicles would include many commercial vans which would be parked over night and weekends causing havoc on the narrow roads of the estate. A single bus route as at present running every 20mins causes problems how do you intend to increase public services more bus routes and more frequent timetables...more chaos! I along with others pay to maintain and the open space as a share holder. Your proposal would seriously devalue our properties and I for one will be seeking serious compensation for this, I trust Croydon has very big capital reserves to meet our legal challenges and compensation. Our gardens are small this is why the land has been designated open land so we have some open space in common with the surrounding houses. Your plans are ill conceived and will effectively destroy Croydon further. There are large areas of open land in Addington which Croydon could use and I presume already own without spending our money attempting to purchase land which will be extremely costly to Croydon in terms of the compensation that you will need to pay out and in the legal fees entailed.

I object to the decision to de-designate this land as metropolitan open land for the use of residential development for the following reasons. These areas are also being used every day and regularly by myself, family members, neighbours friends and many visitors wanting to take there dog for a walk or spending time with family and kids. Ref 548, 542, 541, and 128 are owned by Shirley oaks management. 488 residents are shareholders in this company. There was a decision in 1985 for this land to be open for use by the local residents because the gardens of all homes were considered small. I would also like to mention the increase in road traffic and pollution due to the development. So for those reasons I would once again like to object to building on this land.
Ms S Ikpa

Object

DM43.4 504

The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and land to the rear of S-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Patricia Wood

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 504

I am writing to object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village; in particular to the use of the following five sites for housing: i) land at Poppy Lane reference number 128 ii) Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504 iii) land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541 iv) land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 v) land to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
I am therefore writing to formally object to:

1. de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;
2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   - land at Poppy Lane REFERENCE NO. 128;
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane REFERENCE NUMBER 504;
   - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House REFERENCE NUMBER 541;
   - land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road REFERENCE NUMBER 542; and
   - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens REFERENCE NUMBER 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building houses on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built upon. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Mr R Horton

Object

DM43.4

504

I wish to log my objection to the borough-wide planned changes Croydon Council are proposing to make in their Local Plans for 2016-2036. These proposals are 750 new homes in Shirley Oaks and 35 new homes on the Shrublands Estate. Also the proposed work to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Coombe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Coombe Road.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mr R Kiley

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

504

I am writing this email to register my objection to the misuse of building on green belt land in Shirley, and elsewhere. All our lives are stressful now and we need these green belt areas to maintain our quality of life. I am objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I will also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mr R Morley-Smith

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

504

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
am a resident at 35 Primrose Lane, Shirley Oaks Village, along with 4 other members of my family.

I am writing to express my objection/disagreement to the following:
Object to the de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and in particular to the use of the following five sites for housing:
- Land at Poppy Lane ref 128
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, ref 504
- Land to east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, ref 541
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, ref 542
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, ref 548

No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Object

Object to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks Road and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

Object Soundness - Justified

Objecting to the planning permission proposals below: I object to ref 504. We don’t want building on the green areas in Shirley oaks people live there because they have choose a quiet place with green areas good for their mental and physical well being: this is a place for others to enjoy as well as residents there is no where else the same as this in Croydon.

Object

The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 504. We don’t want building on the green areas in Shirley oaks people live there because they have choose a quiet place with green areas good for their mental and physical well being: this is a place for others to enjoy as well as residents there is no where else the same as this in Croydon.
Mrs S Smithers  
Object DM43.4 504  
The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 504  
Shirley Oaks Village is lovely I go walking round the green areas there and this is such a lovely area. We do not want houses built here and to loose our land that we really like to use.

No change

Mr s Hiku Abdo  
Object DM43.4 504  
Ref 541, 542, 548, 128 and 504 in Shirley Oaks Village  
I was shocked to learn about the changes proposed to our grass areas. These changes, if implemented, will change the very nature of our village. It will not only deprive the residents of very essential open green areas, but it will make the whole place very crowded, much more polluted and quite uglier. This would rob us of essential attractions that made us come to this village in the first place.  
I strongly object to any of these changes and trust that every resident on this estate feels the way I feel. I did not speak to everyone, but the many I spoke with feel as strongly as I do towards this unfair proposal.  
I have been living in this village with my family since 1985, I would like to see the Croydon Council improve it rather than ruin it. I hope the Council will reconsider its plans.

No change
I am grateful to the Council for consulting on the detailed policies and proposals that will make up the Croydon Local Plan. There is much in the document that I agree with, but some of the proposals would, in my opinion, change the character of parts of Croydon very much for the worse. I hope you will forgive me if I focus on these areas of contention. I am therefore writing to formally object to:

1. de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;

2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   - land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   - land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
   - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

3. the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:
   - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502;
   - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 681; and
   - Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 796.

As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
"Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development".

The Council's approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is);

4. Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennets Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too;

5. Policy DM2 on development on garden land, which is too subjective and therefore too weak. There should be a much stronger presumption against development on garden land; and

6. Policy DM28, which should allow higher levels of parking in developments of low public transport accessibility. Restricting parking spaces in such areas doesn't lead to fewer people owning their own car; it just leads to greater competition for existing spaces.
Mr Matt Knight

Object

I object to the use of the site for housing.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land; it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mr S Sasankan

I am resident at 35 Primrose Lane, Shirley Oaks Village, along with 4 other members of my family.

I am writing to express my objection/disagreement to the following:

1. de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village

2. The use of the following five sites for housing:
   - Land at Poppy Lane, ref 128
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, ref 504
   - Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, ref 541
   - Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, ref 542
   - Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeyuckle Gardens, ref 548

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land; it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mrs Mary Gray

Object

I object to the use of the site for housing.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land; it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4059/01/004/DM43.4</td>
<td>Shirley Lidbury</td>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4058/01/004/DM43.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4062/01/004/DM43.4</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Keith &amp; Susan Hobbs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As residents whose small rear garden backs onto part of the Shirley Oaks Metropolitan Open Land, we know full well what impact proposals 128, 504, 541, 542 and 548 would have to the area. There would be an increase in noise from 1) the building work, 2) increased traffic. There would be a substantial impact on the road system. Wickham Road already gets gridlocked at rush hours and school start/end times. The roads into Shirley Oaks are already too narrow for cars to pass if there are any cars parked, which there are always many of since the majority of driveways are too short to accommodate reasonable size car parking for many.

Shirley Road also has a problem with queuing traffic towards Long Lane which will also be compounded by these proposals.

These developments would increase the drainage issues this area suffers from. The whole area is built on London clay and regularly these areas suffer standing water which has gone through our property in the past. Increasing the density of building in Shirley Oaks will increase this problem too.

The lands around Shirley Oaks remain because of the compact nature of the village, whose properties, as well as our own, have small garden areas and as such these areas are used daily for sports activities, exercise and dog walking.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

I object to the use of the site for housing.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4066/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Dr Chandra Pawa</td>
<td>Object the use of Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504 for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area; No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4067/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Marilyn Loader</td>
<td>Object I object to the use of the site for housing. No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4068/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr S Soundararajan</td>
<td>Object I am writing to object to strongly the De-designation of the following five pieces of land as Metropolitan Open Land and their proposed use as housing - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504 - Your proposal will lead to a huge set of issues for the local residents. I strongly object to the plan and proposal No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4071/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Tross</td>
<td>Object Given the existing levels of brownfield sites in the area, these should be exhausted before encroaching on areas that would significantly alter the character of the area. No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kaljit Gata-Aura Object DM43.4 504
The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 504
I have friends who live in Shirley Oaks village and I know them and myself along with many others all object to the proposals to build on the green areas. This grass area is used by many and would totally change the area if built on and we don’t want it. Part of the charm of this area is those green areas and it has something that you don’t find often in Croydon so please let us keep the green areas as we all object to them being built on.

No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Melissa Chu Object DM43.4 504
The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542, and land to the rear of 5-13 Honey)suckle Gardens site reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mr. Reuben Gata-Aura Object DM43.4 504
The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane - Ref 128 Stroud Green Pumping Stn - Ref 504 land to east of Shirley Oaks Road - Ref 541 land to west of Shirley Oaks Road - Ref 542 land to rear of Honey)suckle Gdns - Ref 548

If the Council will not keep them as NOP - these 5 sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces

No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Victoria Moore Object DM43.4 504
Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 25 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 504).

No change
The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Mr Vince Hemment

4096/01/005/DM43.4/O

Object

DM43.4

504

I am therefore writing to formally object to:

designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village; the use of the following five sites for housing:
- land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
- land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
- land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
- land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Terrence & Jacqueline Spriggs

4104/01/003/DM43.4/O

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

504

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Ms V Cruickshank

4112/01/005/DM43.4/O

Object

DM43.4

504

I object to the use of the following five sites for housing:
- Land at Poppy Lane: reference number 128;
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane: reference number 504;
- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House: reference number 541;
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road: reference number 542; and
- Land to the rear of 5 – 13 Honeysuckle Gardens: reference number 548.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Cllr S Brew

Object

DM43.4

I object to the de-designation of land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village as Metropolitan Open Land, page 68 of the Policies Map.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Cllr S Brew

Object

DM43.4

Site 504, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Primrose Lane.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Councillor M Fisher

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

Site 504, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Primrose Lane.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mr Christopher Swan

Object

DM43.4

Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 504).

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Mr Edward Swan  

Object  

DM43.4 504  

I would like to strongly object to the planned five sites being used for residential development in Shirley, Croydon: Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Pread Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 504). Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional traffic.

No change  

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mrs S Rudduck  

Object  

DM43.4 504  

I object to the use of the Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504 for housing:

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

No change  

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Ms S Rao  

Object  

DM43.4 504  

The use of the Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane (site ref 504) for housing.

No change  

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/09/2016</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Andrews</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM43.4 504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/09/2016</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Carpenter</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 504</td>
<td>These proposals to build up to 750 homes on land (assuming it is de-designated) will mean the loss of vital open spaces and will place burdens on local transport, roads, schools and medical facilities which are already under pressure.  No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land. It has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We are writing to object to the proposals to:
1. de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;
2. the use of the following sites for housing:
   • land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   • Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   • land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   • land to the West of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542;
   • land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548;

The Shirley Oaks Village site currently provides a balance of high density housing offset by areas of green space. The proposals for de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land and additional housing on the areas of green space would disrupt that balance and greatly increase the density of housing to an unacceptable level. Access to the Shirley Oaks site is by way of Poppy Lane and Shirley Oaks Road which feed into Shirley Road and Wickham Road respectively. Both Shirley Road and Wickham Road are used heavily throughout the day and subject of long delays particularly at peak times. This has resulted in Poppy Lane and Shirley Oaks Road experiencing heavier traffic flows than they were designed for as commuters cut through between Shirley Road and Wickham Road.

Public transport within the Shirley Oaks site is limited to a small single decker bus due to the road infrastructure and road system. Whilst there are bus services which serve Shirley Road and Wickham Road these are already oversubscribed and subject to delay due to existing traffic congestion.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Mr Trevor Watkins  
Object DM43.4 504  
The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128; Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504; land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541; and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

Carol Holmes  
Object DM43.4 504  
I object to both the de-designation and also to the subsequent house-building at the following sites:  
• Land at Poppy Lane (reference number 128);  
• Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane (reference number 504);  
• Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House (reference number 541);  
• Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road (reference number 542);  
• Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens (reference number 548).  
The very minimum designation for the proposed sites should be as Local Green Spaces, in order to give some protection against over-development.

Mr B Williams  
Object DM43.4 504  
I object to the de-designation of the land as Metropolitan Open Land and its proposed use for housing. The open spaces are collectively designated as Metropolitan Open Land and provide several links in the Shirley Green Chain. They help to form the sort of network necessary to ensure the maintenance of the current range and diversity of our flora and fauna. In addition this is a floodplain. There is a sink pond to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens and if this overflows any properties would be flooded. There is also the potential for flooding of future planned properties. The one road through Shirley Oaks Village could not cope with the additional traffic and its exit on to the A232 would cause yet another bottleneck on this already congested road.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
I am writing to object to the following matters in this document:-
2. the use of the following five sites for housing
   a) Ref No. 128— land at Poppy Lane
   b) Ref No. 504— Stroud Green Pumping station
   c) Ref No. 541 — land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Ash House and Beech House
   d) Ref No. 542 — land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road
   e) Ref No. 548— land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens

If the Council do not keep these sites as Metropolitan Open Land, then at least these five sites should be designated as Local Green Spaces.

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Mr & Mrs DB Good

Object

DM43.4

504

I object to Policy DM43, reference Site 504 to build new homes at Stroud Green Pumping Station (including the conversion of the pumping station which is a locally-listed building)

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mr & Ms Morgan & Mason

Object

DM43.4

504

I object to the use of the site for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mrs Mary Lane

Object

DM43.4

504

I object to the site for use as housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Sheila Newman

Object

DM43.4

504

The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542, and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeydewke Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 504</th>
<th>I object to Policy DM43, reference Site 504 to build new homes at Stroud Green Pumping Station (including the conversion of the pumping station which is a locally-listed building).</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 504</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 504</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 504</td>
<td>The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Melvin Howard

Object DM43.4 504

If the Council will not keep the site as MOL, the site should at least be designated as Local Green Space. Building on this site will not only mean the loss of vital green space it will over burden local services and road infrastructure.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

S Wallace

Object DM43.4 504

Development of Shirley

As residents for many, many years in the Shirley area we strongly disapprove of the proposed development of Shirley Oaks, Devonshire Way and all the other areas in Shirley. The Shirley area has already had many new developments example - Lawdon Estate, Shirley Oaks, The Glade etc and this new proposed development will change the face of Shirley completely, with more cars and traffic, more crowds busses more strain on medical practises and schools and what about the sewage etc? we are totally against these development plans.

I object to Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 504);

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Mrs Glenna Fullick

Object DM43.4 504

I object to Policy DM43, reference Site 504 to build new homes at Stroud Green Pumping Station (Including the conversion of the pumping station which is a locally-listed building)

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4308/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Kathleen Swan</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 504 I would like to strongly object to the planned five sites being used for residential development in Shirley, Croydon: Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 504); Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional traffic.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4309/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Rita Evans</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 504 The proposal to de-designate Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and use it for five housing sites surely flies in the face of current recommendations to preserve Green Belt equivalent land as a vital amenity and ecological asset?</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4312/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Doreen Jansen</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 504 Objection to site. Schools in the area are already over-subscribed, so the number of homes proposed will increase the problem</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 504

I am writing to object to the following matters in this document:-

2. the use of the following five sites for housing
   a) Ref No. 128— land at Poppy Lane
   b) Ref No. 504— Stroud Green Pumping station
   c) Ref No. 541 — land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Ash House and Beech House
   d) Ref No. 542 — land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road
   e) Ref No. 548— land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens

If the Council do not keep these sites as Metropolitan Open Land, then at least these five sites should be designated as Local Green Spaces.

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Object DM43.4 504

The use of the following five sites for housing; land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542, and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Object DM43.4 504

The use of the following five sites for housing; land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542, and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
| 4365/01004/DM43.4/O | The Judge Family | Object | DM43.4 | 504 | We object to Policy DM43, reference Site 504 to build new homes at Stroud Green Pumping Station (Including the conversion of the pumping station which is a locally-listed building) | No change | The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall. |
| 4366/01004/DM43.4/O | Ms Gemma Sturgeon | Object | DM43.4 | 504 | I object to Policy DM43, reference Site 504 to build new homes at Stroud Green Pumping Station (Including the conversion of the pumping station which is a locally-listed building) | No change | The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall. |
I object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in the vicinity of Shirley Oaks Road and Shirley Oaks Village. The land should be at least be designated as Local Green Space, for its protection from development. This open space provides a green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, and should be retained in its present form.

I also object to the following specific proposals for the building of new homes on this site, as detailed in Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan; Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan, Detailed Policies & Proposals:

- Policy DM43, reference 128 to build new homes at Poppy Lane
- Policy DM43, reference 504 to build new homes at Stroud Green - Pumping Station (including the conversion of the pumping station which is a locally-listed building)
- Policy DM43, reference 542 to build new homes on land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road
- Policy DM43, reference 548 to build new homes on land to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens

Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the already-stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.

For the reasons given above:

1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Additional Details</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4378/01/009/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Jennifer Carrozzo</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of the following five sites for housing: -land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128; -Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504; -land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541; -land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and -land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548; If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces;</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4384/01/008/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms N Nesterovich</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542, and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4435/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Janet Baine</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the use of the Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504 for housing:</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object

DM43.4

I object to the use of the following five sites for housing - land at Poppy Lane reference number 128; Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504; land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541; land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548; If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. The Council should focus on developing other land in the Croydon borough such as unused office blocks, derelict corporate buildings/factories/warehouses which have not been occupied for years instead of attacking the green areas which are enjoyed by the residents in their respective areas. The proposals to build circa 700 houses in such a small area will cause the following detrimental effects to the local residents: depreciation of the value of the houses purchased in the relevant areas, too much strain on the water and sewerage systems in the locality where there is already a high water table. This could result in undue flooding and drainage problems, structural problems in years to come as the land is not fit for such intensive building, increase in traffic on Shirley Road, Wickham Road, Lower Addiscombe and Addiscombe which is already congested. This will unduly increase pollution levels which are already toxic. This will undoubtedly cause an increase in the health problems of the people in the locality such as lung cancer and other respiratory illnesses which will in turn place greater stress on the NHS services, cause more people to take sick days which will result in lower incomes obtained and eventually less tax revenue generated. This will have a knock on effect on the economy which is to say at the very least, bleak, the three green spaces in the Shirley Oaks Village are owned by the 488 Freeholders. Each Freeholder owns one share in the nominee company, Shirley Oaks Management Limited which owns the land on behalf of its shareholders. Building upon this land would serious undermine the value of the land purchased by the Freeholders and reduce quality of life. If the residents wanted to move, it would prove near impossible because of the resulting lower sale prices of their respective houses imposed by the Council's building plans. This would appear to be unfair for the Council to impose
such hardship on the residents. I would urge the council to build upon land in the Croydon borough which is derelict and contains buildings which have not been used for years. These buildings can be knocked down to build the much needed housing for generations to come. These unused or derelict buildings serve no purpose to the local residents and are of no value to the residents. The Council should endeavour to create value where it is needed. This will in turn improve the condition of the abandoned areas. This will also prevent squatting and other unlawful uses of such buildings. I witnessed one example last year where the old post office building next to East Croydon Station was used as a rave containing over 1,000 people. This posed a risk to the safety of the passers by and the increase in crime. The Council's redevelopment of such spaces could be highly beneficial to the area. The green spaces are however of great importance to the local residents. The residents enjoy these spaces for walking their dogs, recreational and outdoor activities, space for children to play, piece of mind for the resident who works in the city and comes home to a peaceful environment and it provides space for those residents who already have very small back gardens.

7284/01/006/DM43.4/O Dr I Jayamanne

Object Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

504

I wish to protest vehemently about your plans to destroy Shirley which is a village by building hundred of homes and setting up a Gypsy and Traveller site. You will destroy the Green Belt and increase the traffic in the area thus polluting the environment and the air we breathe.

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
The use of the following five sites for housing:
- Land at Poppy Lane (ref number 128)
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane (ref number 504)
- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House (ref number 541)
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road (ref number 542)
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens (ref number 548)

When the London Borough of Lambeth closed the children's home, known as Shirley Oaks, Croydon Council determined to keep the building redevelopment of the site broadly in line with the building density that had existed for most of the previous hundred years and subsequent applications by the then developer for increased housing density were rejected. There were a number of reasons for maintaining the original policy amongst which were the need to maintain the established green corridor, retain the character of the area and to maintain the surrounding traffic volumes at a manageable level. The decision to designate the land as Metropolitan Open Land was to ensure that in future further building on the land could not take place thus re-affirming the principles established by the original policy decisions. Nothing has changed in the ensuing years to justify any variation to that policy.

No change. The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
I am dismayed at the consideration being given to the above, particularly concerning that proposed in the Shirley area. I have been a Shirley resident for almost 30 years and to date have enjoyed what the area does offer both for the community and with regard to open green spaces, which are precious to the health and wellbeing of all ages. Why should future generations be unable to continue to benefit from an outdoor environment as hitherto?

I strongly object to de-designation of the current Metropolitan Open Land and would hope that at least it could be protected as Local Green Space with regard to future development. This is particularly pertinent with regard to the proposals being considered for the Shirley Oaks area. The present road infrastructure through the estate leaves a lot to be desired and any more traffic will be a great cause for concern, to say nothing of the loss of wildlife and spacious living. If we had wanted to live in a highly densely populated area, we would not have chosen the Shirley area to relocate into, rather the centre of the town. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is more acceptable and there must be many of these in the Croydon area to develop without encroaching on valued green spaces.

No change

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
I wish to formally object to:

1. All the proposed policies relation to the re-designation of land to allow building development at Shirley Oaks Road and land around Shirley Oaks Village.
2. The land at Poppy Lane (reference 128)
3. Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane including the conversion of the locally listed pumping station (reference 504)
4. Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House (reference 541)
5. Land to the West of Shirley Oaks Road (reference 542)
6. Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens (reference 548)

These proposals are NOT appropriate for Croydon to meet its Strategic Objectives. Additionally the proposals are NOT DELIVERABLE or SUSTAINABLE as:

• Croydon have already announced that it is not necessary to deliberately destroy MOL to reach their housing requirements.
• National and London Plans do NOT require or expect Local Authorities to degrade MOL to generate additional housing.
• The loss of this MOL will entail the LOSS of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks through to Ashburton Playing fields, across to South Norwood Park and surrounding Areas.
• The above areas are vital to sustain the drainage of surrounding flood areas.
• The above mentioned areas are referred to the "lungs of Croydon" as they sustain carbon dioxide capture (photosynthesis), oxygen release (photosynthesis) and biodiversity. Local wildlife includes badgers and bats.
• Green areas increase the character, desirability and amenity of residential areas.
• Green areas have a strong positive impact of the character of surrounding residential areas.
• The proposed increase in housing will put an additional burden on public transport, roadways and street parking and other services. The additional volume of traffic will create additional road hazards.

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Object: I object to the de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village; reference Numbers, 128, 504, 541, 542 and 548. This is currently Green Space and provides vital green recreational area and buffer between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding area.

DM43.4
504

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Object: The de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and either side of Shirley Oaks Road. At present I understand that Metropolitan Open Land has the same protection as the Green Belt and I believe that it is vitally important to retain the controls around our green spaces in Shirley. If any additional homes were to be considered for this area then they should be restricted in number and carefully planned in order to retain the character of this area. The idea of building up to 750 new homes is totally out of keeping with this objective and would be considerable strain on local infrastructure and resources. New housing on this scale would lead to a significant increase in traffic along the Wickham Road which is already extremely busy not only servicing the residents of Shirley but as an important thoroughfare into Croydon.

DM43.4
504

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

Object: I am writing to object to:
2. The use of the following five sites for housing
a) Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128
b) Stroud Green Pumping Station reference Number 504
c) Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541
d) Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 and
e) Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference numbers 543

I just hope that there has been enough consideration about the fact that Shirley is built on springs and Heron Homes and Wren both had problems with flooding the area down at Woodmere Avenue.

DM43.4
504

The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.
Use of formerly open land for housing (references 128, 504, 541, 542 and 548): Again, this open land should not be lost. Furthermore, there is no infrastructure in place to support the huge increase in population density that such development would represent.

Development of the site of the former pumping station (reference 504): It was established at the time the Shirley Oaks village was built that this land could not be built on, as there is an Artesian well on the land and any development would risk polluting the water source. Furthermore, a ‘travellers’ site would be inappropriate on this site.

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

I am writing to object to the proposed use of:
- the land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road (541)
- The land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road (542)
- The land at Poppy Lane, Shirley Road (128)
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane (504)
- Land to the rear of honeysuckle gardens (548)
- Open space land at shrublands estate (938)

No change The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and is therefore considered suitable for development subject to consideration of specific site circumstances. Any development of the site should not result in an increase of flood risk in the area, and should in fact aim to reduce flood risk in the area overall.

I am therefore writing to formally object to:
- the use of the following five sites for housing:
- and to the east of Shirley Oaks Road
- and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 54

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, the five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces and not used for housing.

The site should be Local Green Space.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I am therefore writing to formally object to:

1. de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;

2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   - land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   - land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
   - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
De-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land bordering Addiscombe Place (around Shirley Oaks Village) – OBJECT

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, the five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces and not used for housing:
- Ref 126: Land at Poppy Lane
- Ref 504: Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane
- Ref 541: Land east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House, Shirley Oaks Road
- Ref 542: Land to west of Shirley Oaks Road, Shirley Oaks Road
- Ref 548: Land to rear of, 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens

designate as Local Green Spaces and not used for housing

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

We object to the proposed development on green spaces, which should remain designated as part of the Shirley Oaks MOL (see comments on Policy SP7 (Table 9.1)).

This site meets criteria for Metropolitan Open Land, in terms of its nature conservation value.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

I am horrified at the proposals regarding Shirley. There may be a need for more housing but there are alternatives and it is up to the Council to find these rather than making it easier and more profitable for builders which is what is now happening.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
A Arbisman  
Object DM43.4 541
I hereby inform you of my STRONG OBJECTION to allow development on the land noted on your Policy Map 43.
Ref 541
Ref 542
Ref 548
Ref 128
Ref 504
This land forms the reason why I, along with the majority of my neighbors purchased our homes. As freehold property owners we each have a shareholding in the company owning the land and do not wish for this, OUR land to be built on.
We also find it unbelievable that the Council wishes to have a legal battle against 800 of its residents who not just own the land but are determined that the land keeps its “Metropolitan Open Land” protected status.
The idea of building on these main green spaces when the existing houses were built with minimal sized gardens is disastrous, such development would obviously not just spoil the look and value of the area but would damage the health of the residents.
This is the land where the residents catch the summer sun, go for walks, jog, children play, and has the most amazing natural wildlife that we all love.

Balvir & Shobhna Patel  
Object DM43.4 541
I as resident of Shirley Oaks Village am against any change of our Metropolitan Land (with protection to being built on) being allowed as acceptable for development. I have been living in the Village for almost 30 years and paying for this land to be maintained as grass areas. We own the land as shareholder in our management company (Once designated as Amenity Open Land and transference to our Management company.)
I strongly oppose any moves to develop on these grass areas.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I am writing to express my objection to the planning proposals in the Shirley Oaks area. The land has been set aside for our use as we have very undersized gardens on the estate and we have also paid to keep those areas in a well maintained condition.

The road around Shirley Oaks only has 2 exits as well, so would make it very congested as there are only 2 options for traffic to leave and enter and there are already a lot of problems at the Wickham Road end as people drive in and out.

I object to the following Ref Numbers:

Ref 541
Ref 542
Ref 548
Ref 128
Ref 504

I would appreciate any information you could send me in relation to upcoming meeting's about the proposals.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Christine Clark</td>
<td>I am writing to strongly object to the development of land on Shirley Oakes Village. The land was shared between residents and in 1985 designated by Croydon Council as &quot;Amenity Open Land&quot; because of our undersized gardens. The land was transferred to the Management Company, with each property owner as a shareholder in that company. I intend to fight for the use of this land. My front garden is approximately 6’ x 4’ and the lawn in my back garden is only 6’ x 5’. Both my parents and I use the land for exercising dogs as the gardens are so small. This whole thing has come as a huge shock to all of us. With regard to the traveller site, Travellers move around the countryside so why put a traveller site in such a residential area. I appreciate the Borough needs affordable homes but the land on the estate is so restricted in size and the in and out roads to the estate are already extremely dangerous owing to the bends in the road. Health and Safety issues need to be addressed. I strongly object to this development and will explore every possible way to restrict the development of these homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniela Reynolds</td>
<td>I wish to object the following planned proposals; ref:541, ref:542, ref:549, ref:128 and ref:504 These planned proposals will not fit within the current aesthetics of the estate so please accept this email as an objection to the proposal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Re your development plans 541,542,548,128 and 504. Consultation.

I am writing in response to your notices for development of the greenfield sites on the Shirley Oaks Village estate, changing the status of this land to allow development of around 700 new homes.

When I bought my house here 18 years ago, it was on the understanding that this had been designated by Croydon Council as metropolitan amenity open land, an attractive feature of the original development, important not least due to the relatively small gardens of some properties, a mixture of unit sizes in an harmonious design. Thus there is a mixture of family unit sizes and age groups at home here. For many years, I and my fellow-resident members of the Shirley Oaks Management Ltd company have contributed regularly to First Port Property Services and their predecessors under our common upkeep obligation, including provision of boundary posts at various points of these areas to ensure that visiting Travellers could not reoccupy them.

As I understand your plans, you now wish to “designate” this as non-metropolitan land, on which purchasers could build however suits their purposes. This does of course risk a complete change in the nature of our Village. I cannot pretend to understand how you can effectively cut a swathe through all of this, even if you do consider it justified. Some residents might I imagine now be considering the impact on their original investment and individual legal aspects. Against these general considerations, I would like to highlight some specific and practical concerns at the outset.

ROAD SAFETY
The perimeter road via Primrose Lane and Shirley Oaks Road is arguably no longer fit for purpose, increased car ownership and parking, fast through traffic including commercial and public transport all contributing. Buses on the 367 route for example frequently mount pavements to pass each other. There have been accidents, some serious, even fatal and involving elderly pedestrian residents. The road surface is nowadays subject to excessive heavy usage. Clearly, 700 new homes will surely accentuate these problems and dangers.

ENVIRONMENT

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Your plans will effectively remove an important green-field area and with it much unique wildlife. Residents will lose many of the valuable areas for walking, exercise and fresh-air, as will visitors. Any balanced village appearance and community feel to the estate will be consumed by so many new properties of different designs.

In summary many will surely feel betrayed by a Council which proposes removing green-fields against all promises. Some might also suspect that, whatever the social arguments, their interests are being sacrificed against political and ultimately commercial imperatives.

Once the area surrounding Shirley Oaks Village is re-designated the Council plans to build 751 homes on 5 separate sites. Supposing the average house is for 4 people, 3000 people in total will move to the area. The housing will attract families - potentially half being children. The Council mention no where in their 700 page document about the building of new schools (primary and secondary) nor the building of doctor surgeries, nor the expanding of the local shopping area let alone the already stretched local road infrastructure. Our local area can't cope as it is - St John's primary school has applied for an extension to cope with the current demand on its places. During rush hour buses frequently don't stop at bus stops because they are full. Traffic is often diverted down our road, Shirley Church Road, if there is an accident on Wickham Road or Gravel Hill. The dual carriage way (Shirley Park) is crawling along during rush hour. The council are planning to add another 1000 plus cars to this equation. Shirley is often described according to estate agents as leafy, popular, excellent schools. Prices reflect this. Just walking around the area people look after their houses and take pride in living here. People pay more money to live in this area. By building 751 more homes the character of the area will change completely.

1713/02/004/DM43.4/O Alison Connor

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

541

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
We are also writing to object to Croydon Council’s plans to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village, changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542).

Your draft Local Plan identifies five sites:

1. the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, reference number 128);
2. Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, reference number 504);
3. land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, reference number 541);
4. land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542);
5. land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 467-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542).

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
As a resident of Shirley Oaks I am writing to object the proposals for housing development on the estate and surroundings. Having lived in Shirley all of my life I would be deeply disappointed to see it change unrecognisably. I envisage the property on Shirley Oaks Road will either be demolished or surrounded by high density housing. Either eventuality will be highly detrimental.

I have viewed the Detail Policies and Proposals on Croydon Councils website and object the following plans, references - Ref 128, Ref 504, Ref 541, Ref 542, Ref 548, Ref 938, Ref 502, Ref 661

Object to Site 541

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I am writing to object to:

1. THE DE-DESIGNATION of the following five pieces of land as Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and their proposed use as housing:

   Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541

   There is only one narrow very winding road which runs through the village and this could not cope safely with any additional traffic. It is single file around bends as it is and the local road infrastructure would be overburdened.

   These open spaces are collectively designated as Metropolitan Open Land and it would be unacceptable to lose a link to this chain.

   Additionally, this area is a flood plain and there is a sink pond to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens. There would be a detrimental effect and potential flooding of existing and planned properties.

   Three of these sites are owned by the residents of Shirley Oaks Village through the Shirley Oaks Management Company in which every freeholder has a share. The three land sites in question are:

   1. Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 541
   2. Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542
   3. Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I am writing to voice my full-throated objections to the above proposals because of the imparable damage it would do to the character of one of the leafier, more pleasant, parts of the borough. The council seeks de-designation of Metropolitan open land that, as a homeowner in Shirley Oaks Village, I own a share of, and it is protected by covenant. Such thoughtless destruction of our precious little green space (we were granted this Amenity Open Land in 1985 by the council due to our undersized gardens) is obnoxious, ill-conceived and damaging to the value of our properties, as planning blight could linger for a decade. Myriad other neglected parts of the borough are far more appropriate for such massive development and would not stir up so much ire from the current residents, nor would they require the politically-expeditant moving of goalposts regarding land use. Our village simply does not currently have the infrastructure nor the capacity to expand in order to cope with these proposals. There is barely enough parking space available in the village at present, so quite where up to 683 other families will park and seek recreation, I do not know. Quite how all the construction vehicles involved in such huge building works would access the proposed sites without further detriment to the quality of life of the residents is another issue I raise. We are served by one bus route that can only use small, single decker buses. The roads are too narrow for larger vehicles. How would this be overcome? Additionally, the fact that the council would seek to house the travelling community so close to the town centre, on land where in 2012 a group of them set up an illegal encampment and defecated in our woodland, beggars belief. If the council has an inexplicable legal obligation to designate land to travellers, then expand capacity at their existing sites in Beddington Lane and Featherbed Lane rather than dispersing them further across the borough into otherwise salubrious areas. I do hope that common sense prevails and that all five of the above proposals are quickly abandoned. I chose to live in this area precisely because it is not blighted by these hideous developments. I am sure that many other residents echo my sentiments.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
also object to the following specific proposals for the building of new homes on this site, as detailed in Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan, Detailed Policies & Proposals:

Policy DM43, reference Site 128 to build new homes at Poppy Lane
Policy DM43, reference Site 504 to build new homes at Stroud Green Pumping Station (including the conversion of the pumping station which is a locally-listed building)
Policy DM43, reference Site 541 & 542 to build new homes on land to the East & West of Shirley Oaks Road
Policy DM43, reference Site 548 to build new homes on land to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens

Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the local schools are over-subscribed as well as the already-stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
also object to the following specific proposals for the building of new homes on this site, as detailed in Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan, Detailed Policies & Proposals:

Policy DM43, reference Site 128 to build new homes at Poppy Lane
Policy DM43, reference Site 504 to build new homes at Stroud Green Pumping Station (including the conversion of the pumping station which is a locally-listed building)
Policy DM43, reference Site 541 & 542 to build new homes on land to the East & West of Shirley Oaks Road
Policy DM43, reference Site 548 to build new homes on land to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens

Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the local schools are over-subscribed as well as the already-stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
This land is owned by Shirley Oaks Management Limited (SOML). This is the management company for the estate whose shareholders are the home owning residents. SOML owns and manages the open spaces on behalf of and for the benefit of the residents for whom the land is 'amenity open land', i.e. communal, recreational space. The land was transferred to SOML's ownership in 1985 whilst the estate was under development. I believe that the developer had infringed planning regulations by reducing the sizes of the gardens included with the dwellings that it was building in order to increase the density of the housing beyond that which had been agreed with the local planning authority. The open land, which is currently being scrutinized as part of the Council's policy proposals review, was effectively, a penalty levied on the developer whereby an amount of green space was given over to SOML to own and manage as redress and compensation to the residents for skimping on the sizes of individual gardens. I am assured by a Director of SOML that the company has documentary proof of all of the above points. The residents pay a service charge that, inter alia, covers the cost of managing and maintaining these open spaces. SOML is bound by its covenants with the residents that this land shall be managed and maintained as communal open areas for the collective enjoyment and benefit of residents as long as the estate should be in existence. Thus, there is no scope on SOML's part for participating in any effort to develop these spaces and any attempt to develop them undermines the importance of those spaces in providing amenity open land, as previously ordered by the local Council.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

I have just read an email from Gavin Barwell, our Conservative MP, and my husband and I are horrified that the green fields of Shirley Oaks are to be built upon. Especially if the land is to be put aside for gypsies! How can this be right when so many young families are denied council housing and are forced to pay for private lets because of the lack of social housing. My back garden backs onto The main road that runs through the Shirley Oaks estate so you can understand my concerns.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1883/02/02</td>
<td>David Hurst</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913/01/04</td>
<td>Andrea Swaby</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I hereby would like to register my serious OBJECTION to the council's proposal to build 750 new homes in Shirley Oak road and 35 new homes on shrub lands estate to create gypsy traveller sites. As I live on Devonshire I also have serious object to allow 4 storeys in this area</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918/01/04</td>
<td>Mr Gareth Champion</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic. If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923/01/02</td>
<td>Jane Anson</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I have just read a letter from Mick Hewish, Resident Director of Shirley Oaks Management Ltd and I would like to object to the proposals for developing areas around Shirley Oaks. These are as follows: Ref: 541 Shirley Oaks Road East side Ref: 542 Shirley Oaks Road West side Ref: 548 Land rear of Honeysuckle Gardens Ref: 128 Poppy Lane Ref: 504 Water Board HQ Primrose Lane The high density of new homes would put considerable strain on the environment, including overcrowding, drainage, traffic and parking. Objection to the allocation of site 541 Shirley Oaks Road East side for proposed development as the high density of new homes would put considerable strain on the environment, including overcrowding, drainage, traffic and parking.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1924/01/002/DM43.4/P Pamela Lees Object I strongly object to many of the proposed developments within the Shirley area. I believe that allowing low rise developments around Shirley library will alter the balance of properties in that area, which are mainly detached and semi-detached. People have moved to this 'sought after area' precisely because of its current character. I also object to the intensive developments proposed on the Metropolitan open land around Shirley Oaks. We need open land to reduce carbon emissions, for wildlife and for our own well being. Both of the above developments would put a huge strain on the services in the area, schools, doctors, busses and the already congested road system. I urge you not to progress with these proposals.

I also think that the two proposed travellers site in Shirley are inappropriate as they would be on Green Belt land, which is against your own policy and would be a blot on one of the few areas that are beautiful and wildlife friendly within Croydon.

I am always defending Croydon to those that mock it, saying that we have some lovely open spaces in which to walk and enjoy the diversity of nature. They only see the high rise blocks and litter. If these proposals go ahead, Croydon will have nothing left to commend itself.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

1926/01/042/DM43.4/C Councillor Luke Clancy Object Site 541, Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Verdayne Avenue and Firsby Avenue.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

1942/01/005/DM43.4/M Margaret West Object To the de-designation of Metropolitan Land and proposed use for housing at sites 128 504 502 541 542 and 548. If development is allowed it will impact on the sense of community and have an adverse impact of trees and could be subject to flooding. It would also impact on access arrangements and the wildlife

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1954/03/01</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>John Coppard</td>
<td>Soundness -</td>
<td>This land was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as &quot;Amenity Open Land&quot; because of our under-sized gardens &amp; transferred to a Management Company, with each property owner as a shareholder in that company. If the council will not keep it as Metropolitan Open Land it should at least be designated as Local Green Space. Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993/01/03</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Graham &amp; Kate Marsden</td>
<td>DM43.4 541</td>
<td>Shocked at the scale of proposals for Shirley and will fundamentally change the nature of the area. Front gardens are an asset to the local street scene. The proposals for focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 put this stability at risk, and may have an impact on the services we all need from the Council. Object to the de-designation of MOL - at a minimum it should be designated as local green space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022/01/06</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Joe Rowe</td>
<td>Shirley Hills Residents Association</td>
<td>This land is designated as Metropolitan Open Land and there is no justification for re-designation. An increase of up to 741 homes on this land would put local services including schools, transport and already crowded roads under further pressure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022/01/07</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Joe Rowe</td>
<td>Shirley Hills Residents Association</td>
<td>This land is designated as Metropolitan Open Land and there is no justification for re-designation. An increase of up to 741 homes on this land would put local services including schools, transport and already crowded roads under further pressure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have just received a letter about proposals to Shirley Oaks Village open land being built upon. We have lived here happily for 13 years. We want to say we don't want houses or a gypsy site down the road. I will be writing to my local MP Gavin Barwell to defend our way of life in Shirley Oaks village. Leave our open / green spaces alone.</td>
<td>Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposal to build new houses in Shirley Oaks Road does not fall within the Strategic Objectives because:-

Objective 2: This development will not Foster an environment where existing enterprise can prosper, but will reduce enterprise

Objective 4: This development will not reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation. It will not reduce unemployment, improve skills and education and improve environmental conditions, the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Objective 5: This development is not high quality and will not enhance the borough’s natural environment by turning a green area into housing

Objective 7: This development will reduce the area as a safe, healthy and cohesive community but making the area overcrowded with residential property

Objective 10: This development will reduce the quality and accessibility of green space and nature.

If this development is undertaken it will not deliver the strategic objective.

This development will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The development will change the outlook and community within the South Croydon area and future generations will suffer because of this.

This proposed development of new housing in Shirley Oak Road is not within keeping of the current development within this area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with housing in the area.

Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area and is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Building a travelers site will increase noise levels and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area.

Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

This development would diminish the area of green fields and recreational
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comment/Object</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2066/01/28</td>
<td>DM43.4/541</td>
<td>Councillor Dudley Mead</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Site 541, Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Verdayne Avenue and Firsby Avenue;</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2062/01/04</td>
<td>DM43.4/541</td>
<td>Councillor Jason Perry</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2067/02/04</td>
<td>DM43.4/541</td>
<td>Stephen Baker</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>I also object to the development on Shirley Oaks, as a resident who used to live there on Shirley Oaks, any more development on this land would over burden what is already a road system that can not cope with the buses and tight turns that have been made on the estate, it's would also ruin the feel of Shirley.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2067/02/04</td>
<td>DM43.4/541</td>
<td>Stephen Baker</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>I also object to the development on Shirley Oaks, as a resident who used to live there on Shirley Oaks, any more development on this land would over burden what is already a road system that can not cope with the buses and tight turns that have been made on the estate, it's would also ruin the feel of Shirley.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2071/01/042/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Councillor Mario Creatura</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified DM43.4 541 Site 541, Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Verdayne Avenue and Firsby Avenue.</td>
<td>Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2081/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Stuart &amp; Monique Woodrow</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 541 Development at this site would be detrimental to the openness, character, visual amenity and setting of Metropolitan Open Land. It would affect the residential amenity and result in the loss of trees and vegetation to the detriment of the surrounding area</td>
<td>Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2081/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Stuart &amp; Monique Woodrow</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 541 Development at this site would be detrimental to the openness, character, visual amenity and setting of Metropolitan Open Land. It would affect the residential amenity and result in the loss of trees and vegetation to the detriment of the surrounding area</td>
<td>Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2081/02/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Stuart &amp; Monique Woodrow</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 541 We do accept that Croydon does need to provide new housing but this has to be on appropriate sites, i.e. previously developed land and not greenfield/metropolitan open land. We are firmly against this idea as it would set a precedent for inappropriate development/piecemeal development.</td>
<td>Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Alfred Lancaster</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 541 I and many residents in Shirley object to the following. 700 new homes to be built in Shirley oaks village with no provision for extra facilities like schools, doctors etc</td>
<td>Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2128/02/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Cllr Steve O’Connell AM</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land for the purpose of house building. My objection references MOL bearing the same protection from development as the Green Belt. If the Council will not agree to maintain the MOL status, designation as Local Green Space would lessen the negative impact on the local environment. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well-used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Verdayne Avenue and Firsby Avenue. The site should be at least designated as Local Green Space.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2131/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ronald H. Street</td>
<td>The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 541. If the Council will not keep the land as MOL it should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. I am particularly concerned about the effect of local roads that the suggested development will have as, when Heron Homes built the original development some years ago they were prevented by the local council form building the number of houses now proposed because of inadequate access roads onto the estate. Under present conditions the A232 Wickham Road is particularly subject to traffic delays especially in term time. Your proposed developments would also have a detrimental effect on our already crowded local schools and doctor’s surgeries.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2135/03/002/DM43.4/O Mrs Susan Lockyer

Object

DM43.4

541

This could not be developed in addition to 542. It would have to be one or the other. The land is privately owned. The local management company has worked hard to maintain the green area and retain areas suitable for wildlife. The privately owned land is used by the residents as the properties do not have private gardens. The road is already congested with private cars making the bus route difficult. I do not consider it deliverable therefore it will not meet the present needs, let alone future needs. It is unrealistic to expect the land to sustain a limitless growth in population on relatively small patches. Transport will reach gridlock, the more land that is covered over limits drainage. More pipes will be channelled underground to bring in services and take away waste. Changes to due to global warming etc will be exacerbated if the population continues to converge on small land masses rather than spreading over the planet. In addition to the physical problems we would be creating, social problems will occur with people living in closer proximity in congested space.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

2145/02/004/DM43.4/O Paul Vernon & Natalie Payne

Object

DM43.4

541

I am writing to object to:

The de-designation of the five pieces of land as metropolitan open land and their proposed use of housing land at poppy lane reference number 128. I feel that building more houses on the green land would totally destroy the wildlife in the area and would ruin an area of beauty, and that the one road into the village wouldn't be able able to cope with more traffic as its already busy.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

2147/01/003/DM43.4/O Patrick Thomas

Object

DM43.4

541

I am writing at this time to record my objections on the following basis - the use of this site , 541, for housing

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Jonathan E Miller

Object

DM43.4

541

I object to ref 541 I am writing to you with regard to the recent changes in Planning policies by Croydon Council and their impact on the designation of grass areas in Shirley Oaks Village. These areas were formerly designated as Metropolitan Open Land and had protection form being built on. However my understanding is that these areas may now be changed to no Metropolitan Land thus allowing their use for future housing developments. As a resident of Shirley I would like to point out that our land was designated as "Amenity Open Land" in 1985 by Croydon Council because of our undersized gardens and transferred to a Management Company, with each property owner as a shareholder of the Company. Whilst I fully accept the need for new housing in Croydon, in particular affordable housing for first time owners, it is clear the sheer scale of the proposed development and the resultant destruction of a precious greenfield site in Shirley Oaks Village that I object to. I would have no issue with a much smaller scale development of the village, as part of an overall plan for Croydon where new housing was primarily targeted toward development of brownfield sites under the council's jurisdiction. I urge you to consideration of my suggestions in the weeks ahead and look forward to receiving feedback in due course.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become "white land" (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mrs Jane Smith

Object

DM43.4

541

I object to development on these sites as they are MOL and amenity land used by surrounding residents. This would be detrimental to the area as the existing houses on the Estate have undersized gardens and would be obtrusive and lead to increase in traffic and access problems and noise issues.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become "white land" (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Breda Mohan

Object

DM43.4

541

I object to the use of the Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541 for housing.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become "white land" (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Brenda Stratford

Object

The use of the following 5 sites for housing: ref no. 128, 504, 541, 542, 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as local green spaces.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Alan Chitty

Object

Soundness - Justified

My objections are based on the fact that the proposals are not in the best interests of the electorate of the borough and that the proposals will only be harmful to the environment offering no benefits to the community. Building on the Green Belt is not the best option.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Christopher Palmer

Object

I object to the use of the Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541 for housing:

1. If the Council will not keep it as Metropolitan Open Land, it should be at least designated as Local Green Space.

Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr & Mrs E Abdul-Nabi

Object

Soundness - Justified

Object to the use of this site for housing.

If the Council will not keep it as Metropolitan Open Land it should be at least designated as Local Green Space.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Site 541, Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would totally change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Verdayne Avenue and Firsby Avenue.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

I will be objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I will also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

I thoroughly object to these proposals, the traffic has built up over time and I wouldn’t even want to begin to imagine what Shirley Oaks would be like if another 600+ homes where to be built, that would be practically doubling the size of Shirley Oaks as it is at present.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
We strongly object to Croydon Council’s local planning proposals and plans for development to the site being used for residential development. We strongly object to the de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village. No more housing should be built on MO land and it is inappropriate for development since it would over-stretch the local road infrastructure with the additional traffic. The road in and out of Shirley Oaks Village is very narrow and there is hardly enough room for the bus to get by. The increased volume of traffic and parked vehicles would be unmanageable bringing traffic in all directions to a complete standstill. We believe the council needs to rethink its proposals for the sites, but would hope that in any event, an overwhelming majority of homeowners living in the village will reject the council’s proposals. Not only would the area be an eyesore, but the proposal to build a whopping 700 new homes is unrealistic as the open green spaces are very small. You would also be destroying the wildlife by cutting down our precious trees and removing the open green spaces. It was agreed, and we believe documented, that after the build of phase 5 on Shirley Oaks Village that no more houses would be built, and this was a deciding factor when individuals bought their properties on Shirley Oaks Village. If over 700 new homes are built, it would no longer be a village but instead an ugly built up housing estate, changing the character of the landscape completely. From our perspective, if the proposals were approved, we would have no choice but to move away from the area. It would be too upsetting to see our open green spaces developed to excess with over 700 new homes. I have no doubt that developing the land would also devalue the property prices in the future. We find the council’s proposals ludicrous and unreasonable. It is imperative that we protect the precious remaining green spaces around Shirley Oaks Village. On that basis, we vigorously object to the council’s proposal to develop the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lydia Benady</td>
<td>We strongly object to the changes to designations of our grass areas. As a resident and shareholder I point out that our land was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as Amenity Open Lan because of our under-sized gardens. This land is for our use. Not only would building be detrimental to our health and well being but also to the varied and protected wildlife that we have. There are plenty of rundown places in Croydon which should be regenerated and can be built on without impinging into our green spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Sandra Cooper</td>
<td>I object to the designation of Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks enabling parts of this land to be used for housing and in particular site 548, with which I have an adjoining boundary. Should the Council not keep this land as Metropolitan Open Land these spaces should at the least be designated as Local Green Space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Susanne Million</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing. If the Council will not keep this site as MOL, it should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Palmer</td>
<td>I object to the use of the Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541 for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport. I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Object DM43.4
541

I wish to register my objection to the proposed plans for the housing development on the green areas around the Shirley Oaks Estate.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object DM43.4
541

I am writing in response to your notice for development of the greenfield sites on the Shirley Oaks Village estate to change the status of this land to allow development of 751 new homes. My husband and I bought our home in 1987 when the estate was being developed the overriding factor in our decision was the village nature of the development and the assurance that the surrounding green fields of the site would ultimately be transferred to a management company and each purchaser of a property would acquire a share in the company.

It was agreed that through the management company the owners and occupiers would assume responsibility for the peripheral land and incidental open spaces. Subsequently it was arranged that every quarter a payment is made by each household for the maintenance of the grounds. Your proposed development will completely alter the pleasant aspect of the village and negate the intention of the original development. I fail to understand how you can possibly consider completely ignoring our rights as shareholders of this land.

As you are aware, the village has only one through road and there are already problems with buses mounting the pavements and the volume of traffic using the road with the existing housing stock. Ad additional 751 houses would make the problem so much worse. We have already had one fatality and I understand a number of less serious accidents. Therefore, I strongly object to your proposed development plans.
Mrs Shirley M Kall

Our Local Green Belt should remain as such and not redesignated as Metropolitan Open Land which then could be used for new housing. Strongly object to this proposal.

Plans for residential development:
- Ref No. 128 - the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51-107 homes.
- Ref No. 504 - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station is identified as suitable for 26-68 homes.
- Ref No. 541 - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 26-68 homes.
- Ref No. 542 - land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes.
- Ref No. 548 - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes.

Development on any of these sites would change the whole character of the area and surely add to the congestion of local roads, which would increase the risk of accidents.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Ms Karen Fletcher

We wish to register our objection to the proposals to change the policy map 43 in relation to Metropolitan Open Land at Shirley Oaks Village. Like many residents we purchased our home on the understanding that the MOL was owned by the residents themselves and would not be developed. It was a strong factor in our decision to purchase our house. The land itself was transferred to the management company by a transfer dating 30 July 1991 made between Heron Homes Limited and Shirley Oaks Management Limited. The third schedule to this transfer contains restrictive covenants and I have attached the relevant clauses. These clauses that the land is to be used as open space so I do not understand how you can ignore this and grant planning permission to build houses. We understand the need for more housing but feel that this is not the way forward. It would be far better to look at the buildings/land owned by the London Borough of Croydon first to see which could be used as residential properties. The old Ashburton Library in Ashburton Park is such a building that could be redeveloped and used for housing and I am sure there are many more.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2566/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs S White</td>
<td>I object to the use of the Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541 for housing.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2566/02/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr John Boonoff</td>
<td>Land at Poppy Lane and Primrose Lane, Shirley Oaks Village. Residential development. Can you please inform me why? The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The land does not meet the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land, it has no public access, and there is a willing landowner, so it is considered developable subject to consideration of specific site circumstances including ensuring that development of the site incorporates sustainable urban drainage systems such that surface run off from the site is reduced, and development of the site does not increase flooding elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr John Booroff

Object Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 541

Please note that I wish to object to the proposals set out in reference numbers 504, 541, 542, 548 and 128, for the following reasons:

- There has been insufficient notice of the consultation period, and the proposals are not clearly set out as pertaining to Shirley Oaks Village.
- This land is designated as Metropolitan Open Land, and I do not agree that it does not meet the criteria, as it does contribute to the physical structure of London, and there currently are open-air facilities, which serve significant parts of London.
- Increasing the housing density in this development will have a detrimental effect on the environment, and will decrease the value of these homes, as the development contains smaller gardens than those originally planned, and the surrounding green spaces were left vacant to compensate for the lack of adequate open space.
- Any change in the restrictions will adversely affect the accessibility to nature and wildlife of the area, which contains features of metropolitan importance.
- There is inadequate infrastructure in the locality to accommodate such an increase in population.
- There has not been a true 'fit for purpose' investigation of the 'brownfield sites', which already exist in the borough, or of other open land which could be used without.

In view of the above please register my objection to all five proposals, and please acknowledge receipt of this email.

Mr Keith Simmonds

DM43.4 541

As a resident I would like to object to you proposals to build homes on the existing amenity land on Shirley Oaks due to the fact that the infrastructure could not cope and these area's are of natural beauty and full of wildlife, this is a sanctuary that must not be removed

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr Keith Harris

Developments Reference Numbers
541, 542, 548, 128, 504

This we cause dangerous increase
traffic through Shirley Oaks Road &
Primrose Lane, and also increase parking by the
Synagogue which is bad at the best of
times.

Mr Lewis Reynolds

I wish to object to planned proposals;
ref 541

These planned proposals will not fit
within the current aesthetics of the
estate so please accept this email as
an objection to the proposal.

Mr Tau Wey

I am concerned about this proposal.
When I bought my house in Angelica
Gardens, Shirley Oaks Village, it was
my understanding that I would also
become a communal owner of the
surrounding Amenity Open Land.
This was guaranteed by each
freeholder in Shirley Oaks owning a
share of the Shirley Oaks
Management Limited, which in turn
owns and manages the Amenity
Open Land.

Like many residents, I purchased my
house partly due to the pleasant
areas of green space available in my
surroundings. I also think that the
character of the current surrounding
gives each property the value that it
currently has.

I would also object to attempts by
Croydon Council or other agencies to
attempt to purchase the land from
Shirley Oaks Management Limited in
the future.
I am emailing to outline my objections to the planning notices in relation to the above reference numbers which concern land near to Shirley Oaks Road, Honeysuckle Gardens, Poppy Lane and Primrose Lane.

I object to these proposed developments for the following reasons:

1. The move to unravel the protection of Metropolitan open land from significant housing developments is a disappointing and avoidable move by Croydon Council. This sets an unnecessary precedent. This land should be protected by its designation and the council has sufficient options elsewhere in the borough on land that has no such designation.

2. Much of the land concerned was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as "Amenity Open Land" because of the under-sized gardens of many of the Shirley Oaks property. I live with a young family on Shirley Oaks with a very small garden and object to the loss of this open land which is regularly used by young families and residents of the area who do not have large gardens or any gardens at all in some instances.

3. Such proposals will unduly change the character and desirability of the local area which is defined by its open space. Shirley Oaks remains one of the few genuine peaceful residential areas within the borough and such thoughtless development will threaten this.

4. The roads leading to Shirley Oaks are roads not given to significant volumes of traffic. Increasing the density of the population within the immediate area as substantially as you are proposing creates challenges for traffic and parking. The scale of the developments will exponentially increase the volume of traffic and create challenges for parking.

As a resident I would like to object to you proposals to build homes on the existing amenity land on Shirley Oaks due to the fact that the infrastructure could not cope and these areas are of natural beauty and full of wildlife, this is a sanctuary that must not be removed.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Ms Ellie London
Object DM43.4 541

I object to the use of the site for housing.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Ms Sue Ridenton
Object DM43.4 541

I would like to raise my objection to the proposed land changes for the Ref. 541 - Shirley Oaks road east side - up to 215 new homes.

The land we are talking about above was designated by Croydon council in 1985 as Amenity Open Land, because of our under-sized gardens and transferred to the Management Company -- with each property owner as a shareholder in that company.

No one in the village will want any more homes built. The open space keeps the village unique and a nice place to live.

Any more homes will not enhance the village at all and of course will lower our house prices and a GYPSY site... what on earth are the council thinking!!

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Ms Rachel James
Object DM43.4 541

I object to the following proposal for Shirley Oaks Village: Ref. 541, Ref. 542, Ref. 548, Ref. 128, Ref. 504.

I love my home currently on Shirley Oaks and our gardens are considerably small in size and I daily take walks on the land with my 2 children and husband. I feel this would depreciate the area and I wouldn’t be happy with any of the above plans.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Helen Armstrong
Object DM43.4 541

I am writing to register my household’s objection to the proposed developments in Shirley. The projected number of homes will impact dramatically not only on the existing residents and the open feel of the site, but essentially on the transport infrastructure. Wickham Road is a major route, prone to congestion at peak hours and any significant increase in road users will have a dramatic knock on effect not for residents and also for commuters in all directions. The Trinity roundabout is a major junction with many bus routes passing through. This would grind to even more of a halt. The potential number of proposed properties is unacceptably high.

Objection to the development of site 541

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ian Broyd</td>
<td>If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, the five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces and not used for housing. The site should be Local Green Space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicola Hodgson</td>
<td>The Society objects to the proposals to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and on land surrounding Shirley Oaks Village, in particular the proposals on page 68. This land is currently protected from development similar to protection of green belt land. The Society objects in principle to the decision of the council to de-designate land currently held as Metropolitan Open Land. Even if parts of the areas were designated as local green space, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, there would still be a huge loss of open space. If development were allowed in these areas it would be detrimental to the amenity value of the area for the benefit of the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss P Jones</td>
<td>Having lived in Shirley for over 50 years I strongly object to Croydon Council plans to de-designate the Metropolitan open land so that most of this land can be used for new housing. At the moment it has the same Protection as Green Belt. Firstly, this would entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding area, changing the character of the area. More importantly the road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic. Try getting out to the Wickham Road from Orchard Avenue in rush hour.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2635/01/036</td>
<td>Paul Sandford</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2637/01/029</td>
<td>Rebecca Pullinger</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2663/01/003</td>
<td>Mrs Y Sussey</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Object Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Verdayne Avenue and Firsby Avenue.**

**Object Soundness - Effective**

The more specific site allocations represent a large reduction in the amount of designated and non-designated open space. While we acknowledge the need to build new homes and associated infrastructure such as schools, Croydon’s growing population also needs quality open spaces for all the human amenity and ecosystem services which they provide.

We object to the proposed development on green spaces, which are currently designated, and should remain designated, as part of the Shirley Oaks MOL. As mentioned as part of our response to SP7, we feel that most of the site still warrants its MOL designation. We object to the following site allocations as they will fragment the green space impacting on residents’ amenity and wildlife’s use of the area (both current and potential).

The presence of scattered detached housing does not impact the overall openness of the site, and therefore is not a reason to remove the designation of MOL and allocate for further development.

Object to proposals at this site because of the increased risk of flooding and adverse impact on air quality. New Housing should be on brownfield sites.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2665/01/02/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms S Mawaziny</td>
<td>DM43.4 541</td>
<td>There are many reasons why houses should not be built on the MOL of Shirley Oaks Village, but I will mention only one simply because I do not want the council to make a huge mistake. If you check it out you will find that a previous proposal to build many more houses than are now there was abandoned. This is because of difficulties encountered in building the foundations of houses in some areas were immense and would have been very expensive. Underground water seems to be a problem. My brother, who lives in Woodmere Ave where it borders on Shirley Oaks, has had water streaming across his back garden (during wet weather) ever since new houses were built in the area behind the houses on the south side of Woodmere Ave. The council really must investigate this problem. I object to the use of the Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beach House and Ash House reference number 541 for housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2666/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>C Morley-Smith</td>
<td>DM43.4 541</td>
<td>Respect green fields and use brown field land first. Don't just build to reach targets without proper research, debate and thought of the long term consequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2681/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Patricia Harding</td>
<td>DM43.4 541</td>
<td>I would like it known for the record that I strongly object to any changes of use to the open land within Shirley Oaks Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2682/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Kallas</td>
<td>DM43.4 541</td>
<td>I would say to the Council Croydon is full and kindly leave our precious Shirley open spaces and attractive streets alone, we don't need an odd assortment of blocks of flats amongst the semi-detached and small detached properties here, or in similar Croydon suburbs it would be an architectural disaster along the lines of the 1950s concrete jungle development of the centre of Croydon. And we don't have the infrastructure to cope with more people, or the roads to cope with the traffic we already have.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2688/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Perry</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>The proposal to build 750 homes on our amenity open land is depicable, we have lived here since 1986 and paid yearly for these grounds to be maintained. Croydon needs open spaces and trees for the town to breathe. The process of building in this small area would be intolerable and increase the traffic at the Wickham Road and Shirley Road would be horrific. We will complain to our MP to stop this lunacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2696/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Beresford Walker</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>I object to Policy DM43, reference Site 541 to build new homes on land to the East &amp; West of Shirley Oaks Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2706/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Panagakis</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>Object to the use of land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House (reference number 541) for housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2720/01/001/DM43.4/C</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs C P Smith</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>object to this site as this land was designated to residents of Shirley Oaks village as amenity open land in 1985 because of the under sized gardens and transferred to the management company. This land should remain Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2721/01/008/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr A Zelisko</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>I object to the use of this site for housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr G Simmonds

Object to site 541 as the site is undeliverable for the following:
- Lack of evidence to support designation as the report relies entirely on opinion uninformed by actual specifics of land use and forms an important part of Shirley's green infrastructure.
- The land is used for recreation and its loss would be contrary to the Mayor's Pan Policy 17.7 which highlights the positive aspects of MOL such as play areas for children and amenity areas for grandparents to play with their children, play areas for kids going home from school and also for others such as dogwalkers.
- The land should be retained as MOL as it meets the criteria set out by the London Plan.

DM43.4

541

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr & Mrs Hunt

Object to site 541 as the site is undeliverable for the following:
- Lack of evidence to support designation as the report relies entirely on opinion uninformed by actual specifics of land use and forms an important part of Shirley's green infrastructure.
- The land is used for recreation and its loss would be contrary to the Mayor's Pan Policy 17.7 which highlights the positive aspects of MOL such as play areas for children and amenity areas for grandparents to play with their children, play areas for kids going home from school and also for others such as dogwalkers.
- The land should be retained as MOL as it meets the criteria set out by the London Plan.

DM43.4

541

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr & Mrs Hunt

Object to site 541 as the site is undeliverable for the following:
- Lack of evidence to support designation as the report relies entirely on opinion uninformed by actual specifics of land use and forms an important part of Shirley's green infrastructure.
- The land is used for recreation and its loss would be contrary to the Mayor's Pan Policy 17.7 which highlights the positive aspects of MOL such as play areas for children and amenity areas for grandparents to play with their children, play areas for kids going home from school and also for others such as dogwalkers.
- The land should be retained as MOL as it meets the criteria set out by the London Plan.

DM43.4

541

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr & Mrs Hunt

Object to site 541 as the site is undeliverable for the following:
- Lack of evidence to support designation as the report relies entirely on opinion uninformed by actual specifics of land use and forms an important part of Shirley's green infrastructure.
- The land is used for recreation and its loss would be contrary to the Mayor's Pan Policy 17.7 which highlights the positive aspects of MOL such as play areas for children and amenity areas for grandparents to play with their children, play areas for kids going home from school and also for others such as dogwalkers.
- The land should be retained as MOL as it meets the criteria set out by the London Plan.

DM43.4

541

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
We are writing to object to the use of the following five sites for housing:
- Land at Poppy Lane, reference number 128
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, ref no. 504
- Lane to the East of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541.
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, ref number 542.
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, ref number 548.

If council will not keep them as metropolitan open land, these sites should at least be designated as green spaces.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

I object to the use of the Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541 for housing.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object to this site: building on it would lead to a loss of greenspace between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding area.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

I am writing regarding the Council's plans for a massive redevelopment in the Shirley Area. More houses mean more traffic on our already crowded roads. I no longer go into Croydon because of the journey times. How long would it be before the Council considered bringing in a congestion charge. When you build all these properties do you consider the local amenities and the effect that more people would have on these. Where are the school places for all of these children? Regarding doctors. Unless it is an emergency I have to wait at least a week for an appointment. This waiting time can only increase if there are more patients. Is it the Council's policy to build over green belt land to the detriment of locals? I sincerely hope not. I think you need to seriously reconsider these plans.
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Object Soundness - Justified 541 These open spaces are collectively designated as Metropolitan Open Land. It would be disastrous to lose a link in this chain.

THE SHIRLEY GREEN CHAIN

The green open spaces of Shirley Oaks Village provide several links in the Shirley Green Chain. This chain starts at the South Norwood Country Park in the north and runs south through Ryland Fields, Long Lane Woods, Ashburton Playing Fields, the open spaces of Shirley Oaks Village, Trinity School playing fields, Shirley Park Golf Course and up to the Shirley Hills. From there the Green Chain continues through Heathfield, Bramley Bank Nature Reserve, Littleheath Woods and via Selsdon Park to Kings Wood at Hamsey Green. These open spaces are collectively designated as Metropolitan Open Land. It would be disastrous to lose a link in this chain.

Planning Policy Guidance Note 9

This guidance stresses the importance of nature conservation, not only on nationally important sites, but also suggests that many urban sites for nature conservation have enhanced local importance as a consequence of the relative lack of wildlife sites in built up areas. Statutory and non-statutory sites which provide wildlife corridors, links or stepping stones from one habitat site to another, all help to form a network necessary to endure the maintenance of the current range and diversity of our flora and fauna.

The Green Spaces in Shirley Oaks were designated as Metropolitan Open Land and today still meet the criteria for this protection. The sites (1) contain conservation and habitat interest of value at a metropolitan level and (2) forms part of the Shirley Green Chain. These are two of the criteria for Metropolitan Open Land. The Green Spaces in Shirley Oaks Village were designated as Metropolitan Open Land and today still meet the criteria for this protection.

The sites (1) contain conservation and habitat interest of value at a metropolitan level and (2) form part of the Shirley Green Chain. These are two of the criteria for Metropolitan Open Land.

These sites possibly have a section 52 agreement, and are part ownerships shared by each of the Shirley Oaks Village residents.

Re-designation of MOL falls foul of
the London Plan.

Existing dwellings to be retained or demolished? If retained the Site Area should be adjusted to take account of the existing dwellings: The Lodge, Beech House & Ash House? On the East site And the Synagogue and the two house (can’t read their names) on the West side.

Infrastructure not specified to support development.

Schools are oversubscribed; GP Surgeries oversubscribed

Road system could not cope with the increase in traffic during peak travel times

Area has high water table and is subject to flooding.

London Plan

POLICY 7.17 METROPOLITAN OPEN LAND

Strategic

A The Mayor strongly supports the current extent of Metropolitan Open Land (MOL), its extension in appropriate circumstances and its protection from development having an adverse impact on the openness of MOL.

Planning decisions

B The strongest protection should be given to London’s Metropolitan Open Land and inappropriate development refused, except in very special circumstances, giving the same level of protection as in the Green Belt. Essential ancillary facilities for appropriate uses will only be acceptable where they maintain the openness of MOL.

LDF preparation

C Any alterations to the boundary of MOL should be undertaken by Boroughs through the LDF process, in consultation with the Mayor and adjoining authorities.

D To designate land as MOL Boroughs need to establish that the land meets at least one of the following criteria:

a) it contributes to the physical structure of London by being clearly distinguishable from the built up area

b) it includes open air facilities, especially for leisure, recreation, sport, the arts and cultural activities, which serve either the whole or significant parts of London

c) it contains features or landscapes (historic, recreational, biodiversity) of either national or metropolitan value if it forms part of a Green Chain or a link in the network of green infrastructure and meets one of the above criteria.
The London Plan 7.56

The policy guidance of paragraphs 79-92 of the NPPF on Green Belts applies equally to Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). MOL has an important role to play as part of London’s multifunctional green infrastructure and the Mayor is keen to see improvements in its overall quality and accessibility. Such improvements are likely to help human health, biodiversity and quality of life. Development that involves the loss of MOL in return for the creation of new open space elsewhere will not be considered appropriate. Appropriate development should be limited to small scale structures to support outdoor open space uses and minimise any adverse impact on the openness of MOL. Green chains are important to London’s open space network, recreation and biodiversity. They consist of footpaths and the open spaces that they link, which are accessible to the public. The open spaces and links within a Green Chain should be designated as MOL due to their London-wide importance.

2775/01/042/DM43.4/O Cllr Tim Pollard
London Borough of Croydon
Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 Site 541, Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Verdayne Avenue and Firsby Avenue.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

2776/01/042/DM43.4/O Cllr Helen Pollard
London Borough of Croydon
Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 Site 541, Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Verdayne Avenue and Firsby Avenue.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
The preferred approach is not the most appropriate for Croydon to meet the Strategic Objectives - the land is current Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land or otherwise designated green land and should not be built on. I disagree that it "does not contribute to the physical structure of London". Just because it has no facilities does not mean that it is not an asset to the life of London. Yes, it is deliverable but should not be delivered on that land. No, it is not sustainable because it removes the need for green space for future generations.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Site 541, Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would totally change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Verdayne Avenue and Firsby Avenue.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Site 541, Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would totally change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Verdayne Avenue and Firsby Avenue.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Object Soundness - Justified

Site 541, Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Verdayne Avenue and Firsby Avenue.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Residential development on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and around Shirley Oaks Village (reference numbers 128, 504, 541, 542, 548 on Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals) This is Metropolitan Open Land which is accorded the same level of statutory protection as the Green Belt. Changing this designation in order to allow building amounts to an abuse of the planning process. The area is liable to localised flooding, which anyway makes it unsuitable for residential housing. There appears to be no provision for additional infrastructure which would support the building of up to 750 new homes. In particular, local roads are already inadequate; morning traffic queues are already common in this area, especially towards the town centre. The proposals cannot but fundamentally alter the character of this part of Shirley, again, for the worse.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object to the development at the rear of Beech House and Ash House as it is protected land as MOL

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
The site is owned by Shirley Oaks Management Company. The site is currently designated MOL. There is a legal agreement which relates to the land and identifies an area of which the site is part. It requires that the site be transferred to a management company and be held as amenity open space. The company is the successor in the title to the original developer. The Section 52 agreement prevents development of the site and therefore it is not deliverable. The MOL designation should remain. Should the decision to de-designate the site as MOL, it should be designated at local green space. Development of the site would not comply with the NPPF nor would it be sustainable development for the reasons set out above and those identified in respect to the objection to Policy SP7. The highway network is already at saturation point and in any event any proposed residential development would generate an unacceptable amount of traffic. The site has a high water table.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Ms Debbie Butler  

Object: Soundness - Justified  

DM43.4  

I object to the use of the following five sites for housing:  
• Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;  
• Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;  
• Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;  
• Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and  
• Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 545;  

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.  

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I write concerning Croydon Council's proposals contained in the consultation document of the Croydon Local Plan that includes the re-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in Shirley and specifically within the confines of Shirley Oaks. I consider these proposals and others listed above to be inappropriate as they would significantly change the character of the area in which I have lived all 61 years of my life and I wish to add my voice to those already expressing concerns and objections about these proposals.

I strongly object to the proposal to re-designate Metropolitan Open Land to facilitate the building of new homes on land in Shirley Oaks and the provision of temporary or permanent traveller/gypsy sites in areas that are acknowledged by the Council to be in the green belt at Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries in Conduit Lane.

These proposals are totally out of keeping with the character of the area which predominantly comprise owner-occupied semi and detached homes. Surely areas considered to be brownfield sites are more appropriate than the unacceptable use of Metropolitan Open Land?

The proposals affecting the area surrounding Shirley Library are also of concern as this would adversely change the character of the area and potentially result in the establishment of additional unsightly car-parking sites on the south side of Wickham Road, similar to that at the front of the Shirley Medical Centre at 370 Wickham Road.
2924/01/006/DM43.4/O Mr Roohi F Khan

Object DM43.4

541

These areas allowed by Shirley Oaks Management Ltd. 488 residents are shareholders in this company. This land was transferred to the above company in 1985 and designated as open amenity land by Croydon Council for use of residents as the gardens of the dwellings built by Heron Homes were very small. These areas of open amenity land are fully utilised by the residents and others for recreation and leisure and are clearly identified as private land. High density building in these areas would result in lack of pleasure and leisure amenity for present residents, increase traffic congestion and an increased risk to residents personal safety and health especially through high pollution levels.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

2931/01/008/DM43.4/O Mr John Newman

Object DM43.4

541

I object to the use of the site for housing.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

2948/01/003/DM43.4/O Mrs Carolyn Dare

Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4

541

I raise strong objection to the allocation of this site for development. I am a shareholder in Shirley Oaks Management Company which owns the land and maintains it. I pay a quarterly charge towards its upkeep. The traffic is already too much for the road through the village. Please do not allow our village to be destroyed.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

2948/01/003/DM43.4/O Mrs Carolyn Dare

Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4

541

I raise strong objection to the allocation of this site for development. I am a shareholder in Shirley Oaks Management Company which owns the land and maintains it. I pay a quarterly charge towards its upkeep. The traffic is already too much for the road through the village. Please do not allow our village to be destroyed.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
The proposal to build new houses in Shirley Oaks Road does not fall within the Strategic Objectives because:

Objective 2: This development will not Foster an environment where existing enterprise can prosper, but will reduce enterprise

Objective 4: This development will not reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation. It will not reduce unemployment, improve skills and education and improve environmental conditions, the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Objective 5: This development is not high quality and will not enhance the borough’s natural environment but will reduce the natural environment by turning a green area into housing

Objective 7: This development will reduce the area as a safe, healthy and cohesive community but making the area overcrowded with residential property

Objective 10: This development will reduce the quality and accessibility of green space and nature. This proposed development of new housing in Shirley Oak Road is not within keeping of the current development within this area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with housing in the area. Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area and is not in keeping with the surrounding area

Building a travelers site will increase noise levels and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area.

Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. This development would diminish the area of green fields and recreational land within the area.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mrs Janet Hills

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 541

Change

This cannot be allowed:

1) I own the Land and am not prepared to sell my Share!
2) This open pastureland is used by children (playing) and dog walkers from other parts of Shirley. I know this because friends of mine walk their dogs - and pick up their litter. We’re all being encouraged to exercise more yet you’re taking away the possibilities of doing so on our own ‘home ground’!
3) It will grossly decrease the value of my property. !!!
4) I am in my 70’s (I moved here 8 yrs ago because of the tranquility) and haven’t the energy to move again!
5) The Wickham Road is already congested a lot of the time, I can’t imagine what it’ll be like with the introduction of 750 ‘new builds’ on Shirley Oaks + the plans for altering other parts of Shirley.
6) There are wild birds, and animals, living here as well as us you know!!

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Jane Bowden

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 541

Change

2) I understand that the Council are seeking to de-designate various pieces of land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and around Shirley Oaks village, so that it is no longer Metropolitan Open Land, with a view to potentially building between 304 and 751 new homes. (Reference numbers 128, 504, 541, 542 & 548). Open, green land is essential to maintain a pleasant living area, and to maintain the character of the area. In addition, this number of additional dwellings would seriously overwhelm the local infrastructure. In particular, the local road infrastructure could not cope with the additional traffic.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr John Helen

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 541

Change

3) We are objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) - if the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I will also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr John Hitchcock

Our family has lived on Shirley Oaks Village approx 20 years ago and understood the village to be a Private estate and I am writing to object to the de-designation of the open land around the village and to the use of five sites for housing.

The land rightfully belongs to the residents, the areas and roads will become congested and property values will decrease.

Mr John Roberts

I am writing to object to:
The use of the Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, reference number 541 for housing.

If the Council will not keep these areas as Metropolitan Open Land, these 5 sites should at least be designated as Local Green Space.

My objections are based on the following:
i. The change in local designation and subsequent development would lead to a material reduction to an important green space and amenity within a basically urban area, ii. The effect and congestion on the local infrastructure which would be caused by the building of more housing to an already densely developed site, iii. The effect on existing property values of property to Shirley Oaks and surrounding areas caused by the reduced amenity and congestion.

I urge that the Council should take these and other objections in consideration and not continue with their plans to re-designate the areas described above.
Land currently designated as Metropolitan Open Land at Poppy Lane, Stroud Green Pumping Station, to the east of Shirley Oaks Road, to the west of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens has been identified as suitable for up to 741 homes (pages 445-446, 451-452, 453-454, 455-456, 457-458 Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference numbers 128, 504, 541, 542 and 548).

I object to these proposals on the grounds that:

This land is designated as Metropolitan Open Land and there is no justification for re designation. An increase of up to 741 homes on this land would put local services including schools, transport and already crowded roads under further pressure.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

---

2. REF:128, REF:504, REF:541, REF:542, REF:548 (Shirley Oaks Village)

Once the area surrounding Shirley Oaks Village is re-designated the Council plans to build 751 homes on 5 separate sites.

Supposing the average house is for 4 people, 3000 people in total will move to the area. The housing will attract families - potentially half being children. The Council mention no where in their 700 page document about the building of new schools (primary and secondary) nor the building of doctor surgeries, nor the expanding of the local shopping area let alone the already stretched local road infrastructure. Our local area can't cope as it is - St John's primary school has applied for an extension to cope with the current demand on its places. During rush hour buses frequently don't stop at bus stops because they are full. Traffic is often diverted down our road, Shirley Church Road, if there is an accident on Wickham Road or Gravel Hill. The dual carriage way (Shirley Park) is crawling along during rush hour. The council are planning to add another 1000 plus cars to this equation. Shirley is often described according to estate agents as leafy, popular, excellent schools. By building 751 more homes the character of the area will change completely.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3018/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Chris Lynam</td>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in the vicinity of Shirley Oaks Road and Shirley Oaks Village. The land should be at least designated as Local Green Space, for its protection from development. This open space provides a green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, and should be retained in its present form. Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the local schools are over-subscribed as well as the already-stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3028/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Nick Barnes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Road. None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3029/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Paul Newton</td>
<td>Addington Village Residents Assoc</td>
<td>Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic. If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sarah Minter

Object DM43.4

I strongly object to the proposed development plans for the Shirley Area. I have lived here all my life and have seen a steady influx of people, and a massive reduction in the green space in the area. The roads are already far too congested and the social infrastructure is already struggling to cope with the number of residents. There are many areas in the Croydon borough much more suited to such large scale development. I am thinking particularly of areas around Purley Way. There are also many brownfield sites in the borough that could be put to more effective use as housing without affecting the green areas. I guess the council prefers to redevelop the green areas rather than the brownfield areas due to cost. As I said I do not want my local area turned into a concrete jungle where there is nowhere for people to relax in the open.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr Brian Jacobs

Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4

I am writing to object to all the proposed changes and plans affecting the Shirley neighbourhood as advised to me by Gavin Barwell and the Executive Committee of Spring Park Residents Association. 1) I object strongly to any plans to change the definition of existing land and use. 2) When dealing with the further extension of Shirley Oaks site I am disturbed by the fact there are just two access points i.e. Shirley Road and Wickham Road the later being onto the A232 which is very busy all day and particularly during rush hour periods, when traffic backs up westwards to the Shirley Road roundabout and beyond. 3) The proposals for Shirley Oaks, given to me indicate land being suitable for between 304 and 751 additional homes. As many properties nowadays have at least one car this will have a serious additional congestion to Shirley and Wickham Roads. 4) Additionally, development of this size would have a serious demand on existing schools (primary particularly), doctors and other local services.

Christine McCarthy

Object DM43.4

I object to all the proposals set out for new housing and travellers sites in Shirley. I feel it will ruin the area by taking up all the open spaces.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I am writing to express my objection to the proposals of development to the Shirley oaks estate, on website www.croydon.gov.uk/policiesmap on “Changes to the policy Map 43” those being:-
Ref:541. Shirley oaks road East side, up to 215 new homes!!!
Ref:542. Shirley oaks road west side, up to 236 new homes!!!
Ref:548. Land rear of honeysuckle gardens, up to 125 new homes!!!
Ref:128. Poppy lane, up to 107 new homes!!!
Ref:504. Up to 68 new homes or gypsy site at the water board HQ, primrose lane!!!!!!!!!

I brought my home on 5 Flag Close, Shirley Oaks, Surrey, CR0 8XT as it was on a green and pleasant estate and on the understanding this land was designated to us as because of our undersized gardens. We were told this land would never be built on and each of the properties on the estate are shareholders of this land as it was designated “amenity open land” by the Croydon council and transferred to our management company.

We are forming groups and seeking legal advice and looking into the legal implications and small print to your proposals and will not take this laying

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

I object to the use of the site for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mrs Halina Tutt

Object

DM43.4

This lovely part of Croydon seems to be the worst affected by the Council’s proposals. Croydon Council plans to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village. Metropolitan Open Land has the same protection from development as the Green Belt. The Council are proposing to remove this designation so that most of this land can be used for new housing. I am objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land. If the Council won’t keep it as such, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, but trust me, the local roads couldn’t cope with the additional traffic. If you ever travel on Wickham Road, Addiscombe Road or Lower Addiscombe Road at rush hour you will agree with me. The traffic is already horrendous and more housing would simply treble this problem.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr Paul Grosser

Object

DM43.4

The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 541 I have friends who live in Shirley Oaks village and I know them and myself along with many others all object to the proposals to build on the green areas. This grass area is used by many and would totally change the area if built on and we don’t want it. Part of the charm of this area is those green areas and it has something that you don’t find often in Croydon so please let us keep the green areas as we all object to them being built on.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr Ben Lynam

Object

DM43.4

I object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in the vicinity of Shirley Oaks Road and Shirley Oaks Village. The land should be at least designated as Local Green Space, for its protection from development. This open space provides a green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, and should be retained in its present form. Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the local schools are over-subscribed as well as the already-stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3098/01/003/DM43.4/O Mr Derrick Thurley | DM43.4 541 De-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village thus enabling the following sites to be built on.  
a) Policy DM43, Reference 128 Land to build 51 to 107 homes in Poppy Lane  
b) Policy DM43, Reference 504 Land to build 26 to 68 homes at Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane including conversion of the pumping station  
c) Policy DM43, Reference 541 Land to build 80 to 215 homes to the east of Shirley road and rear of Beech House  
d) Policy DM43, Reference 542 Land to build 88 to 236 homes to the west of Shirley Oaks Road  
e) Policy DM43, Reference 548 Land to build 5 to 13 homes to the rear of 5 to 13 Honeysuckle Gardens This entails loss of green space, changing the character of the area and local road infrastructure unable to cope. | Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan. |
| 3101/01/002/DM43.4/O Mrs B McLean | DM43.4 541 It is of great shock to me that this is threatened and I hope that this can be lifted. | Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan. |
| 3102/02/005/DM43.4/O Mr Richard Horton | DM43.4 541 I wish to log my objection to the borough-wide planned changes Croydon Council are proposing to make in their Local Plans for 2016-2036. These proposals are 750 new homes in Shirley Oaks and 35 new homes on the Shrublands Estate. Also the proposed work to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Combe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Coombe Road. | Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan. |
| 3109/01/005/DM43.4/O Mr Dominic Quinn A3 Architecture London LTD | DM43.4 541 Object to the de-designation of MOL around Shirley Oaks Village as it will change the character of the area. If they are not MOL they should at least be Local Open Land. Building Houses on them would lead to the loss of a vital green corridor and set a precedent | Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan. |
Object | DM43.4 641
--- | ---
I am writing to lodge my objection to some of the proposals contained in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals.

In particular:
1. **Shirley Oaks**
   - The proposal to re-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on Shirley Oaks Road and around Shirley Oaks Village so that it can be used for new housing (page 68, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals).
   - My main objections are:
     - This would result in the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area.
     - The local road network could not cope with the additional traffic.
     - Insufficient local infrastructure to cope with the increased population.

**Conclusion**
The proposals I have highlighted can only be viewed as negative. If adopted, they will increase the local population - and the density of that population - without providing any supporting infrastructure. The new residents from the planned apartment blocks and traveller sites will need additional public services such as schools, medical services and shops. Older residents will give way to young families who require greater social support, yet no additional resources are identified to help manage the changing demographic. Traffic congestion along already busy roads will increase, as will pollution and accident black-spots. The few remaining green spaces will disappear. Overall, the proposals signal a reduction in the quality of life for both the existing residents and the newcomer.

| Change | As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan. |

---

3113/01/005/DM43.4/O | Mr Stuart Beaton
02 September 2016 | Page 2535 of 4384
Carolyn Heath

Object

DM43.4

541

I am writing to object to:
1. The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:
   - Coombe Lodge Nurseries (site ref 661)
   - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road (site ref 502)
   - Poppy Lane (site ref 128)
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station (site ref 504)
   - Shirley Oaks Road/Beech House (site ref 541)
   - Shirley Oaks Road (site ref 542)
   - Honeysuckle Gardens (site ref 548)
   - Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Cottage (site ref 755)
All areas provide vital green space in already densely populated areas, and there is insufficient infrastructure to cope with the additional traffic/population. Some of these areas are in the Green Belt, others are in Metropolitan Open Land. They would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become “white land” (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Clive Smith

Object

DM43.4

541

6 marigold way cotlyty objects to the planning proposals which are being planned for shirley oak village, this land rightfully belongs to the residents, leave our green areas alone.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become “white land” (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr David Harwood

Object

DM43.4

541

(1) I object to residential development at the following sites & to the policy of de-designate of metropolitan open land at the following
   Land at the east of Shirley Oaks Road reference no 541

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become “white land” (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr Graeme Monk

Object

DM43.4

I have read some of the planning proposals for Croydon, and I fear that some would seem to be poorly thought through. Any development around the Shirley Road area would need major road development also, which, in a major residential area would be catastrophic. Shirley Road has serious traffic congestion in both directions from the Lower Addiscombe Road to the Wickham Road; Addiscombe Road has congestion in both directions from Croydon; the Lower Addiscombe is congested from Croydon & towards Beckenham. If you add the number of houses in the green areas which you are proposing, we will have total gridlock. To think that these new developments will not own cars is living in a dream world. Buses will be in no better position to get through as there is no space for bus lanes. There are more suitable areas in Croydon for necessary housing which will cause less chaos for current residents, and a more pleasant environment for new residents.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr Jim Cowan

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

I have read Gavin Barwell’s assessment of policies and proposals in the Croydon Local Plan and totally agree that if implemented would destroy the character of Shirley. The infrastructure in Shirley is already stretched to the limit and can not withstand any further burdens.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Sonya Millen

Object

DM43.4

I am also objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr Stan Minter

I have major concerns over the planned development of the Shirley Area. This is currently one of the nicest areas of Croydon and you plan to swamp it with a number of housing developments and some travellers sites. This will be very detrimental to the whole area.

I understand that nationally we need to have more accommodation for families. We need to achieve this with ought destroying the whole fabric of our society. This scale of development will transform the whole area into a old fashioned “Estate”.

There are not sufficient services in the wider area to support such an influx of families.

The road infrastructure already struggles at time and these developments will make the whole situation much worse.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr Stan Minter

I have major concerns over the planned development of the Shirley Area. This is currently one of the nicest areas of Croydon and you plan to swamp it with a number of housing developments and some travellers sites. This will be very detrimental to the whole area.

I understand that nationally we need to have more accommodation for families. We need to achieve this with ought destroying the whole fabric of our society. This scale of development will transform the whole area into a old fashioned “Estate”.

There are not sufficient services in the wider area to support such an influx of families.

The road infrastructure already struggles at time and these developments will make the whole situation much worse.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr Steve Hopkins

As a resident of Shirley Oaks from Day one, I totally oppose any new buildings to be approved or built on my private estate.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr Stephen Smith

Object

DM43.4
541

I am writing to object to re-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and the intention to build on open sites at Poppy Lane (ref 128), Primrose Lane (ref 504), Shirley Oaks Road (refs 541 + 542) and Honeysuckle Gardens (ref 548).

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr Steve White

ASPRA

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4
541

I am therefore writing to formally object to:

1. de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;

2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   - land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   - land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
   - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?
3218/01/001/DM43.4/O Shirley Beddoes

Object DM43.4 541

We bought our property at the original building phase in Shirley Oaks many years ago and were informed that there would be no further development in this area and that all grassed areas were to remain undeveloped and were for the use of residents and local people at leisure, further to this we have paid yearly a maintenance cost to ensure these areas were up kept for this use. This is the main reason we invested in this property. The grassed areas are in constant use and development of these areas would change the natural village atmosphere that exists here and is one of the few areas of Croydon that there is an abundance of wildlife close to an urban area. The proposed development and designation of our grass areas is unacceptable and would infringe our rights as in our original contracts with Heron homes who built the site.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

3219/01/002/DM43.4/O Mr & Mrs Nair

Object DM43.4 541

I write further to the recent proposals to develop on our green areas.

I have been a resident for over 30yrs and strongly oppose these changes.

Roads will be congested and property values will decline should these go ahead.

This land is private and belongs solely to residents who have been paying maintenance charges for the upkeep of the area.

I object to the new build on this land which will turn our quiet and safe community into an overpopulated area.

Please reconsider these proposals as none of the residents are in support of this.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

3235/01/006/DM43.4/O Mr Peter Kenny

Object DM43.4 541

I am writing to object to The use of the following sites for housing: Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128 Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane Reference number 504 Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541 Land to the West is Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548

If the council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should be at least designated as Local Green Spaces.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr Matthew Carey
Object DM43.4 S41

The area of Shirley Oaks Village and it's adjacent road infrastructure is already at breaking point. Any slight build up of traffic seriously hinders movement for residents. The 2 main arterial routes into Croydon or towards Bromley (being wickham road & lower addiscombe road) are extremely busy with traffic and often lead to extended journey times for those of us who wish to head in to one of these town centres or further afield in to London for work. As proven only yesterday when a traffic accident in the Shirley area led to a 3 hour journey home from bromley back to Shirley. The road network around here is poor. The interlink between Shirley Oaks village and its surrounding area is poor. To add hundreds of houses within this area will only lead to increased volume of traffic on the surrounding roads and leave Shirley itself in an almost permament state of gridlock. Shirley Oaks Road is always busy with vehicles parked up. This is due to a number of reasons; The excessive traffic on wickham road leading to people abandoning their vehicles to try and walk nearer to Croydon to catch a tram or bus. The unreliable 367 bus route which is often hindered by traffic or accidents outside of Shirley Oaks Village leading to people driving closer to other bus routes. The use of the local synagogue. Combine these issues above with the additional housing being proposed and the vehicles that come with them, Shirley Oaks will become even cut off than it already is. There are many elderly residents in this area that rely on carers (friends etc) being able to visit them. They often complain about the issues I have raised above and I can only see this getting worse should the proposals for Shirley go ahead. Croydon is a massive borough so there must be other areas that these proposals could be met.

Mr Terrence McCarthy
Object DM43.4 S41

I object to the use of the site for housing. If the Council will not it as Metropolitan Open Land, it should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on it would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.
Object 3278/01/002/DM43.4/O Tracey Lewin

It has been brought to my attention that there are proposals for new houses to be built on the green space behind my house in Shirley Oaks. Whilst I understand the need for new housing surely this can be built in brownfield spaces. I chose to live in my house because of the green area behind my garden, we are not overlooked at all and have the trees and wildlife. I do not wish to be overlooked and have the added noise, this will have a direct input into the value of my property or are you going to compensate for the loss of value to my house? It will increase the traffic in the area and we already struggle with traffic jams in the rush hours! It is a struggle to get children into local schools now and the strain on the local Dr's surgeries are also apparent. I am strongly opposed to these proposals and would like to be kept informed of what is going on.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object 3279/01/005/DM43.4/O Terry Lewin

I object to the use of the site for housing.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
To help you identify my specific objections, the five proposals mentioned so far and to which I wish to object as being detrimental to the character of the area are:

- the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 128);
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 504);
- land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 541);
- land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542); and
- land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548).

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3354/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Dr Bob Wenn</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3355/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr John Mullis</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3356/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Rishi Gohill</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change Summary:
- Dr Bob Wenn: Object to the site for use for housing.
- Mr John Mullis: In response to your notices for the development of the greenfield sites on Shirley Oaks Village and the intention to change the status of this land, I make the following observations: In 1985 Croydon Council designated land within Shirley Oaks Village as "Amenity Open Land" because our gardens were small due to the layout and construction of the area by Heron Homes. This amenity land is owned collectively by the property owners who own 1 share each. The shares are held by the current trust company - First Port, who also maintain this estate. Is compulsory purchase envisaged? If a total of some 700 homes the village would need vast changes to its infrastructure to accommodate these properties. The present main road - Primrose Lane/Shirley Oaks Road is barely able to cope now - with just a single decker bus affored to a growing number of cars. There is a regular flooding problem during heavy downpours - particularly from Primrose Lane into Laburnum Gardens. The loss of a wildlife conservation area is surely against wider interests including many present owners. |
- Mr Rishi Gohill: Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic. If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. |
3358/01/004/DM43.4/O Joy Harris
Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 S41
Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic. If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.
Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

3369/01/001/DM43.4/O Mr Anthony Ryder
Object DM43.4 S41
Regarding the proposal to build around Shirley Oaks Rd. I wish to register my disapproval and hope the land will remain Open Land.
Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

3370/01/004/DM43.4/O Claire Rutland
Object DM43.4 S41
As a shareholder of the open space in Shirley Oaks I would like to object to the proposals made in Policy Map 43.
One of the reasons I bought the property was for the nice open spaces that surround the houses.
Building unnecessarily on this land will change the whole look and feel of the community of Shirley Oaks Village. We have one road in and out of the village and cramping in 700+ homes onto our lovely open space will also create congestion on the one road.
Shirley Oaks is privately owned and we take pride in our village and how it looks and will fight against these proposals.
Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

3371/01/003/DM43.4/O Claire Corper
Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 S41
To who this may concern
Ref.541
Ref.542
Ref.548
Ref.128
Ref.504
I strongly object to these plans as a resident of hazel close I am a shareholder of Shirley Oaks management and feel strongly that the land be left as it is as we have very small gardens and pay for these open land areas to be kept and maintained for our use and enjoyment. Also these plans especially the ref 504 will devalue my property immensely and will downgrade the area dramatically.
Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
One of the requirements of the Pitt review of 2007 was for the Environment Agency to provide some warning for surface water flooding, as was already the practise for river and coastal flooding. The result was the LIDAR returns which are provided on the Environment Agency’s website under ‘what’s in my backyard’. This shows clearly how the lie of the land amongst the Shirley Oaks Estate causes surface water to run from South to North joining another stream which runs in from the SW from Shirley Road into Primrose Lane. On numerous occasions over recent wet winters we have had a constant stream of water running across the kerb into Primrose Lane which has on occasion caused substantial amounts of ice to form. No doubt your winter maintenance department could confirm this is an area where they have to regularly do spot treatments of rock salt-since they do Primrose lane as it is a bus route, when other parts of the network are totally dry and do not require treatment.

From the Pitt Review of 2007, RECOMMENDATION 7: There should be a presumption against building in high flood risk areas, in accordance with PPS25, including giving consideration to all sources of flood risk, and ensuring that developers make a full contribution to the costs both of building and maintaining any necessary defences. Section 5.14 of the report reiterates that PPS25 applies to all sources of flood risk. This states that an SFRA (surface flooding risk assessment) should assess surface water flood risk and identify critical drainage areas. Good information is therefore needed from sewerage undertakers and other sources, including local knowledge, historic flooding and risk modelling. Local authorities should ensure that SFRAs carried out on their behalf adequately address this type of flooding. I find it difficult to believe this has been done as otherwise there would have never been a suggestion of using the remaining green parts of the estate in this way.

Any increase in the built up area around the estate would thus exacerbate the already on occasion saturated surface. Having investigated in detail the benefits in the reduction of flooding by the provision of trees, I have found that Oak trees can use up to 50 gallons a day and some trees on a hot day will utilise 150-200 gallons (wiki-answers.com). Trees admittedly are most effective when we are in the Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
growing season at excess water removal, but that is also when we tend to have the most extreme rainfall events. Having looked at ‘Heavy falls in a day’ and ‘Heavy falls in short Periods’ both produced in part for British Rainfall by the Met Office (my employer), I have found that invariably the most extreme rainfall happens in SE England between June and September. This is just when a tree is in full leaf so not only intercepts falling rain by the size of its canopy, but also as it is growing, that rain which reaches the soil is quickly extracted for use in the tree’s transpiration. Preliminary research results from the University of Manchester indicate that trees can reduce runoff by as much as 80% compared to asphalt. Thus the best way to alleviate summer extreme rainfall surface water flooding is not to remove trees.

The soil on which Shirley Oaks is located is of a clay type and is therefore impervious: another reason why it reacts to surface water flooding the way it does. The large area of grassland is ideal for ‘making room for water’ as a water storage area, thus to remove this pooling facility will mean the rain will have to find somewhere else to go, which would inevitably mean flooding for Shirley Oaks residents. Also I have learned, from Meteorological Office memorandum No 80-the properties of soils in NW Europe, that the root system of grassland provides a channel through which some rainfall does manage to slowly percolate through beneath the surface even with clay soils. However, without the grassland root system the water just tends to form bodies of water lying on the surface. This effect of our grassland is very helpful in alleviating the surface water flooding in winter, which occurs when prolonged rainfall totally saturates the area, and the trees are no longer as effective at its removal.

So in conclusion
- We need trees to mitigate effects of extreme rainfall in summer, something which will become increasingly frequent with global warming
- We need open grassland for water to accumulate in winter when trees are less effective at water removal from the system, whilst in addition their root systems help to aid percolation beneath the soil reducing surface flooding. Over the last 40 years winter rainfall has been increasing throughout the UK.
- Soil behaviours also dictate risk of flooding. We have issues because:
1) We are on a clay soil type so low permeability and heavy rain does not soak in but floods. 
2) We are on sloping ground with tendency for run off to flow south to north across the site. 
3) We, also because of having a clay soil, have a high water table, so in winter many areas of the site are wet and all parts stay damp throughout. Thus waterlogging very quickly occurs and there would with the proposed building work be less and less places for the water to flow to.

3377/01/002/DM43.4/O Mr Stuart Day

Object DM43.4 541

I am writing to you to object to the councils planned proposals Ref:541 Ref:542 Ref:548 Ref:128 Ref:504

I moved to the area with the understanding that the grass areas had protection from being built upon and I strongly object to the council proposing the new developments as referenced above. This will make the area I live in with my family crowded and I bought my property with the understanding that the grass areas would not be built on.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
First, the Council plans to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village (page 68, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals). Metropolitan Open Land has the same protection from development as the Green Belt. The Council is proposing to remove this designation so that most of this land can be used for new housing. The draft Local Plan identifies five sites:

- the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 128);
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 504);
- land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 541);
- land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542); and
- land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548).

I will be objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I will also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

3381/01/006/DM43.4/O Mr Daniel James Object

DM43.4 S41

I am writing to object to the council’s proposition to allow the development at the following sites:- Ref: 541, 542, 548, 128 and 504 in Shirley Oaks Village.

I have only lived on Shirley Oaks for 5 years, but one of the things I love the most is walking my children over to the grass areas so they can play. As you probably already know, our gardens are quite small so it’s really nice to have space to take full advantage of. Another thing that disappoints me, is that one of the selling points of our house, is the fact that all the land around the estate is protected from building on. I strongly disagree with any of your plans to build upon this land, and along with other Shirley Oaks residents will do my best to get our voices heard.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

3391/01/003/DM43.4/O Ms Aileen Deeney Object

DM43.4 S41

As a resident of Shirley Oaks Village, I wish to register my objection to the above proposals to allow the development of new homes on the designated Amenity Open Land which is available for my use and that of my fellow residents. This use was allowed by Croydon Council because of the undersized gardens which is a negative feature of the current development and which hinders enjoyment and comfort of my property. For example, it is not possible for children to play with footballs/other toys/play noisily without disturbing the adjoining and physically very close neighbours. You are no doubt aware that there are no nearby children’s parks. Also my garden can easily be overlooked by at least 4 sets of neighbours and which I believe is typical of the other gardens on the development. Having the Amenity Open Land available is some compensation for the above lack of privacy and if it was to be withdrawn it would have a detrimental impact on

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr Alan Heathcote

This is to object strongly to your ill-conceived proposals for high density dwellings on greenbelt parkland, on existing semi-detached housing areas, and gardens in the Shirley Oaks / Library region. Also for travellers sites in the vicinity of Coombe farm. All as outlined in Gavin Barwell's email.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Ms A Pavon-Lopez

I object to the use of the site for housing.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr & Mrs Cyril Nazareth

As a resident of Croydon Borough and in particular Shirley Oaks, I am contacting you to voice my objection to the following development proposals: Ref 541 Shirley Oaks Road East Side

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr Chris McInerney

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I would like to object to the following Metropolitan open land proposals -
Poppy Lane - Ref 128 -Stroud Green Pumping Station - Ref 504 -Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House - ref 541 -Land to the west of Shirley Road ref 542 -Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens ref 548. The Metropolitan land provide several links in the Shirley Garden Chain.
Under the Planning Policy Guidance Note 9 the importance of nature conservation is stressed. This combined with the extra traffic seems unacceptable. Three of the proposed sites are owned by the residents of Shirley Oaks Village of which my house backs onto. We have several friends that live there all of which have raised the problems regarding such a development.
The three areas are:
- Ref 541 - land east of Shirley Oaks Road
- Ref 542 - land west of Shirley Oaks Road
- Ref 548 - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr Daniel Nuthall

Object

DM43.4

541

Site 541, Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Verdayne Avenue and Firby Avenue.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr Donald Speakman

Change

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

541
Mr David Wilson

Object DM43.4 541

We wish to object in the strongest terms to the plans being discussed regarding the proposed development of land for new housing in the Shirley area, specifically the building of Gypsy/Traveller sites on our doorstep, and the inherent increase in crime and anti-social behaviour that always follows, and can be seen in many examples nationally. Not only this, but the whole ‘Village’ feel of the area will be completely obliterated, and the very things that attracted us to move to Shirley (off Orchard Ave) will be no more. Of course people need a place to live and raise families, but time and again we have seen the resultant decline of neighbourhoods, with rubbish, noise and theft frequent occurrences. We urge you to think again and take heed of Gavin Barwell’s very real concerns, and those of what I’m sure are many of his constituents, and other Shirley dwellers. We are particularly concerned that you should take into account the fears of ordinary hard working people like us, who want to enjoy life (we’re not ‘oldies’) in a pleasant community, and think again about the following proposals:

- land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 541).

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr D Lane

Object DM43.4 541

I object to the use of Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
3445/01/004/DM43.4/O Mr E King OBE

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 541

Object to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

3449/01/006/DM43.4/O Mrs E Thomas

Object: DM43.4 541

I wish to log my objection to the borough-wide planned changes Croydon Council are proposing to make in their Local Plans for 2016-2036. These proposals are 750 new homes in Shirley Oaks and 35 new homes on the Shrublands Estate. Also the proposed work to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Coombe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Coombe Road.

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

3453/01/004/DM43.4/O Mr & Mrs Proctor

Object: DM43.4 541

We are writing to object most strongly to the Croydon Council's Local Plan for housing on Green Belt land, with particular reference to Shirley.

Our Green Belt should be protected at all costs and brown field sites must be targetted. In this respect, we support our MP Gavin Barwell's objections, which you will doubtless have received.

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

3461/01/005/DM43.4/O Mr F Kurum

Object: DM43.4 541

I am writing to object to the use of the following five sites for housing:
- land at poppy lane (128)
- Stroud Green pumping station, 140 Primrose Lane (504)
- land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House (541)
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks road (542)
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens (938)

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Space.

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3464/01/001/DM43.4/O Frances Pickering</td>
<td>I would like to oppose the redevelopment of Shirley Oaks Village most strongly. We brought our property 8 years ago and were told that no further building would happen as our property runs along the side of one of your proposed sights. My understanding was that we paid a quarterly maintenance for the upkeep of our surrounding therefore making us shareholders of the estate. Nobody to date has said anything to us as shareholders except the posters on lampposts a couple of years ago we had to pay extra to keep gypsies out of our village. Now you are proposing to invite them to come and live with us. Croydon is not a nice place to live and the only escape we have is our home and now you want to take that away from us. The development would have a fast impact on the schooling, utility’s, hospital etc in the area. Where and when will this all stop? We pay our rates are law abiding citizens and feel all you are interested in is destroying all we have worked hard for.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3465/01/006/DM43.4/O Mr & Mrs Hobbs | I am writing to you to object to the use of the following sites for housing development.  
• The land at Poppy Lane. Ref. No. 128  
• Strudwick Green Pumping Station. Ref. No. 504  
• Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and rear of Beech and Ash House. Ref no. 541  
• Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road. Ref no. 542  
• Land to rear of part of Honey Suckle Gardens. Ref no. 548 | As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan. |
| 3473/01/002/DM43.4/O Mr Dave Brown | I object to these proposals to build on the land ref 541. The land should be left as it is. | As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan. |
I wish to lodge a serious objection to the proposals for the building of houses on Shirley Oaks Village. That name speaks for itself. I have lived on Shirley Oaks Village for 30 years and during that time have paid the management company a contribution to maintain the amenity open land. The residents each own a share of the land and over the years the open areas have been enjoyed by families for games walking and enjoying the lovely trees not to mention the wildlife. When the land was sold by Lambeth in 1984 the intention was to create a village! Has any thought been given to the effect on the infrastructure by adding 751 properties? the pressures on the roads in particular.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
The proposal to build new houses in Shirley Oaks Road does not fall within the Strategic Objectives because:

Objective 2: This development will not Foster an environment where existing enterprise can prosper, but will reduce enterprise.

Objective 4: This development will not reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation. It will not reduce unemployment, improve skills and education and improve environmental conditions, the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Objective 5: This development is not of high quality and will not enhance the borough’s natural environment but will reduce the natural environment by turning a green area into housing.

Objective 7: This development will reduce the area as a safe, healthy and cohesive community but making the area overcrowded with residential property.

Objective 10: This development will reduce the quality and accessibility of green space and nature. This development will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The development will change the outlook and community within the South Croydon area and future generation will suffer because of this. This proposed development of new housing in Shirley Oak Road is not within keeping with the current development within this area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with housing in the area. Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area and is not in keeping with the surrounding area. Building a traveller site will increase noise levels and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area. Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. This development would diminish the area of green fields and recreational land within the area.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission Draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Object DM43.4 541

Re the above proposals with Ref nos 541, 542, 548, 504, and 128 I wish to object in the possible strongest sense. This land was not designated for this use and hence our homes all have very small gardens to protect this open space. We already have problems with the road through the estate and it cannot possibly take any more traffic. The allowed parking on this road particularly on the curves gives cause for real concern. I have avoided two accidents only by making an emergency stop. If the council goes ahead with these proposals then we will fight and please note we are depending on support from local councillors and our MP. Think again please

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object DM43.4 541

I am writing to object to the plans to build gypsy/traveller sites in the area of Shirley and the building of anything on any area of green belt land, green spaces or back gardens

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object DM43.4 541

I wish to object strongly to the proposed developments at Shirley Oaks - Ref 541. Shirley Oaks Road East side - 215 new homes

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object DM43.4 541

Please see this email as my objection to the proposed housing. This is ridiculous. The village is small and the road going through the village would NOT suffice the extra traffic! I pay a maintenance charge and moved here as it is a quiet location. I have been burgled a couple years back due I believe to the travellers that squatted on the land here and I do not want that fear again. Please rethink this crazy idea and let me know how I can further stop this.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr Gary Smithers

Object DM43.4 541

The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 541

I have friends who live in Shirley Oaks Village and I know them and myself along with many others all object to the proposals to build on the green areas. This grass area is used by many and would totally change the area if built on and we don't want it. Part of the charm of this area is those green areas and it has something that you don't find often in Croydon so please let us keep the green areas as we all object to them being built on.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr Gary Kenney

Object DM43.4 541

I am writing to show that I object to a number of your plans around the Shirley area. I contest that you need to build on our green sites and bring in new 'traveler' sites into Shirley.

On top of this I cannot understand the need to bring 'medium' high rise buildings in and around Shirley, including Devonshire way and the new proposals around Hartland way.

Please can you let me know if my objection has been noted and how I can make it more official?

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr John Albert

Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 541

As a long term resident and shareholder residing in Shirley Oaks Village, I and my partner object to the proposals to Changes to the Policy Map 43 - REFs 541, 542, 548, 128 & 504

These areas have metropolitan open land and had protection from being built on!

Our land was designated by Croydon Council in 1985, as Amenity Open Land because of our under sized gardens and transferred to the management company whom we our shareholders of and this land is for our use and want it to stay this way!

Having lived here for 20 years we do not want it further condensed by more homes and totally not fit for purpose!

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Object 3508/01/006/DM43.4/O Jennifer Worstall

I object to proposals to destroy open green spaces in Shirley Village. The Council wants to take away the status of Metropolitan Open Land for some of these green spaces, to make them easier to build on. What is the necessity or precedent for this? If all the open spaces in Shirley Village are to be built over with blocks of flats, the character of the area (green spaces with 2/3 storey houses/flats) will be changed forever. There is potentially a problem with drainage too as the open green spaces absorb much of the heavy rainfall we experience now. The local roads in this development as it is now, are far too small to cope with the increase there would be in traffic.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object 3510/01/002/DM43.4/O Katrina Neal

As a long term resident of Shirley/West Wickham and one who has seen many changes over the years, I am strongly objecting to Land east of Shirley Oak Road (rear of Beech House) ref 541 for housing use. If these are not kept as MOL then at least keep them as Local Green Spaces.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object 3511/01/006/DM43.4/O Jenny Hayden

The proposals for Shirley will have a huge impact on the area, the current infrastructure is already at bursting point and the building of new homes on green spaces will add further stress to the current situation. Ref nos, 128,504,541,542, 548... these relate to the building of additional homes. From the information available in the Council's documentation, this could be up to 800 new homes. I would like to know what sort of homes these are likely to be... social, housing associations or private... I doubt that any of them would be affordable homes for first time buyers. How will the local roads cope with the extra traffic. There will be a need for more schools, doctors' surgeries etc to support the intended increase to the local population. I would therefore like to object to the Council's decision to use these five sites for future residential development. Apart from putting extra burden on the local roads, it would also mean losing valuable green spaces. I believe any new residential development should be on brownfield sites. The addition of so many extra homes would have an adverse affect on the character of Shirley, in my opinion.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhodri Flower</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I write with reference to your document 'Changes to the Policies Map (Policy DM43)'; and in specific reference to sites 541, 542, 548, 128 and 504. These sites are all open space surrounding the development known as Shirley Oaks Village. I wish to object to the proposals to re-classify the land and make it eligible for planning permission and the building of homes. In my opinion it is essential to preserve the open space for the use of local residents. It is well used for recreation, dog walking etc. It is also an important part of the character of Shirley Oaks Village and would change the nature of that development. I bought a house on Primrose Lane in June 2015 and a large factor in my decision to buy was the amount of open space available locally. I understand that Croydon Council designated this land as 'Amenity Open Land' in 1985 because of under-sized gardens in Shirley Oaks Village and transferred it to the Shirley Oaks Management Company, which has maintained it ever since. As a house owner I am a shareholder in that company. I strongly object to your proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM43.4 541</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Sims</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>As a local affected resident, I am registering my comments and objections to the proposals as documented in the Croydon Local Plans CLP1.1 and CLP2 4 Proposed Policy DM43 De-designation of Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village. I object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in the vicinity of Shirley Oaks Road and Shirley Oaks Village. The land should be at least designated as Local Green Space, for its protection from development. This open space provides a green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, and should be retained in its present form. Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the local schools are over-subscribed as well as the already-stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM43.4 541</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms Geraldine Pyatt

Object

DM43.4

I am writing to object to the Council's proposals to allow the land in Shirley Oaks Village to be acceptable for development. The areas have been Metropolitan Open Land and had protection from being built upon. Our land was designated by the Council in 1985 as "Amenity Open Land" because of our under-sized gardens and transferred to the Management Company. Each property owner is a shareholder in the Management Company and we pay towards the upkeep and maintenance of the land. I object to the Council's proposal to change the title of the land in order to proceed with development plans. This is Our land and for our use.

When I bought my house I paid a higher price because of the sought after location and the appeal of the well kept green areas and the privacy of the land in my area. I feel that by allowing development of so many more houses on our land, it is going to affect house prices and my house will loose value. Roads will be congested and property values will decrease and much more. I am concerned how so many houses can be justified and how additional parking on dangerous bends will affect the bus route, extra traffic and especially emergency vehicles and therefore I object to the Council's plans of development.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

The policy relating to Shirley should not be read in isolation. It should be read in conjunction with other policies contained within the Local Plan such as but not limited to policies in the Transport and Communication section of the plan.

Matters relating to the house valuations are not matters that can be considered through the Local Plan process.
I refer to the proposed changes to the planning policies to allow Croydon Council to build new homes on the Amenity Open Land at the above. The Amenity Open Land was granted in part, due to the extremely small rear gardens. Also I and other people in the village for many years here contributed to its upkeep at no cost to Croydon Council. To lose this land will greatly impact on the peaceful enjoyment that I and my neighbours have in using this land as well as the general impact on the area of high density building, changing the character of our village forever.

No doubt this development will result in many trees and flowers being sacrificed which help to sustain the urban wildlife such as various birds, bats, foxes, badgers and bees etc. There seems to be little consideration for this urban oasis!

Whilst I understand central government’s drive for more houses, I find it hard to believe that Croydon Council needs this land in order to fill its housing quota, given the Westfield and other developments proposed in Croydon. There are also other lands, such as those owned by the local NHS hospital that would be suitable for development and at the same time give ready money to the NHS.

Furthermore, the existing main roads are already inadequate to service the village without adding a further 751 homes along with the years of road works that will be associated with upgrading the utilities, make traveling through the village more difficult and dangerous.

I urge you to reconsider your plans.
Kindly note that as a homeowner (and shareholder) of Shirley Oaks Village, resident here for over 25 years, I am deeply concerned that Croydon Council seems to think it has the right to change the nature of the estate from being protected Metropolitan land to being unprotected land ripe for excessive building. Not only is the green space around the current estate, a much loved feature, it also provides a sanctuary for wildlife and allows for nice walks for local people. The road was built to be narrow and already there are problems with passing places for traffic to the hospital and synagogue. Last year the council allowed a resident to build a fence which obstructs drivers’ vision when turning out of Cornflower Lane and has caused several minor incidents. Simply put, the roads here were not built for traffic! The idea of ruining my neighbourhood by cramming more housing onto unsuitable roads, lacking shops and facilities whilst depriving me of the green spaces I love and part own makes me sick to my stomach. There are so many brownfield sites that could be built on and provide more suitable housing in and around Croydon that I feel that this attack on Shirley is politically motivated. I formally ask the council to re-consider the proposals.

I am writing to object to:
3. The use of the following 5 sites for housing:
   • Land at Poppy Lane: reference number 128;
   • Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane: reference number 504;
   • Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House; reference number 541;
   • Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road; reference number 542; and
   • Land to the rear of 5 – 13 Honeysuckle Gardens; reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these 5 sites should at least be designated as local green spaces.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Objection</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3550/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Kalpana Patel</td>
<td>We have got objection for above proposal. We are not happy, it would cause lots of traffic and not ideal for residents.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3556/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Karen Warwick</td>
<td>I would like to raise my objection to the proposed land changes for the following references: Ref. 541 - Shirley Oaks road east side - up to 215 new homes. The land was designated by Croydon council in 1985 as &quot;Amenity Open Land&quot;, because of our under-sized gardens and transferred to the Management Company - with each property owner as a shareholder in that company. As for looking at a Gypsy site, you should have seen what a mess they made when they camped illegally at Shirley Oaks just over a year ago - it was disgusting!</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3566/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Maureen Wilcox</td>
<td>Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic. If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Object Description</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Mr Mike Jones Object DM43.4 541 The de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village in particular such as the use of the following for housing: land at Poppy Lane Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. There is a lot of history around here and the loss of the Shirley Lodge in the late 1990s was a big mistake. Generally in Croydon there is no room for more traffic that new building will generate and judging from what I have seen around Croydon squeezed housing units with small garages not fit to store cars and little or no street parking will only add to stress and problems in the future.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Mr Peter Newsham Object DM43.4 541 I wish to register my objection in the strongest possible terms to the proposal for new housing, (ref. 541,), in these areas of Metropolitan Open Land, which is essential for recreational purposes in an already overcrowded place, is unacceptable and the proposed re-designation of the land so that it can be used for high-density urban development will find no local support, but instead, a huge and vocal opposition.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Michael Hewish

Object

DM43.4

541

Please see my objections to your proposals as detailed below.

DM43

Ref 541 Land east of Shirley Oaks Road

Ref 542 Land west of Shirley Oaks Road

Ref 548 Land to rear Honeysuckle Gardens

These areas of Metropolitan Open Land are not “incidental open spaces” or “Grassland with a few detached houses” as your report states. These areas were designated by Croydon Council as residents “Amenity Open Spaces” under a section 52 agreement on the 4th December 1985. This was to ensure that the residents were provided with adequate open space following a dispute between the Council and Heron Homes, the developer. These areas were then handed over to the Shirley Oaks Management Limited, a company with the property owners as shareholders.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Feb 28, 2016

Mr Michael Hewish

Object

DM43.4

541

I wish to make the following comments in relation to land east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, Shirley Oaks Road, reference number 541 (Site). The Site is owned by Shirley Oaks Management Limited (Company). There are over 400 shareholders of which I am one. The Site is presently protected by the designation of the Metropolitan Open Land. Separate objections have been made in relation to the proposal to de-designate this land as MOL. Those objections are repeated for the purpose of this representation. The designation as MOL should remain if the decision to re-designate this land as MOL proceeds. If the decision to de-designate proceeds, the Site should be designated as Local Green Space. The proposed development of the Site in the event that the present designation remains or that re-designation takes place as Local Green Space would not be consistent with national policy under the NPPF and such a proposal would be incompatible. The proposed approach is not appropriate nor would it enable sustainable development for the reasons set out above and those identified in respect to the objection to Policy SP7. The highway network is already at saturation point and in any event any proposed residential development would generate an unacceptable amount of traffic. The site also has a high water table.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr Nick Barnes Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 541

Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up to four storeys along Wickham Road.

None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.

Mrs Margaret Hawkins Object DM43.4 541

Refer 541 - Land East of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House.

I am objecting to the proposal for de-designation of this area as Metropolitan Open Land, with a view to “working with the landowner” to bring development of up to 215 houses forward. It is a vital part of the green chain and wildlife corridor through Shirley. This can clearly be seen by viewing Google satellite photos of the area. There are mature trees on this land which would be damaged by digging near the roots, as well as woodland, hedgerow and meadow habitats. Badgers, woodpeckers, jays, goldfinches and a huge variety of insects live in this area. This land is used as a local amenity by many local people, not just residents of Shirley Oaks. The land is jointly owned by 500 equal share-holders, which would make “working with the landowner” a complex issue. The council would be unlikely to get the co-operation of all 500 shareholders. Development of this area would put extra stress on the road junction between Shirley Oaks Road and the A232 Wickham Road. Traffic in this area is already extremely slow at peak times.

Cllr J Cummings Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 541

Site 541, Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House. Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes. This site should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would totally change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Verdayne Avenue and Firsby Avenue.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>541</th>
<th>Proposal Details</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3702/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms J Fasham</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>I object to the Councils proposal to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land of Shirley Oaks Road and Shirley Oaks Village as the local infrastructure could not cope.</td>
<td>Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3704/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs J Horton</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>I wish to log my objection to the borough-wide planned changes Croydon Council are proposing to make in their Local Plans for 2016-2036. These proposals are 750 new homes in Shirley Oaks and 35 new homes on the Shrublands Estate. Also the proposed work to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Coombe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Coombe Road.</td>
<td>Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3713/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms J Stokes</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>I object to the proposals to completely change Shirley Oaks Road which is a green lung for that part of the Borough. The amount of car ownership will rise significantly as the bus service is infrequent. The traffic will dog up the Wickham Road even more than now. St John’s school has already plans for more classrooms and the intake will rise in all the local schools. Also pulling down established houses and putting up more flats is detrimental to the character of the area. We had a once in a lifetime chance to improve the look of Croydon, on a human scale. Instead of which we are building hideous tower blocks, while in other parts of the country they are pulling them down. Nobody should have to raise a family in a block 44 stories high. They will eventually become the slums of the future.</td>
<td>Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3715/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Jenny Tighe</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>Development of these sites will have a negative impact on the local area by changing the character of Shirley, and well as being a loss of green space, wildlife habitat and a vital green corridor</td>
<td>Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3723/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs J Middleton</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>I object to the site for use for housing.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3726/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Miss Amanda Smithers</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 541. My partner is a resident of Betony close Shirley oaks village and we definitely do not want the surrounding areas to be built on.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3733/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms Jennifer Addis</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>I strongly object to the development proposals by the council for the above areas on Shirley Oaks Village. All the gardens on our houses are tiny so this green land which was designated as ‘Amenity Open Land’ was supposed to be for the use of the residents. There are enough houses on this area already! This will have a huge detrimental effect on all the residents in the area.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3735/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Tim Duce</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>I strongly object to any plan to build on Metropolitan Open Land. There are plenty of brown field sites available in Croyton and the MOL should be re-designated as Local Green Space.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3737/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr J Patel</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>I am writing to record my objection to various planning as follows. Your Ref No 128, 504, 541, 542, 548 and 938. I don’t think it will be good for the area.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic. If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr J Menhinnitt  
Object  
DM43.4  
541  

I live in Verdayne Avenue, on the odd side, and objecting to these plans sounds like simple "NIMBY ism" but, literally this development is in my back garden. With this development what little is left of the "green" character of Shirley will lost under a wave of concrete. Surely all the "brown field" sites should be identified and developed first. When the Shirley Oaks estate was first built the fact that the houses had small gardens was compensated by the greenery of the area around them, that "compensation" is now going to disappear. The plans for the new homes seem to show that these buildings will be of greater density and crowding. On the plans there doesn't appear to be any infrastructure planned to go with the homes. The schools, in Shirley, are full, filled by children "bussed" in from other parts of the borough. Does this, then, mean the children from the new homes will have to catch buses out of Shirley to attend schools else where?  

Though the bus routes through Shirley are good most of the time there is chaos at school times especially in the afternoon as the schools empty and the pupils leave the area to go home. It would appear that the whole of the school population of Croydon will be moving every morning and evening. The transport system on the Wickham Road works at the moment but extra traffic, people and cars, would put it under considerable strain. The tram stops are not close enough to Shirley to help dissipate the human traffic. Will the roads around the area be widened, especially in the Shirley Oaks estate, to take extra vehicle traffic? At present the buses and refuse lorries have difficulty negotiating the narrow road. The same argument goes for doctors. Again the surgeries, in Shirley, are full at present, where in the plans are the provision for this new health centres? Are they suppose to attend the A&E department at "Mayday" hospital which even now has problems coping. There have been previous plans to build on the land but they have failed due to the unsuitability of the ground, high water table etc. These problems, I take it, have "gone" away?

Change  
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3769/01007/DM43.4/O</th>
<th>Mr K George</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 541</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am also concerned that you consider there is space for up to 751 houses in the Shirley Oaks Road area. References 128, 504, 541, 542, 548. This would lead to the elimination of green space in that area and therefore I think at least 3 of these areas should be Local Green Spaces if not Metropolitan open land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We have lived in the Borough of Croydon for 30 years and value its vibrancy and diversity.

As Croydon ratepayers we object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land generally, especially land detailed above, which will change forever Croydon’s character.

We would ask you to encourage policies/development to:

1. Build new housing on brown field sites by all means AND preserve invaluable green space for the benefit of the community of Croydon; 2. Protect green belt land and preserve the green corridors we desperately vital for wildlife and biodiversity; 3. Amend the tall buildings policy and keep the tall building zone where it is suited in the centre of town; 4. Utilise brownfield sites for new low-level housing only where it can be developed alongside new GP surgeries, schools and improved public transport; 5. Traveller sites are not appropriate in the green belt and is a clear breach Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. When travellers camped on Addington Playing Fields in 2012/13 they left rubbish, debris, waste, and deterioration to a local green space. Sadly true of most traveller sites.

"Nowadays people know the price of everything and the value of nothing”. Green Belt is vital and precious. Once lost for future generations and will not be replaced by developers.

We understand the need for housing, schools, hospitals and infrastructure. Are the Developers investing these also alongside their building investments?

Please protect our few remaining green spaces on the borough map, by making better use of brown field sites.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become "white land" (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3775/01005/DM43.4/O</th>
<th>Mr &amp; Mrs Barnes</th>
<th><strong>Object</strong></th>
<th>DM43.4 541</th>
<th><strong>We are objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council will not keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. We are also objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure could not cope with the additional traffic.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


I am writing this email to voice my deep concern about the planned development in the private estate that I have lived in for many years, namely:

- Ref 541, Ref 542, Ref 548, Ref 128 and Ref 504 – all on Shirley Oaks Village private estate.

Firstly, it would have been nice to be informed about any planning ideas in writing rather than see small notices pinned to lamp post around the estate. I would also like to draw your attention that our land was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as ‘Amenity Open Land’ for the residents and for which we pay a quarterly fee for maintenance of the green open land, but more importantly can I bring to your notice that this land was transferred to the Shirley Oaks Management Company, with each property owner as a shareholder in that company. This land is for our use and not for developing a concrete jungle on every single green inch of land in Croydon.

The Shirley Oaks estate has a great community spirit and has become a real sought after location for families to live due to the community nature and the lovely open land that we have, by developing on this land you will be taking away all of the good that has been built up over the years by the many residents we have as well as making the village overcrowded, bringing in more traffic thus resulting in more danger on the main Primrose Lane for people crossing and driving, congestion for parking and so on. I can also bring to your attention that we have already had a couple of fatalities on that main road that runs through the village and this will make it worse for the safety of our kids.

I am sure you have now had many hundreds of emails from residents like myself voicing the same concerns with your planning proposals!

This land belongs to us as residents so I feel its harsh to take this away and start your own developments.
3785/01/003/DM43.4/O Jenny Greenland

Object  DM43.4
541

I object to the de-designation of the site in Shirley as MOL. If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I enjoy this space every weekend and meet many like-minded people. I also be object to the site being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic so it struggles now. I am happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but I object to building on open space.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

3789/01/004/DM43.4/O Mr Paul Slaughter

Object  Soundness - Justified  DM43.4
541

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic. If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

3792/01/007/DM43.4/O Mr Simon Bradley

Object  DM43.4
541

To save you looking it up, and to help you identify my specific objections, the five sites mentioned so far and to which I wish to object as being detrimental to the character of the area are:

- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Bleech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 541).

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
3793/01/006/DM43.4/O Mr Stephen Barnes

Object

DM43.4 541

Second, the Council plans to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village (page 68, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals). Metropolitan Open Land has the same protection from development as the Green Belt. The Council is proposing to remove this designation so that most of this land can be used for new housing. The draft Local Plan identifies five sites:

- land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 541);

I object to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I also object to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

3803/01/002/DM43.4/O Mr Denis Perrott

Object

DM43.4 541

I object to the use of the Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541 for housing:

- If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Site 541, Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would totally change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Verdayne Avenue and Firsby Avenue.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I write to you with my objections to the proposed Croydon Local Plan, specifically on the points below.

- The land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 128);
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 504);
- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 541);
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542);
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548).

I object to the decision to designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I also object to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
3809/01/005/DM43.4/O Mr Ian Leonard  
Object DM43.4 541  
I object to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council will not keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I also object to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, thereby disastrously changing the character of the area, additionally, the local road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional traffic.

3820/01/003/DM43.4/O Mrs & Mrs Linter  
Object DM43.4 541  
I object to land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House being identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 541); As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

3823/01/004/DM43.4/O Mr Ross Aitken  
Object DM43.4 541  
I would like to object to these proposals: Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 541; As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

3825/01/001/DM43.4/S Yasmeen Hanifa  
Support  
Soundness - Justified DM43.4 541  
I write to you having received this email from Gavin Barwell MP, the tone of which I find inflammatory and discriminatory towards the Gypsy and Traveller communities, and smacks of "not in my backyard". I write as a resident of Addiscombe who recognises the huge problem of lack of affordable housing to buy and to rent in London promulgated by this Conservative government and the previous coalition government. I fully support Croydon Council's proposals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3826/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms L Pinkney</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I object to site 541</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3827/01/004/DM43.4/C</td>
<td>Ms L Sasankhan</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I object to site 541</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3844/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Lee Kirby-Walker</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I object to site 541</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr M Foster

Object DM43.4 541

I wish to lodge an objection to all five sites where the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open space land and to build housing on them, not only would we be losing vital open space and change the very character of the area, I believe the local road infrastructure would not cope with any more traffic, why must the council continual to try and ruin areas that people like. At the moment this area as a rural feel to it, nice green spaces and a open aspect which we would loose if these plans were to go ahead. I would ask the council to think very hard before implementing these plans before we have another area that people want to move out of instead of to, these plans will not improve the area quite the reverse, where at the moment people like to live here.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

---

Miss Rebecca Thomas

Object DM43.4 541

I email to express my formal concern and objection to the proposal to build additional housing in the green areas of Shirley Oaks Village. I currently reside in Beckenham, 1 Hamilton House, Orchard Way, BR33ER, on the Shirley boarder, and was previously a resident of Shirley for 30 years. The addition of these houses will not only bring down the areas reputation, spoil views from current properties but also cause additional congestion to an already busy area. We should be looking to preserve our green areas, and Shirley Oaks Village should remain just that, a village! I believe that the Wickham Road has already been flagged as one of the busiest roads in the area, with a fatal road accident occurring both this year and last. Additional housing/congestion will only add to this danger. This proposal will cause residents of the local area to be driven from their homes unfairly, I am sure that they did not purchase properties to be overlooked and to lose the view of the land that they have been paying to maintain for, in most cases, a number of years. I am contactable on my home address/phone should wish me to validate my views further.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Ms M Tomas Ward
Object
I am writing to express my objection to the planning proposals in the Shirley Oaks area. The land has been set aside for our use as we have very undersized gardens on the estate and we have also paid to keep those areas in a well maintained condition. The road around Shirley Oaks only has 2 exits as well so would make it very congested as there are only 2 options for traffic to leave and enter and there are already a lot of problems at the Wickham Road end as people drive in and out.

Mr Nicholas Barnes
Object
Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Road. None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.

Mr M Lockeyear
Object
I wish to register my objection to these proposals for the following reasons: I purchased my property on the understanding that all the open grassed land surrounding the village was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as “Amenity Open Land” because of our under-sized gardens and transferred to the Management Company, with each property owner as a shareholder in that company.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Ms M Gibson

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 541

With regard to the 'very scant' notices that have been posted on Shirley Oaks Village, in places that are not in visible of all residents, I must object VERY STRONGLY to these plans. (1) The land is owned by the residents with a covenant on it. Our houses are condensed with tiny gardens, the compensation for which is the open ground (owned by all residents) that we are able to use. My understanding is that the original development was curtailed by the then council because of the density of housing/population on Shirley Oaks.

(2) Drainage on Shirley Oaks is very poor. I am given to understand that the water table is very high and indeed during the winter months the open spaces are sodden, holding water which could probably present a flooding problem. It is so bad in some places that the ducks move in!

(3) Could the services (sewerage etc) really support the number of properties proposed. There have already problems from time to time, especially down Shirley Oaks Road.

(4) Realistically, whatever type of property would be built, you could expect an average of two cars per dwelling. Shirley Oaks Road/Primrose Lane are extremely hazardous and would not be able to sustain another probably 500/1000 cars. Where would people park. There are enough problems on here already with regard to parking, deliveries etc. Both Shirley Oaks Road at the Wickham Road end and Primrose Road at the Shirley Road end are used as car parks and quite often it takes a bit of delicate maneuvering to get round, especially if you meet a bus.

(5) Planning permission has been refused for the plot in Poppy Lane (128) a number of times. The area was declared as a nature reserve some time back and I was unaware that this had changed. Part of the reason for the last planning application was the high water table, so how come there has been a change of mind?

Edwina Morris

Object: DM43.4 541

I object to the use of the Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541 for housing.

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Barbara Cumming</td>
<td>I object to the planned five sites being used for residential development in Shirley, Croydon: Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Whilst I agree that we desperately need new housing, it should be built on brownfield sites - not our remaining precious green spaces!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms M Bailey</td>
<td>The Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks and all around Shirley Oaks Village should not be de-designated, but designated as Local Green space. It is very important that Croydon needs green spaces as these give the feeling of openness and a pleasant environment in which to live. Upwards of approximately 700 hundred odd homes could be built in this area which will lead to possible flooding of areas as rain water will not be able to drain away as easily as it would if it was left as a green belt area. Secondly the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic stemming from these additional homes, and this includes public transport. Thirdly are the NHS facilities in the area able to cope with this large influx?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Payne</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Every year we get proposals and consultations for building more homes or structures on Shirley Oaks green land. But must admit the above proposal is the worst and the most ridiculous so far. From what we read, the proposal suggests to build around 750 new homes on what's left of green patches in the village.

The village is already over crowded with Shirley Oaks road and Primrose road looking like a huge PARKING LOT throughout the day. One cannot begin to imagine what it would like with more residents and obviously with at least double the number of cars to that of the number of the new homes proposed.

We bought our property back in 1989, paying above market value at the time, for the sole purpose that the village is quiet and has some green land. Our home was one of the last phases of any buildings to be erected in the village, or so we were promised and confirmed in writing. Since then, a synagogue was built, bus 367 goes through the narrow winding road, every year for the last few years we get proposals to use our green land for one suggestion or another and now this proposal.

We completely oppose this proposal and hope that the council will appreciate that it's not all about the money and just building more houses, but quality of life matters just the same. On one hand the government and councils encourage and push people to plant more trees, grow their veg, recycle etc... Yet on the other hand come up with proposals to use every last green patch to build more structures and homes. Doesn't make any sense.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3899/02/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms E Rudduck</td>
<td>I object to the use of the Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541 for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport. I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3901/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Frederick Banjo</td>
<td>As property owners/Residents and shareholders in the company that manages Shirley Oaks Village, we are writing to state our objection to the above mentioned proposal. The land/s in question is designated as 'Amenity open Land' for the use of the property owners and residents of shirley oaks village and must not be built upon. The proposal to build on these lands will simply destroy the peace &amp; tranquility of the village. The enjoyment of the open land by residents will be lost not to mentioned the increased traffic situation amongst other things. We strongly object to these proposals to build upon these lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3923/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms A Smithers</td>
<td>The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 541 I object to this as Shirley oaks village and surrounding areas are lovely and people go there for their green space to walk their dogs and have a nice time. This would ruin the whole area and what it currently stands for and I amongst many will be upset if the green areas are built on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3926/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Peter &amp; Brenda Mullings</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3927/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Mollison</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3933/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Thacker</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3942/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Scott Hunter</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3943/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Steve Murray</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr C Rudduck

Object DM43.4 541

I object to the use of the Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541 for housing.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr K Rudduck

Object DM43.4 541

I object to the use of the Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541 for housing.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I am a resident of Shirley and strongly object to the current proposals to build on green belt land on the Shirley Oaks and surrounding areas.

There are plenty of brown sites that are unoccupied and could fulfill the purpose of providing new homes. Shirley is already tight for school places. St John’s, in Spring Park Road, is increasing to 2 form entry already with the number of children living locally requiring education. The 367 bus serving the Shirley Oaks Village is infrequent and much more transport will be required. Parking is already a nightmare and with the lack of parking contemplated with the new build supply the problem will only get worse. There will be an incredible build up of traffic on the already congested Wickham Road and other local roads.

I believe this proposed building of traveller’s sites and homes will change the whole ethos of Shirley and cause resentment and the lowering of living standards. This is a particular area of standard housing and should not be changed by the building of blocks of houses. Garden land should not be built on and this is an inappropriate development and should not be allowed to go ahead. Metropolitan Open Land has the same protection as the Green Belt and the rules should be followed accordingly.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Ms M D Chandler

Object

DM43.4

541

I object on the grounds of appalling over-crowding, your plan would bring at least 2000 more vehicles onto the estate. It is already nearly impossible to get in and out of the estate by car at rush hours. The roads on the estate can barely cope as it is with the bus route. These extra vehicles would include many commercial vans which would be parked over night and weekends causing havoc on the narrow roads of the estate. A single bus route as at present running every 20mins causes problems how do you intend to increase public services more bus routes and more frequent timetables....more chaos! I along with others pay to maintain and the open space as a share holder. Your proposal would seriously devalue our properties and I for one will be seeking serious compensation for this, I trust Croydon has very big capital reserves to meet our legal challenges and compensation. Our gardens are small this is why the land has been designated open land so we have some open space in common with the surrounding houses. Your plans are ill conceived and will effectively destroy Croydon further. There are large areas of open land in Addington which Croydon could use and I presume already own without spending our money attempting to purchase land which will be extremely costly to Croydon in terms of the compensation that you will need to pay out and in the legal fees entailed.

Mr N Oratis

Object

DM43.4

541

I object to the decision to de-designate this land as metropolitan open land for the use of residential development for the following reasons. These areas are also being used every day and regularly by myself, family members, neighbours friends and many visitors wanting to take there dog for a walk or spending time with family and kids. Ref 548, 542, 541, and 128 are owned by Shirley oaks management. 488 residents are shareholders in this company. There was a decision in 1985 for this land to be open for use by the local residents because the gardens of all homes were considered small. I would also like to mention the increase in road traffic and pollution due to the development. So for those reasons I would once again like to object to building on this land.

Change

As this site does not have a willing land owner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

I am writing to object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village; in particular to the use of the following five sites for housing:

i) land at Poppy Lane reference number 128
ii) Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504
iii) land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541
iv) land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542
v) land to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548

If the Council cannot keep this land as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should be at least designated as Local Green Spaces.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

I wholly disagree with the plans to develop the land on Shirley Oaks Village.

This is metropolitan land and will not be built on.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Object  
Soundness - Justified  
DM43.4  
541

I am therefore writing to formally object to:

1. de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;
2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   - land at Poppy Lane REFERENCE NO. 128;
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane REFERENCE NUMBER 504;
   - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House REFERENCE NUMBER 541;
   - land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road REFERENCE NUMBER 542, and
   - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens REFERENCE NUMBER 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building houses on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built upon. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

Change  
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object  
DM43.4  
541

We are writing to object to the following sites for housing and traveller sites.

(541)

Change  
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object  
DM43.4  
541

I wish to log my objection to the borough-wide planned changes Croydon Council are proposing to make in their Local Plans for 2016-2036. These proposals are 750 new homes in Shirley Oaks and 35 new homes on the Shrublands Estate. Also the proposed work to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Combe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Combe Road.

Change  
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr R Kiley

Object Soundness - Justified

am writing this email to register my objection to the misuse of building on green belt land in Shirley, and elsewhere. All our lives are stressful now and we need these green belt areas to maintain our quality of life. I am objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I will also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr R Morley-Smith

Object Soundness - Justified

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr & Mrs Ewin

Object Soundness - Justified

Objection to Croydon Council’s proposal to provide sites for travellers & the building of houses, etc on green land in Shirley & other areas.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Ms L Sasankan

Object Soundness - Justified

am a resident at 35 Primrose Lane, Shirley Oaks Village, along with 4 other members of my family.

I am writing to express my objection/disagreement to the following:

Object to the de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and in particular to the use of the following five sites for housing:

- Land at Poppy Lane ref 128
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, ref 504
- Land to east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beach House and Ash House, ref 541
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, ref 542
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, ref 548

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4035/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms S Ragh</td>
<td>I am writing to express my objection/disagreement to the following: 2. The use of the following five sites for housing: Land at Poppy Lane ref 128 Stroud Green Pumping Station, ref 504 land to east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beach House and Ash House, ref 541 Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, ref 542 Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, ref 548</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4036/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms S Wheeler-Kiley</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic. If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4039/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs S Smithers</td>
<td>The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 541. We don’t want building on the green areas in Shirley oaks people live there because they have choose a quiet place with green areas good for their mental and physical well being, this is a place for others to enjoy as well as residents there is no where else the same as this in Croydon.</td>
<td>The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 541 Shirley Oaks Village is lovely I go walking round the green areas there and this is such a lovely area. We do not want houses built here and to loose our land that we really like to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs S Smithers</td>
<td>The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ref. 541, 542, 548, 128 and 504 in Shirley Oaks Village

I was shocked to learn about the changes proposed to our grass areas. These changes, if implemented, will change the very nature of our village. It will not only deprive the residents of very essential open green areas, but it will make the whole place very crowded, much more polluted and quite uglier. This would rob us of essential attractions that made us come to this village in the first place.

I strongly object to any of these changes and trust that every resident on this estate feels the way I feel. I did not speak to everyone, but the many I spoke with feel as strongly as I do towards this unfair proposal. I have been living in this village with my family since 1985, I would like to see the Croydon Council improve it rather than ruin it. I hope the Council will reconsider its plans.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I am grateful to the Council for consulting on the detailed policies and proposals that will make up the Croydon Local Plan. There is much in the document that I agree with, but some of the proposals would, in my opinion, change the character of parts of Croydon very much for the worse. I hope you will forgive me if I focus on these areas of contention. I am therefore writing to formally object to:

1. de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;
2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   - land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   - land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
   - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

3. the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:
   - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502;
   - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; and
   - Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 750.

As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site...
Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

“Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is);

4. Focused intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too;

5. Policy DM2 on development on garden land, which is too subjective and therefore too weak. There should be a much stronger presumption against development on garden land;

6. Policy DM28, which should allow higher levels of parking in developments of low public transport accessibility. Restricting parking spaces in such areas doesn’t lead to fewer people owning their own car; it just leads to greater competition for existing spaces.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/01/005</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Mr Matt Knight</td>
<td>4051</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S41</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/004</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Mr S Sasankan</td>
<td>4053</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S41</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/002</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Mrs Mary Gray</td>
<td>4058</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S41</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/002</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Shirley Lidbury</td>
<td>4059</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S41</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 541</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Object | Soundness - Justified | DM43.4 541 | As residents whose small rear garden backs onto part of the Shirley Oaks Metropolitan Open Land, we know full well what impact proposals 128, 504, 541, 542 and 548 would have to the area. There would be an increase in noise from 1) the building work, 2) increased traffic. There would be a substantial impact on the road system. Wickham Road already gets gridlocked at rush hours and school start/end times. The roads into Shirley Oaks are already too narrow for cars to pass if there are any cars parked, which there are always many of since the majority of driveways are too short to accommodate reasonable size car parking for many. Shirley Road also has a problem with queuing traffic towards Long Lane which will also be compounded by these proposals. These developments would increase the drainage issues this area suffers from. The whole area is built on London clay and regularly these areas suffer standing water which has gone through our property in the past. Increasing the density of building in Shirley Oaks will increase this problem too. The lands around Shirley Oaks remain because of the compact nature of the village, whose properties, as well as our own, have small garden areas and as such these areas are used daily for sports activities, exercise and dog walking. | Change | As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan. |
4065/01/002/DM43.4/O  Mr Clive Jarvis  
Object  
DM43.4 541  
I object to the use of the site for housing.  
Change  
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

4066/01/008/DM43.4/O  Dr Chandra Pawa  
Object  
DM43.4 541  
the use of land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541 for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area;  
Change  
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

4067/01/002/DM43.4/O  Mrs Marilyn Loader  
Object  
DM43.4 541  
I object to the use of the site for housing.  
Change  
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

4068/01/004/DM43.4/O  Mr S Soundararajan  
Object  
DM43.4 541  
I am writing to object to strongly the De-designation of the following five pieces of land as Metropolitan Open Land and their proposed use as housing -- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541- the site is owned by the residents of Shirley Oaks Village through the Shirley Oaks Management Company in which every freeholder has a share. Your proposal will lead to a huge set of issues for the local residents. I strongly object to the plan and proposal  
Change  
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

4071/01/003/DM43.4/O  Mr & Mrs Tross  
Object  
DM43.4 541  
Given the existing levels of brownfield sites in the area, these should be exhausted before encroaching on areas that would significantly alter the character of the area.  
Change  
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Kajit Gata-Aura

DM43.4

Object

I object to ref 541

The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 541

I have friends who live in Shirley Oaks village and I know them and myself along with many others all object to the proposals to build on the green areas. This grass area is used by many and would totally change the area if built on and we don't want it. Part of the charm of this area is those green areas and it has something that you don't find often in Croydon so please let us keep the green areas as we all object to them being built on.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Melissa Chu

DM43.4

Object

The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542, and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr Reuben Gata-Aura

DM43.4

Object

The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane - Ref 128 Stroud Green Pumping Stn - Ref 504 land to east of Shirley Oaks Road - Ref 541 land to west of Shirley Oaks Road - Ref 542 land to rear of Honeysuckle Gardens - Ref 548.

If the Council will not keep them as MOP - these 5 sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Victoria Moore

DM43.4

Object

land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 541).

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr Vince Hemment

I am therefore writing to formally object to:
- the de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village; the use of the following five sites for housing:
  - land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
  - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
  - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
  - land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
  - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Terrence & Jacqueline Spriggs

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Ms V Cruickshank

I object to the use of the following five sites for housing:
- Land at Poppy Lane: reference number 128;
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane: reference number 504;
- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House: reference number 541;
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road: reference number 542; and
- Land to the rear of 5 – 13 Honeysuckle Gardens: reference number 548.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I'm writing in response to your notice for development of the greenfield sites on the Shirley Oaks Village estate to change the status of this land to allow development of 751 new homes. When I bought my house 18 months ago it was purchased on the understanding that together with the other householders on the estate that we would have joint ownership in the land directly surrounding the estate and that a quarterly bill would be levied to cover the maintenance of the land. I purchased the property in the knowledge that there were designated areas of green space surrounding the estate and was led to believe that these would remain. I strongly object to the proposal of building any further houses on the land surrounding the estate on the grounds that the main road through the estate is dangerous enough as it is. To more than double the amount of residents using the estate is ludicrous. The road was designed to cope with a certain amount of traffic and is already dangerous at time.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4125/01/042/DM43.4/O</th>
<th>Councillor M Fisher</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>DM43.4 541</th>
<th>Site 541, Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Verdayne Avenue and Firsby Avenue. Change</th>
<th>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4126/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr. Christopher Swan</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 541</td>
<td>land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454. Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 541);</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4129/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr. Edward Swan</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 541</td>
<td>I would like to strongly object to the planned five sites being used for residential development in Shirley, Croydon: land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454. Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 541); Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional traffic.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4137/01/02</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Mrs S Rudduck</td>
<td>I object to the use of the Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541 for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport. I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4138/02/03</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Ms S Rao</td>
<td>The use of the land at east of Shirley Oaks Road and rear of Beech House and Ash House (site ref 541) for housing. As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4145/01/00</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Andrews</td>
<td>I am grateful to the Council for consulting on the detailed policies and proposals that will make up the Croydon Local Plan. There is much in the document that I agree with, but some of the proposals would, in my opinion, change the character of parts of Croydon very much for the worse. I hope you will forgive me if I focus on these areas of contention. I am therefore writing to formally object to: 1. the use of the following five sites for housing: • land at Poppy Lane reference number 128; • Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504; • land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541; • land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and • land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 546. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

02 September 2016
4146/01/004/DM43.4/O  Mr & Mrs Carpenter  

Object  

DM43.4  
541  

These proposals to build up to 750 homes on land (assuming it is de-designated) will mean the loss of vital open spaces and will place burdens on local transport, roads, schools and medical facilities which are already under pressure.

Change  

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

4147/01/003/DM43.4/O  Mr & Mrs A Catherall  

Object  

DM43.4  
541  

The de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land status on Shirley Oak will be vigorously opposed. I can see no reasoned explanation in the planning document for such a course of action nor is there any evidence of the thinking of the Council in the previous plan or 2012 Inspector's Report to explain how MOL status has been revisited with the conclusion that MOL designation be withdrawn. It also seems to have escaped the planning process that Shirley Oaks is governed by a Section 52 Agreement under the 1971 Town and Country Planning Act controlling development of the 'amenity lands' on Shirley Oaks. Further, the land is owned by the 488 Shirley Oaks resident property owners as shareholders of Shirley Oaks Management Ltd that owns the land. There is, therefore, no likelihood of the land ever being sold voluntarily. In summary, this part of the proposed Local Plan is undeliverable.

Change  

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Kennard

Object

We are writing to object to the proposals to:

1. de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;
2. the use of the following sites for housing:
   - land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   - land to the West of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542;
   - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548;

The Shirley Oaks Village site currently provides a balance of high density housing offset by areas of green space. The proposals for de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land and additional housing on the areas of green space would disrupt that balance and greatly increase the density of housing to an unacceptable level. Access to the Shirley Oaks site is by way of Poppy Lane and Shirley Oaks Road which feed into Shirley Road and Wickham Road respectively. Both Shirley Road and Wickham Road are used heavily throughout the day and subject of long delays particularly at peak times. This has resulted in Poppy Lane and Shirley Oaks Road experiencing heavier traffic flows than they were designed for as commuters cut through between Shirley Road and Wickham Road.

Public transport within the Shirley Oaks site is limited to a small single decker bus due to the road infrastructure and road system. Whilst there are bus services which serve Shirley Road and Wickham Road these are already oversubscribed and subject to delay due to existing traffic congestion.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr Trevor Watkins

Object DM43.4 541  The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Carol Holmes

Object DM43.4 541  I object to both the de-designation and also to the subsequent house-building at the following sites: •Land at Poppy Lane (reference number 128); •Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane (reference number 504); •Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House (reference number 541); •Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road (reference number 541); •Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens (reference number 548).

The very minimum designation for the proposed sites should be as Local Green Spaces, in order to give some protection against over-development.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr B Williams

Object DM43.4 541  I object to the de-designation of the land as Metropolitan Open Land and its proposed use for housing. The open spaces are collectively designated as Metropolitan Open Land and provide several links in the Shirley Green Chain. They help to form the sort of network necessary to ensure the maintenance of the current range and diversity of our flora and fauna. In addition this is a floodplain. There is a sink pond to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens and if this overflows any properties would be flooded. There is also the potential for flooding of future planned properties. The one road through Shirley Oaks Village could not cope with the additional traffic and its exit on to the A232 would cause yet another bottleneck on this already congested road.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I am writing to object to the following matters in this document:–

2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   a) Ref No. 128—land at Poppy Lane
   b) Ref No. 504—Stroud Green Pumping station
   c) Ref No. 541 —land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Ash House and Beech House
   d) Ref No. 542 —land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road
   e) Ref No. 548—land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens

If the Council do not keep these sites as Metropolitan Open Land, then at least these five sites should be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

I am writing to object to the following:

2. The use of the following five sites for housing:

   - Land at Poppy Lane, reference number 128
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, reference number 504
   - Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, reference number 541
   - Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, reference number 542, and
   - Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, reference number 543.

If the Council do not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at a minimum be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

This land is owned by Shirley Oaks Management Ltd of which I am a shareholder. There is a section 52 legal agreement in place which requires this site to be transferred to a management company and be held as amenity open space.

The highway network is already at saturation point and in any event any proposed development would generate an unacceptable amount of traffic.

The site has a high water table.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4209/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs King</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to Policy DM43, reference Site 541 to build new homes on land to the East &amp; West of Shirley Oaks Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4213/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs DB Good</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to Policy DM43, reference Site 541 to build new homes on land to the East &amp; West of Shirley Oaks Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4218/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Ms Morgan &amp; Mason</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4223/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Mary Lane</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the site for use as housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4228/01/009/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Sheila Newman</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 541</td>
<td>The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeywoodke Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4233/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Farrow</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 541</td>
<td>I object to Policy DM43, reference Site 541 to build new homes on land to the East &amp; West of Shirley Oaks Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4238/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Miss b Hall</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 541</td>
<td>As 541, 542 &amp; 548 would consist of 750 residences, the present utilities, particularly the drains, are likely to be inadequate. I assume that provision will be made for Shirley Oaks Hospital to function during the building and afterwards with the increase in traffic pollution and NHS ambulance access to their base. Healthcare facilities for such an increase in local residents cannot be sustained for the area. If the Council will not keep bullet points 1 &amp; 2 as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4244/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Kiltty</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 541</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Object Details</th>
<th>Change Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4245/01/004/DM3.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Maguire</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4268/01/009/DM3.4/O</td>
<td>Mr D Nesterovitch</td>
<td>The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4278/01/008/DM3.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Melvin Howard</td>
<td>If the Council will not keep the site as MOL, the site should at least be designated as Local Green Space. Building on this site will not only mean the loss of vital green space it will over burden local services and road infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4294/01/003/DM3.4/O</td>
<td>S Wallace</td>
<td>I object to land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 541).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3405/01/005/DM43.4/O Mrs Glenna Fullick
Object DM43.4 541 I object to Policy DM43, reference Site 541 to build new homes on land to the East & West of Shirley Oaks Road
Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

3406/01/004/DM43.4/O Mrs Kathleen Swan
Object DM43.4 541 I would like to strongly object to the planned five sites being used for residential development in Shirley, Croydon; land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454). Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 541); Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional traffic.
Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

3409/01/005/DM43.4/O Mrs Rita Evans
Object DM43.4 541 The proposal to de-designate Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and use it for five housing sites surely flies in the face of current recommendations to preserve Green Belt equivalent land as a vital amenity and ecological asset?
Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

3412/01/005/DM43.4/O Doreen Jansen
Object DM43.4 541 Object to site. Schools in the area are already over-subscribed, so the number of homes proposed will increase the problem
Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Object: Mrs J Furmanska
Soundness: Justified

I am writing to object to the following matters in this document: -

2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   a) Ref No. 128 — land at Poppy Lane
   b) Ref No. 504 — Stroud Green Pumping station
   c) Ref No. 541 — land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Ash House and Beech House
   d) Ref No. 542 — land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road
   e) Ref No. 548 — land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens

If the Council do not keep these sites as Metropolitan Open Land, then at least these five sites should be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object: Mr P Bhanji

The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542, and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object: Ms B Fontaine

The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542, and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
We object to Policy DM43, reference Site 541 to build new homes on land to the East & West of Shirley Oaks Road. As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Ms Gemma Sturgeon

I object to Policy DM43, reference Site 541 to build new homes on land to the East & West of Shirley Oaks Road. As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Jennifer Ciaruzzo

I am writing to object to the use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128; Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504; land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541; land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548; if the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Ms N Nesterovich

The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548; if the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area. As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM43.4 541</td>
<td>I object to the use of the Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541 for housing. As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the use of the following five sites for housing - land at Poppy Lane reference number 128; Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504; land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541; land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548; If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. The Council should focus on developing other land in the Croydon borough such as unused office blocks, derelict corporate buildings/factories/warehouses which have not been occupied for years instead of attacking the green areas which are enjoyed by the residents in their respective areas. The proposals to build circa 700 houses in such a small area will cause the following detrimental effects to the local residents: depreciation of the value of the houses purchased in the relevant areas, too much strain on the water and sewerage systems in the locality where there is already a high water table. This could result in undue flooding and drainage problems, structural problems in years to come as the land is not fit for such intensive building, increase in traffic on Shirley Road, Wickham Road, Lower Addiscombe and Addiscombe which is already congested. This will unduly increase pollution levels which are already toxic. This will undoubtedly cause an increase in the health problems of the people in the locality such as lung cancer and other respiratory illnesses which will in turn place greater stress on the NHS services, cause more people to take sick days which will result in lower incomes obtained and eventually less tax revenue generated. This will have a knock on effect on the economy which is to say at the very least, bleak, the three green spaces in the Shirley Oaks Village are owned by the 488 Freeholders. Each Freeholder owns one share in the nominee company, Shirley Oaks Management Limited which owns the land on behalf of its shareholders. Building upon this land would serious undermine the value of the land purchased by the Freeholders and reduce quality of life. If the residents wanted to move, it would prove near impossible because of the resulting lower sale prices of their respective houses imposed by the Council’s building plans. This would appear to be unfair for the Council to impose...
such hardship on the residents. I would urge the council to build upon land in the Croydon borough which is derelict and contains buildings which have not been used for years. These buildings can be knocked down to build the much needed housing for generations to come. These unused or derelict buildings serve no purpose to the local residents and are of no value to the residents. The Council should endeavour to create value where it is needed. This will in turn improve the condition of the abandoned areas. This will also prevent squatting and other unlawful uses of such buildings. I witnessed one example last year where the old post office building next to East Croydon Station was used as a rave containing over 1,000 people. This posed a risk to the safety of the passers by and the increase in crime. The Council’s redevelopment of such spaces could be highly beneficial to the area. The green spaces are however of great importance to the local residents. The residents enjoy these spaces for walking their dogs, recreational and outdoor activities, space for children to play, piece of mind for the resident who works in the city and comes home to a peaceful environment and it provides space for those residents who already have very small back gardens.

7284/01/007/DM43.4/O Dr I Jayamanne

Object Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 S41

I wish to protest vehemently about your plans to destroy Shirley which is a village by building hundred of homes and setting up a Gypsy and Traveller site. You will destroy the Green Belt and increase the traffic in the area thus polluting the environment and the air we breathe.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
The use of the following five sites for housing:
- Land at Poppy Lane (ref number 128)
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane (ref number 504)
- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House (ref number 541)
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road (ref number 542) and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens (ref number 548)

When the London Borough of Lambeth closed the children's home, known as Shirley Oaks, Croydon Council determined to keep the building redevelopment of the site broadly in line with the building density that had existed for most of the previous hundred years and subsequent applications by the then developer for increased housing density were rejected. There were a number of reasons for maintaining the original policy amongst which were the need to maintain the established green corridor, retain the character of the area and to maintain the surrounding traffic volumes at a manageable level. The decision to designate the land as Metropolitan Open Land was to ensure that in future further building on the land could not take place thus re-affirming the principles established by the original policy decisions. Nothing has changed in the ensuing years to justify any variation to that policy.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I am dismayed at the consideration being given to the above, particularly concerning that proposed in the Shirley area. I have been a Shirley resident for almost 30 years and to date have enjoyed what the area does offer both for the community and with regard to open green spaces, which are precious to the health and well-being of all ages. Why should future generations be unable to continue to benefit from an outdoor environment as hitherto?

I strongly object to de-designation of the current Metropolitan Open Land and would hope that at least it could be protected as Local Green Space with regard to future development. This is particularly pertinent with regard to the proposals being considered for the Shirley Oaks area. The present road infrastructure through the estate leaves a lot to be desired and any more traffic will be a great cause for concern, to say nothing of the loss of wildlife and spacious living. If we had wanted to live in a highly densely populated area, we would not have chosen the Shirley area to relocate into, rather the centre of the town. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is more acceptable and there must be many of these in the Croydon area to develop without encroaching on valued green spaces.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I wish to formally object to:
1. All the proposed policies relating to the re-designation of land to allow building development at Shirley Oaks Road and land around Shirley Oaks Village.
2. The land at Poppy Lane (reference 128).
3. Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane including the conversion of the locally listed pumping station (reference 504).
4. Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House (reference 541).
5. Land to the West of Shirley Oaks Road (reference 542).

These proposals are NOT appropriate for Croydon to meet its Strategic Objectives. Additionally the proposals are NOT DELIVERABLE or SUSTAINABLE as:

• Croydon have already announced that it is not necessary to deliberately destroy MOL to reach their housing requirements.
• National and London Plans do NOT require or expect Local Authorities to degrade MOL to generate additional housing.
• The loss of this MOL will entail the LOSS of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks through to Ashburton Playing fields, across to South Norwood Park and surrounding Areas.
• The above areas are vital to sustain the drainage of surrounding flood areas.
• The above mentioned areas are referred to the "lungs of Croydon" as they sustain carbon dioxide capture (photosynthesis), oxygen release (photosynthesis) and biodiversity. Local wildlife includes badgers and bats.
• Green areas increase the character, desirability and amenity of residential areas.
• Green areas have a strong positive impact of the character of surrounding residential areas.
• The proposed increase in housing will put an additional burden on public transport, roadways and street parking and other services. The additional volume of traffic will create additional road hazards.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7308/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr John Carley</td>
<td>DM43.4 541</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village; reference Numbers, 128, 504, 541, 542 and 548. This is currently Green Space and provides vital green recreational area and buffer between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7314/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>P L Johnson</td>
<td>DM43.4 541</td>
<td>I wish to object to the use of the following sites for housing: - Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road (ref no 541) - Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road (ref no 542) We should preserve these pastoral and woodland sites for environmental reasons: for nurture and humanity. Due to high traffic usage of the A232 and Upper Shirley Road - particularly when the M25 gets closed - the air quality in this area is not perfect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7320/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Steve Westray</td>
<td>DM43.4 541</td>
<td>The de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and either side of Shirley Oaks Road. At present I understand that Metropolitan Open Land has the same protection as the Green Belt and I believe that it is vitally important to retain the controls around our green spaces in Shirley. If any additional homes were to be considered for this area then they should be restricted in number and carefully planned in order to retain the character of this area. The idea of building up to 750 new homes is totally out of keeping with this objective and would be considerable strain on local infrastructure and resources. New housing on this scale would lead to a significant increase in traffic along the Wixham Road which is already extremely busy not only servicing the residents of Shirley but as an important thoroughfare into Croydon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7321/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Ann Sebire</td>
<td>Object DM43.4 541</td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 2. The use of the following five sites for housing: a) Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128) b) Stroud Green Pumping Station reference number 504 c) Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541 d) Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 and e) Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference numbers 543 I just hope that there has been enough consideration about the fact that Shirley is built on springs and Heron Homes and Wren both had problems with flooding the area down at Woodmere Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7323/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs L Woods</td>
<td>Object DM43.4 541</td>
<td>In particular I have grave concerns about the choice of location for the proposed gypsy and traveller sites and also the building of 750 new homes at Shirley Oaks Village. The local schools are already struggling to cope with ever increasing numbers of children, and the journey from Shirley into Croydon can be extremely congested at peak times. The extra traffic generated by the proposals would cause misery in my opinion. The loss of green spaces in the proposed areas of development would also be most detrimental. I would therefore urge Croydon Council to consider and respect the very real concerns and fears of the majority of residents in the Shirley area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7324/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Olive Garton</td>
<td>Object DM43.4 541</td>
<td>Use of formerly open land for housing (references 128, 504,541,542 and 548): Again, this open land should not be lost. Furthermore, there is no infrastructure in place to support the huge increase in population density that such development would represent. Development of the site of the former pumping station (reference 504): It was established at the time the Shirley Oaks village was built that this land could not be built on, as there is an Artesian well on the land and any development would risk polluting the water source. Furthermore, a travellers’ site would be inappropriate on this site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mrs M Davies
Object DM43.4 541
I am writing to object to the proposed use of:
- the land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road (541)
- The land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road (542)
- The land at Poppy Lane, Shirley Road (128)
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane (504)
- Land to the rear of honeysuckle gardens (548)
- Open space land at shrublands estate (038)

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr Leeroy Purcell
Object DM43.4 541
I have seen a poster for some proposed developments. It was attached to a lamppost. I am a resident of Shirley Oaks Village. I am concerned about these development proposals. I do not think it is a good idea. I believe it will have a negative impact on the area and the residents.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr Bob Sleeman
Object DM43.4 542
I am therefore writing to formally object to:
- the land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
- If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Addiscombe Residents Association
Object DM43.4 542
If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, the five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces and not used for housing.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I am therefore writing to formally object to:

1. de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;
2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   • land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   • Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   • land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   • land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
   • land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0391/02/019/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Mira Armour</td>
<td>HOME Residents Association</td>
<td>De-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land bordering Addiscombe Place (around Shirley Oaks Village) – OBJECT If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, the five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces and not used for housing: Ref 128: Land at Poppy Lane Ref 594: Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane Ref 541: Land east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, Shirley Oaks Road Ref 542: Land to west of Shirley Oaks Road, Shirley Oaks Road Ref 548: Land to rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens designate as Local Green Spaces and not used for housing</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0790/01/145/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Mathew Frith</td>
<td>London Wildlife Trust</td>
<td>We object to the proposed development on green spaces, which should remain designated as part of the Shirley Oaks MOL (see comments on Policy SP7 (Table 9.1)). This site meets criteria for Metropolitan Open Land, in terms of its nature conservation value.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1180/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs K Davenport</td>
<td>London Wildlife Trust</td>
<td>I am horrified at the proposals regarding Shirley. There may be a need for more housing but there are alternatives and it is up to the Council to find these rather than making it easier and more profitable for builders which is what is now happening.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I hereby inform you of my STRONG OBJECTION to allow development on the land noted on your Policy Map 43.

Ref 541
Ref 542
Ref 548
Ref 128
Ref 504

This land forms the reason why I, along with the majority of my neighbors purchased our homes. As freehold property owners we each have a shareholding in the company owning the land and do not wish for this, OUR land to be built on.

We also find it unbelievable that the Council wishes to have a legal battle against 800 of its residents who not just own the land but are determined that the land keeps its “Metropolitan Open Land” protected status.

The idea of building on these main green spaces when the existing houses were built with minimal sized gardens is disastrous, such development would obviously not just spoil the look and value of the area but would damage the health of the residents.

This is the land where the residents catch the summer sun, go for walks, jog, children play, and has the most amazing natural wildlife that we all enjoy.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

I hereby inform you of my STRONG OBJECTION to allow development on the land noted on your Policy Map 43.

Ref 541
Ref 542
Ref 548
Ref 128
Ref 504

I as resident of Shirley Oaks Village am against any change of our Metropolitan Land (with protection to being built on) being allowed as acceptable for development. I have been living in the Village for almost 30 years and paying for this land to be maintained as grass areas. We own the land as shareholder in our management company (Once designated as Amenity Open Land and transference to our Management company.) I strongly oppose any moves to develop on these grass areas.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Object  

I am writing to express my objection to the planning proposals in the Shirley Oaks area. The land has been set aside for our use as we have very undersized gardens on the estate and we have also paid to keep those areas in a well maintained condition.

The road around Shirley Oaks only has 2 exits as well, so would make it very congested as there are only 2 options for traffic to leave and enter and there are already a lot of problems at the Wickham Road end as people drive in and out.

I object to the following Ref Numbers:

Ref 541
Ref 542
Ref 548
Ref 128
Ref 504

I would appreciate any information you could send me in relation to upcoming meeting's about the proposals.

Change  

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mrs Christine Clark

Object DM43.4

I am writing to strongly object to the development of land on Shirley Oaks Village.

The land was shared between residents and in 1985 designated by Croydon Council as “Amenity Open Land” because of our undersized gardens. The land was transferred to the Management Company, with each property owner as a shareholder in that company. I intend to fight for the use of this land.

My front garden is approximately 6’ x 4’ and the lawn in my back garden is only 6’ x 5’. Both my parents and I use the land for exercising dogs as the gardens are so small. This whole thing has come as a huge shock to all of us.

With regard to the traveller site. Travellers move around the countryside so why put a traveller site in such a residential area.

I appreciate the Borough needs affordable homes but the land on the estate is so restricted in size and the in and out roads to the estate are already extremely dangerous owing to the bends in the road. Health and Safety issues need to be addressed.

I strongly object to this development and will explore every possible way to restrict the development of these homes.

Daniela Reynolds

Object DM43.4

I wish to object the following planned proposals; ref:541, ref:542, ref:548, ref:128 and ref:504.

These planned proposals will not fit within the current aesthetics of the estate so please accept this email as an objection to the proposal.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr David Cox

Object

Re your development plans 541,542,548,128 and 504. Consultation.

I am writing in response to your notices for development of the greenfield sites on the Shirley Oaks Village estate, changing the status of this land to allow development of around 700 new homes.

When I bought my house here 18 years ago, it was on the understanding that this had been designated by Croydon Council as metropolitan amenity open land, an attractive feature of the original development, important not least due to the relatively small gardens of some properties, a mixture of unit sizes in an harmonious design. Thus there is a mixture of family unit sizes and age groups at home here. For many years, I and my fellow-resident members of the Shirley Oaks Management Ltd company have contributed regularly to First Port Property Services and their predecessors under our common upkeep obligation, including provision of boundary posts at various points of these areas to ensure that visiting Travellers could not reoccupy them.

As I understand your plans, you now wish to "designate" this as non-metropolitan land, on which purchasers could build however suits their purposes. This does of course risk a complete change in the nature of our Village. I cannot pretend to understand how you can effectively cut a swathe through all of this, even if you do consider it justified. Some residents might I imagine now be considering the impact on their original investment and individual legal aspects. Against these general considerations, I would like to highlight some specific and practical concerns at the outset.

ROAD SAFETY

The perimeter road via Primrose Lane and Shirley Oaks Road is arguably no longer fit for purpose, increased car ownership and parking, fast through traffic including commercial and public transport all contributing. Buses on the 367 route for example frequently mount pavements to pass each other. There have been accidents, some serious, even fatal and involving elderly pedestrian residents. The road surface is nowadays subject to excessive heavy usage. Clearly, 700 new homes will surely accentuate these problems and dangers.

ENVIRONMENT

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Your plans will effectively remove an important green-field area and with it much unique wildlife. Residents will lose many of the valuable areas for walking, exercise and fresh-air, as will visitors. Any balanced village appearance and community feel to the estate will be consumed by so many new properties of different designs.

In summary many will surely feel betrayed by a Council which proposes removing green-fields against all promises. Some might also suspect that, whatever the social arguments, their interests are being sacrificed against political and ultimately commercial imperatives.

Once the area surrounding Shirley Oaks Village is re-designated the Council plans to build 751 homes on 5 separate sites. Supposing the average house is for 4 people, 3000 people in total will move to the area. The housing will attract families - potentially half being children. The Council mention no where in their 700 page document about the building of new schools (primary and secondary) nor the building of doctor surgeries, nor the expanding of the local shopping area let alone the already stretched local road infra-structure. Our local area can't cope as it is - St John's primary school has applied for an extension to cope with the current demand on its places. During rush hour buses frequently don't stop at bus stops because they are full. Traffic is often diverted down our road, Shirley Church Road, if there is an accident on Wickham Road or Gravel Hill. The dual carriage way (Shirley Park) is crawling along during rush hour. The council are planning to add another 1000 plus cars to this equation. Shirley is often described according to estate agents as leafy, popular, excellent schools. Prices reflect this. Just walking around the area people look after their houses and take pride in living here. People pay more money to live in this area. By building 751 more homes the character of the area will change completely.
We are also writing to object to Croydon Council’s plans to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village, changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan:

Your draft Local Plan identifies five sites:

1. the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, reference number 128);

2. Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, reference number 504);

3. land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, reference number 541);

4. land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542);

5. land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 467-468, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548).

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/06/17</td>
<td>Angus &amp; Olivia Bloom</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>Object to Site 542</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As a resident of Shirley Oaks I am writing to object the proposals for housing development on the estate and surroundings. Having lived in Shirley all of my life I would be deeply disappointed to see it change unrecognisably. I envisage the property on Shirley Oaks Road will either be demolished or surrounded by high density housing. Either eventuality will be highly detrimental.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have viewed the Detail Policies and Proposals on Croydon Councils website and object the following plans, references - Ref 128 Ref 504 Ref 541 Ref 542 Ref 548 Ref 598 Ref 502 Ref 681</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/18</td>
<td>Jane &amp; Paul Riley</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>Object to Site 542</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am writing to object to:

1. THE DE-DESIGNATION of the following five pieces of land as Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and their proposed use as housing:

   - Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542
   - There is only one narrow very winding road which runs through the village and this could not cope safely with any additional traffic. It is single file around bends as it is and the local road infrastructure would be overburdened.
   - These open spaces are collectively designated as Metropolitan Open Land and it would be unacceptable to lose a link to this chain.

   - Additionally, this area is a flood plain and there is a sink pond to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens. There would be a detrimental effect and potential flooding of existing and planned properties.

   - Three of these sites are owned by the residents of Shirley Oaks Village through the Shirley Oaks Management Company in which every freeholder has a share. The three land sites in question are:
     1. Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 541
     2. Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542
     3. Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548
     - Also on the land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road coming from the Wickham Road there is a Synagogue. The Synagogue, their car park and frontage are owned by the Jewish Community and they have no plans to sell this land. The Synagogue is on consecrated land and is in fact the only Synagogue in Croydon. It is discriminatory to have identified this site without first consulting with the Board of Management.

   - As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Object

DM43.4

542

I am writing to voice my full-throated objections to the above proposals because of the immeasurable damage it would do to the character of one of the leafier, more pleasant, parts of the borough. The council seeks de-designation of Metropolitan open land that, as a homeowner in Shirley Oaks Village, I own a share of, and it is protected by covenant. Such thoughtless destruction of our precious little green space (we were granted this Amenity Open Land in 1985 by the council due to our undersized gardens) is obnoxious, ill-conceived and damaging to the value of our properties, as planning blight could linger for a decade. Myriad other neglected parts of the borough are far more appropriate for such massive development and would not stir up so much ire from the current residents, nor would they require the politically-expedient moving of goalposts regarding land use. Our village simply does not currently have the infrastructure nor the capacity to expand in order to cope with these proposals. There is barely enough parking space available in the village at present, so quite where up to 683 other families will park and seek recreation, I do not know. Quite how all the construction vehicles involved in such huge building works would access the proposed sites without further detriment to the quality of life of the residents is another issue I raise. We are served by one bus route that can only use small, single-decker buses. The roads are too narrow for larger vehicles. How would this be overcome? Additionally, the fact that the council would seek to house the travelling community so close to the town centre, on land where in 2012 a group of them set up an illegal encampment and defecated in our woodland, beggars belief. If the council has an inexplicable legal obligation to designate land to travellers, then expand capacity at their existing sites in Beddington Lane and Featherbed Lane rather than dispersing them further across the borough into otherwise salubrious areas. I do hope that common sense prevails and that all five of the above proposals are quickly abandoned. I chose to live in this area precisely because it is not blighted by these hideous developments. I am sure that many other residents echo my sentiments.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become "white land" (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
This land is owned by Shirley Oaks Management Limited (SOML). This is the management company for the estate whose shareholders are the home owning residents. SOML own and manage the open spaces on behalf of and for the benefit of the residents for whom the land is ‘amenity open land’, i.e., communal, recreational space. The land was transferred to SOML’s ownership in 1985 whilst the estate was under development. I believe that the developer had infringed planning regulations by reducing the sizes of the gardens included with the dwellings that it was building in order to increase the density of the housing beyond that which had been agreed with the local planning authority. The open land, which is currently being scrutinized as part of the Council’s policy proposals review, was effectively, a penalty levied on the developer whereby an amount of green space was given over to SOML to own and manage as redress and compensation to the residents for skimping on the sizes of individual gardens. I am assured by a Director of SOML that the company has documentary proof of all of the above points. The residents pay a service charge that, inter alia, covers the cost of managing and maintaining these open spaces. SOML is bound by its covenants with the residents that this land shall be managed and maintained as communal open areas for the collective enjoyment and benefit of residents as long as the estate should be in existence. Thus, there is no scope on SOML’s part for participating in any effort to develop these spaces and any attempt to develop them undermines the importance of those spaces in providing amenity open land, as previously ordered by the local Council.

I have just read an email from Gavin Barwell, our Conservative MP, and my husband and I are horrified that the green fields of Shirley Oaks are to be built upon. Especially if the land is to be put aside for gypsies! How can this be right when so many young families are denied council housing and are forced to pay for private lets because of the lack of social housing. My back garden backs onto The main road that runs through the Shirley Oaks estate so you can understand my concerns.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
1883/02/005/DM43.4/O David Hurst
Object DM43.4 542
I object to the use of the site for housing.
Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

1904/01/004/DM43.4/O Emma Smith
Object DM43.4 542
I am writing to object to the use of the following five sites for housing: land at poppy lane reference number 128, Stroud green pumping station, 140 primrose lane reference number 504, land to the west of Shirley oaks road and to the rear of beech house and ash house reference number 542, land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle gardens reference number 548.
If the council will not keep them as metropolitan open land these five sites should at least be designated as local green spaces.
Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

1913/01/005/DM43.4/O Andrea Swaby
Object DM43.4 542
I hereby would like to register my serious OBJECTION to the council's proposal to build 750 new homes in Shirley Oak road and 35 new homes on shrub lands estate to create gypsy traveller sites. As I live on Devonshire I also have serious objection to allow 4 storeys in this area. If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.
Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

1918/01/005/DM43.4/O Mr Gareth Champion
Object DM43.4 542
I objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.
If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.
Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
1923/01/003/DM43.4/O Jane Anson

Object DM43.4

I have just read a letter from Mick Hewish, Resident Director of Shirley Oaks Management Ltd and I would like to object to the proposals for developing areas around Shirley Oaks.

These are as follows:
- Ref: 541 Shirley Oaks Road East side
- Ref: 542 Shirley Oaks Road West side
- Ref: 548 Land rear od Honeysuckle Gardens
- Ref: 128 Poppy Lane
- Ref: 504 Water Board HQ Primrose Lane

The high density of new homes would put considerable strain on the environment, including overcrowding, drainage, traffic and parking.

Objection to the allocation of Site 542 Shirley Oaks Road West side for proposed development as the high density of new homes would put considerable strain on the environment, including overcrowding, drainage, traffic and parking.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

1924/01/005/DM43.4/O Pamela Lees

Object DM43.4

I strongly object to many of the proposed developments within the Shirley area. I believe that allowing low rise developments around Shirley library will alter the balance of properties in that area, which are mainly detached and semi detached. People have moved to this 'sought after area' precisely because of its current character. I also object to the intensive developments proposed on the Metropolitan open land around Shirley Oaks. We need open land to reduce carbon emissions, for wildlife and for our own well being. Both of the above developments would put a huge strain on the services in the area, schools, doctors, busses and the already congested road system. I urge you not to progress with these proposals.

I also think that the two proposed travellers site in Shirley are inappropriate as they would be on Green Belt land, which is against your own policy and would be a blight on one of the few areas that are beautiful and wildlife friendly within Croydon.

I am always defending Croydon to those that mock it, saying that we have some lovely open spaces in which to walk and enjoy the diversity of nature. They only see the high rise blocks and litter. If these proposals go ahead, Croydon will have nothing left to commend itself.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1926/01/04</td>
<td>Councillor Luke Clancy</td>
<td>Site 542, Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would totally change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Shirley Avenue and Wickham Road.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942/01/06</td>
<td>Margaret West</td>
<td>Object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Land and proposed use for housing at sites 128 504 502 541 542 and 548. If development is allowed it will impact on the sense of community and have an adverse impact of trees and could be subject to flooding. It would also impact on access arrangements and the wildlife</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954/01/01</td>
<td>John Coppard</td>
<td>This land was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as &quot;Amenity Open Land&quot; because of our under-sized gardens &amp; transferred to a Management Company, with each property owner as a shareholder in that company. If the council will not keep it as Metropolitan Open Land it should at least be designated as Local Green Space.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993/01/04</td>
<td>Graham &amp; Kate Marsden</td>
<td>Shocked at the scale of proposals for Shirley and will fundamentally change the nature of the area. Front gardens are an asset to the local street scene. The proposals for focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an areas local character under Policy DM31.4 put this stability at risk, and may have an impact on the services we all need from the Council. Object to the de-designation of MOL - at a minimum it should be designated as local green space.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Object Details</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022/01/08</td>
<td>Joe Rowe</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>This land is designated as Metropolitan Open Land and there is no justification for re-designation. An increase of up to 741 homes on this land would put local services including schools, transport and already crowded roads under further pressure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035/01/04</td>
<td>Mrs Lorraine Cox</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Object: Shirley Hills Residents Association

Object: Shirley Oaks Village open land being built upon. We have lived here happily for 13 years. We want to say we don't want houses or a gypsy site down the road. I will be writing to my local MP Gavin Barwell to defend our way of life in Shirley Oaks village. Leave our open / green spaces alone.

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
The proposal to build new houses in Shirley Oaks Road does not fall within the Strategic Objectives because:-

Objective 2: This development will not foster an environment where existing enterprise can prosper, but will reduce enterprise.

Objective 4: This development will not reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation. It will not reduce unemployment, improve skills and education and improve environmental conditions, the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Objective 5: This development is not high quality and will not enhance the borough’s natural environment but will reduce the natural environment by turning a green area into housing.

Objective 7: This development will reduce the area as a safe, healthy and cohesive community but making the area overcrowded with residential property.

Objective 10: This development will reduce the quality and accessibility of green spaces and nature.

If this development is undertaken it will not deliver the strategic objective. This development will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The development will change the outlook and community within the South Croydon area and future generations will suffer because of this. This proposed development of new housing in Shirley Oak Road is not in keeping with the surrounding area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with housing in the area.

Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area and is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Building a traveler's site will increase noise levels and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area.

Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

This development would diminish the area of green fields and recreational land within the area.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
2056/01/027/DM43.4/C Councillor Dudley Mead London Borough of Croydon

Comment
DM43.4 542

Site 542, Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Shirley Avenue and Wickham Road.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

2062/01/043/DM43.4/O Councillor Jason Perry London Borough of Croydon

Object
Soundness - Justified
DM43.4 542

Site 542, Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Shirley Avenue and Wickham Road.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

2067/02/006/DM43.4/O Stephen Baker

Object
DM43.4 542

I also object to the development on Shirley oaks, as a resident who used to live there on Shirley oaks, any more development on this land would over burden what is already a road system that can not cope with the buses and tight turns that have been made on the estate, it’s would also ruin the feel of Shirley.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

2071/01/043/DM43.4/O Councillor Mario Creatura London Borough of Croydon

Object
Soundness - Justified
DM43.4 542

Site 542, Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Shirley Avenue and Wickham Road.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

2081/01/005/DM43.4/O Stuart & Monique Woodrow

Object
DM43.4 542

Development at this site would be detrimental to the openness, character, visual amenity and setting of Metropolitan Open Land. It would affect the residential amenity and result in the loss of trees and vegetation to the detriment of the surrounding area.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
We do accept that Croydon does need to provide new housing but this has to be on appropriate sites, i.e. previously developed land and not greenfield/metropolitan open land. We are firmly against this idea as it would set a precedent for inappropriate development/piecemeal development.

I and many residents in Shirley object to the following. 700 new homes to be built in Shirley oaks village with no provision for extra facilities like schools, doctors etc.

I object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land for the purpose of house building. My objection references MOL bearing the same protection from development as the Green Belt. If the Council will not agree to maintain the MOL status, designation as Local Green Space would lessen the negative impact on the local environment. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Shirley Avenue and Wickham Road.

The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 542. If the Council will not keep the land as MOL it should at least be designated as Local Green Space. I am particularly concerned about the effect of local roads that the suggested development will have as, when Heron Homes built the original development some years ago they were prevented by the local council from building the number of houses now proposed because of inadequate access roads onto the estate. Under present conditions the A232 Wickham Road is particularly subject to traffic delays especially in term time. Your proposed developments would also have a detrimental effect on our already crowded local schools and doctor's surgeries.
Mrs Susan Lockyer

Object

DM43.4
542

I accept that more housing is needed but this could not be developed in addition to 541. It would have to be one or the other. Some may be achievable but certainly not 236, that is approx. half of the rest of the estate put together! However the land is privately owned. The local management company has worked hard to maintain the green area and retain areas suitable for wildlife. The privately owned land is used by the residents as the properties do not have private gardens. The road is already congested with private cars making the bus route difficult. I do not consider it deliverable as planned, therefore it will not meet the present needs, let alone future needs. It is unrealistic to expect the land to sustain a limitless growth in population on relatively small patches. Transport will reach gridlock, the more land that is covered over limits drainage. More pipes will be channelled underground to bring in services and take away waste. Changes to due to global warming etc will be exacerbated if the population continues to converge on small land masses rather than spreading over the planet. In addition to the physical problems we would be creating, social problems will occur with people living in closer proximity in congested space.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Paul Vernon & Natalie Payne

Object

DM43.4
542

I am writing to object to: The de-designation of the five pieces of land as metropolitan open land and their proposed use of housing land at poppy lane reference number 128. I feel that building more houses on the green land would totally destroy the wildlife in the area and would ruin an area of beauty, and that the one road into the village wouldn't be able able to cope with more traffic as it is already busy.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Patrick Thomas

Object

DM43.4
542

I am writing at this time to record my objections on the following basis - the use of this site, 542, for housing

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I object to ref 542-I am writing to you with regard to the recent changes in Planning policies by Croydon Council and their impact on the designation of grass areas in Shirley Oaks Village. These areas were formerly designated as Metropolitan Open Land and had protection form being built on. However my understanding is that these areas may now be changed to no Metropolitan Land thus allowing their use for future housing developments. As a resident of Shirley I would like to point out that our land was designated as 'Amenity Open Land' in 1985 by Croydon Council because of our undersized gardens and transferred to a Management Company, with each property owner as a shareholder of the Company. Whilst I fully accept the need for new housing in Croydon, in particular affordable housing for first time owners, it is clear the sheer scale of the proposed development and the resultant destruction of a precious greenfield site in Shirley Oaks Village that I object to. I would have no issue with a much smaller scale development of the village, as part of an overall plan for Croydon where new housing was primarily targeted toward development of brownfield sites under the council's jurisdiction. I urge you to consideration of my suggestions in the weeks ahead and look forward to receiving feedback in due course.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object

DM43.4

542

I object to the use of the land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 for housing.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object

DM43.4

542

I object to development on these sites as they are MOL and amenity land used by surrounding residents. This would be detrimental to the area as the existing houses on the Estate have undersized gardens and would be intrusive and lead to increase in traffic and access problems and noise issues.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object

DM43.4

542

Mrs Jane Smith

Object

DM43.4

542

Breda Mohan

Object
Object The use of the following 5 sites for housing; ref no. 128, 504, 541, 542, 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as local green spaces.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Support Soundness - Justified My objections are based on the fact that the proposals are not in the best interests of the electorate of the borough and that the proposals will only be harmful to the environment offering no benefits to the community. Building on the Green Belt is not the best option.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object I object to the use of the Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 for housing:

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object to the use of this site for housing.

If the Council will not keep it as Metropolitan Open Land it should be at least designated as Local Green Space.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Object Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 542

Site 542, Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Shirley Avenue and Wickham Road.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object DM43.4 542

Mr & Mrs Jeffrey

I thoroughly object to these proposals, the traffic has built up over time and I wouldn't even want to begin to imagine what Shirley Oaks would be like if another 600+ homes where to be built, that would be practically dubling the size of Shirley Oaks as it is at present.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object DM43.4 542

Mr & Mrs Jeffrey

I will be objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council won't keep it as MOL it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I will also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
We strongly object to Croydon Council’s local planning proposals and plans for development to the site being used for residential development. We strongly object to the de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village. No more housing should be built on MO land and it is inappropriate for development since it would over-stretch the local road infrastructure with the additional traffic. The road in and out of Shirley Oaks Village is very narrow and there is hardly enough room for the bus to get by. The increased volume of traffic and parked vehicles would be unmanageable bringing traffic in all directions to a complete standstill. We believe the council needs to rethink its proposals for the sites, but would hope that in any event, an overwhelming majority of homeowners living in the village will reject the council’s proposals. Not only would the area be an eyesore, but the proposal to build a whopping 700 new homes is unrealistic as the open green spaces are very small. You would also be destroying the wildlife by cutting down our precious trees and removing the open green spaces. It was agreed, and we believe documented, that after the build of phase 5 on Shirley Oaks Village that no more houses would be built, and this was a deciding factor when individuals bought their properties on Shirley Oaks Village. If over 700 new homes are built, it would no longer be a village but instead an ugly built-up housing estate, changing the character of the landscape completely. From our perspective, if the proposals were approved, we would have no choice but to move away from the area. It would be too upsetting to see our open green spaces developed to excess with over 700 new homes. I have no doubt that developing the land would also devalue the property prices in the future. We find the council’s proposals ludicrous and unreasonable. It is imperative that we protect the precious remaining green spaces around Shirley Oaks Village. On that basis, we vigorously object to the council’s proposal to develop the
Object

DM43.4

We strongly object to the changes to designations of our grass areas. As a resident and shareholder I point out that our land was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as Amenity Open Lan because of our under-sized gardens. This land is for our use. Not only would building be detrimental to our health and well being but also to the varied and protected wildlife that we have. There are plenty of rundown places in Croydon which should be regenerated and can be built on without impinging into our green spaces.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object

DM43.4

Soundness - Justified

I object to the designation of Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks enabling parts of this land to be used for housing and in particular site 542, with which I have an adjoining boundary. Should the Council not keep this land as Metropolitan Open Land these spaces should at the least be designated as Local Green Space.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object

DM43.4

I object to the use of the site for housing. If the Council will not keep this site as MOL, it should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object

DM43.4

I object to the use of the site for housing. If the Council will not keep it as MOL, it should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object

DM43.4

I object to the use of the site for housing. If the Council will not keep the site as MOL, it should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Object DM43.4 To build on this land would alter for
the worse, the character of the
neighbourhood and present social
problems of overcrowding. The
current infrastructure could not
support such a development.

Change As this site does not have a
willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be
developed. Therefore the
proposed allocation will not be
carried forward into the
Proposed Submission draft
and the land will in effect
become 'white land' (land with
no designation) in the
Local Plan.

Object DM43.4 I wish to register my objection to the
proposed plans for the housing
development on the green areas
around the Shirley Oaks Estate.

Change As this site does not have a
willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be
developed. Therefore the
proposed allocation will not be
carried forward into the
Proposed Submission draft
and the land will in effect
become 'white land' (land with
no designation) in the
Local Plan.

Object DM43.4 I strongly object to your proposed
development plans for this site.

Change As this site does not have a
willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be
developed. Therefore the
proposed allocation will not be
carried forward into the
Proposed Submission draft
and the land will in effect
become 'white land' (land with
no designation) in the
Local Plan.

Object DM43.4 Our Local Green Belt should remain
as such and not de-designated as
Metropolitan Open Land which then
could be used for new
housing. I strongly object to this
proposal.

Change As this site does not have a
willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be
developed. Therefore the
proposed allocation will not be
carried forward into the
Proposed Submission draft
and the land will in effect
become 'white land' (land with
no designation) in the
Local Plan.
Ms Karen Fletcher

Object DM43.4 542

We wish to register our objection to the proposals to change the policy map 43 in relation to Metropolitan Open Land at Shirley Oaks Village. Like many residents we purchased our home on the understanding that the MOL was owned by the residents themselves and would not be developed. It was a strong factor in our decision to purchase our house. The land itself was transferred to the management company by a transfer dating 30 July 1991 made between Heron Homes Limited and Shirley Oaks Management Limited. The third schedule to this transfer contains restrictive covenants and I have attached the relevant clauses. These clauses that the land is to be used as open space so I do not understand how you can ignore this and grant planning permission to build houses. We understand the need for more housing but feel that this is not the way forward. It would be far better to look at the buildings/land owned by the London Borough of Croydon first to see which could be used as residential properties. The old Ashburton Library in Ashburton Park is such a building that could be redeveloped and used for housing and I am sure there are many more.

Mrs S White

Object DM43.4 542

I object to the use of the land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 for housing.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr John Booroff

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

Please note that I wish to object to the proposals set out in reference numbers 504, 541, 542, 548 and 128, for the following reasons:

- There has been insufficient notice of the consultation period, and the proposals are not clearly set out as pertaining to Shirley Oaks Village.
- This site is designated as Metropolitan Open Land, and I do not agree that it does not meet the criteria, as it does contribute to the physical structure of London, and there currently are open-air facilities, which serve significant parts of London.
- Increasing the housing density in this development will have a detrimental effect on the overall environment, and will decrease the value of these homes, as the development contains smaller gardens than those originally planned, and the surrounding green spaces were left vacant to compensate for the lack of adequate open space.
- Any change in the restrictions will adversely affect the accessibility to nature and wildlife of the area, which contains features of metropolitan importance.
- There is inadequate infrastructure in the locality to accommodate such an increase in population.
- There has been an inadequate investigation of the brownfield sites, which already exist in the borough, or of other open land which could be used instead.

In view of the above, please register my objection to all five proposals, and please acknowledge receipt of this email.

Change:
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr John Booroff

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

Land at Poppy Lane and Primrose Lane, Shirley Oaks Village.

Residential development.

Can you please inform me why?

- All three consultation documents have only appeared in the last few days, yet the consultation meetings are for 25th and 28th of November. This is surely insufficient notice.
- I have tried to view the proposals on your website without success. Why would this be?

In view of the insufficient notice and lack of both digital as well as hard information, please register this email as an objection.

Change:
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
2572/01/002/DM43.4/O Mr Keith Simmonds

Object: Justified

DM43.4
542

As a resident I would like to object to your proposals to build homes on the existing amenity land on Shirley Oaks due to the fact that the infrastructure could not cope and these areas are of natural beauty and full of wildlife, this is a sanctuary that must not be removed.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

2573/01/005/DM43.4/O Mr Keith Harris

Object

DM43.4
542

Development Reference Numbers 541,542,548,128,504

This cause dangerous increase traffic through Shirley Oaks Road & Primrose Lane, and also increase parking by the Synagogue which is bad at the best of times.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

2574/01/002/DM43.4/O Mr Lewis Reynolds

Object

DM43.4
542

I wish to object to planned proposals; ref 542.

These planned proposals will not fit within the current aesthetics of the estate so please accept this email as an objection to the proposal.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

2578/01/003/DM43.4/O Mr Tau Wey

Object

DM43.4
542

I am concerned about this proposal. When I bought my house in Angelica Gardens, Shirley Oaks Village, it was my understanding that I would also become a communal owner of the surrounding Amenity Open Land. This was guaranteed by each freeholder in Shirley Oaks owning a share of the Shirley Oaks Management Limited, which in turn owns and manages the Amenity Open Land.

Like many residents, I purchased my house partly due to the pleasant areas of green space available in my surroundings. I also think that the character of the current surrounding gives each property the value that it currently has.

I would also object to attempts by Croydon Council or other agencies to attempt to purchase the land from Shirley Oaks Management Limited in the future.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I am emailing to outline my objections to the planning notices in relation to the above reference numbers which concern land near to Shirley Oaks Road, Honeysuckle Gardens, Poppy Lane and Primrose Lane.

I object to these proposed developments for the following reasons:

1. The move to unravel the protection of Metropolitan open land from significant housing developments is a disappointing and avoidable move by Croydon Council. This sets an unnecessary precedent. This land should be protected by its designation and the council has sufficient options elsewhere in the borough on land that has no such designation.

2. Much of the land concerned was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as "Amenity Open Land" because of the under-sized gardens of many of the Shirley Oaks property. I live with a young family on Shirley Oaks with a very small garden and object to the loss of this open land which is regularly used by young families and residents of the area who do not have large gardens or any gardens at all in some instances.

3. Such proposals will unduly change the character and desirability of the local area which is defined by its open space. Shirley Oaks remains one of the few genuine peaceful residential areas within the borough and such thoughtless development will threaten this.

4. The roads leading to Shirley Oaks are roads not given to significant volumes of traffic. Increasing the density of the population within the immediate area as substantially as you are proposing creates challenges for traffic and parking. The scale of the developments will exponentially increase the volume of traffic and create challenges for parking.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Ms Ellie London

Object DM43.4

I object to the use of the site for housing.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Ms Rachel James

Object DM43.4

I object to the following proposal for shirley oaks village. Ref: 541, Ref: 542, Ref: 548, Ref: 128, Ref: 504

I love my home currently on shirley oaks our gardens are considerably in the small side and I daily take walks on to the land with have with my 2 children and husband. I feel this would depreciate the area and I wouldn't be happy with any of the above plans.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Helen Armstrong

Object DM43.4

I am writing to register my household's objection to the proposed developments in Shirley. The projected number of homes will impact dramatically not only on the existing residents and the open feel of the site, but essentially on the transport infrastructure. Wickham Road is a major route, prone to congestion at peak hours and any significant increase in road users will have a dramatic knock on effect not for residents and also for commuters in all directions. The Trinity roundabout is a major junction with many bus routes passing through, this would grind to even more of a halt. The potential number of proposed properties is unacceptably high.

Objection to the proposed development of Site 542

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Ian Broyd

Object DM43.4

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, the five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces and not used for housing.

The site should be Local Green Space.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 542</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Nicola Hodgson</td>
<td>The Open Spaces Society</td>
<td>The Society objects to the proposals to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and on land surrounding Shirley Oaks Village, in particular the proposals on page 68. This land is currently protected from development similar to protection of green belt land. The Society objects in principle to the decision of the council to de-designate land currently held as Metropolitan Open Land. Even if parts of the areas were designated as local green space, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, there would still be a huge loss of open space. If development were allowed in these areas it would be detrimental to the amenity value of the area for the benefit of the public.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Miss P Jones</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 542</td>
<td>Having lived in Shirley for over 50 years I strongly object to Croydon Council plans to de-designate the Metropolitan open land so that most of this land can be used for new housing. At the moment it has the same protection as Green Belt. Firstly, this would entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding area, changing the character of the area, more importantly the road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic. Try getting out to Wickham Road from Orchard Avenue in rush hour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/01/037/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Paul Sandford</td>
<td>Bourne Society</td>
<td>DM43.4 542</td>
<td>Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well-used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Shirley Avenue and Wickham Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The more specific site allocations represent a large reduction in the amount of designated and non-designated open space. While we acknowledge the need to build new homes and associated infrastructure such as schools, Croydon’s growing population also needs quality open spaces for all the human amenity and ecosystem services which they provide.

We object to the proposed development on green spaces, which are currently designated, and should remain designated, as part of the Shirley Oaks MOL. As mentioned as part of our response to SP7, we feel that most of the site still warrants its MOL designation. We object to the following site allocations as they will fragment the green space impacting on residents’ amenity and wildlife’s use of the area (both current and potential).

The presence of scattered detached housing does not impact the overall openness of the site, and therefore is not a reason to remove the designation of MOL and allocate for further development.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object Soundness - Effective DM43.4 542

Mrs Y Sussey

object to proposals at this site because of the increased risk of flooding and adverse impact on air quality. New Housing should be on brownfield sites

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Ms S Mawaziny

I object to the use of the Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 for housing:

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

C Morley-Smith

Respect green fields and use brown field land first. Don’t just build to reach targets without proper research, debate and thought of the long term consequences.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mrs Patricia Harding: Object DM43.4 S42 I would like it known for the record that I strongly object to any changes of use to the open land within Shirley Oaks Village. Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr & Mrs Kellas: Object DM43.4 S42 I would say to the Council Croydon is full and kindly leave our precious Shirley open spaces and attractive streets alone, we don't need an odd assortment of blocks of flats amongst the semi-detached and small detached properties here, or in similar Croydon suburbs - it would be an architectural disaster along the lines of the 1950s concrete jungle development of the centre of Croydon. And we don't have the infrastructure to cope with more people, or the roads to cope with the traffic we already have. Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr & Mrs Perry: Object DM43.4 S42 The proposal to build 750 homes on our amenity open land is depicable, we have lived here since 1986 and paid yearly for these grounds to be maintained. Croydon needs open spaces and trees for the town to breathe. The process of building in this small area would be intolerable and increase the traffic at the Wickham Road and Shirley Road would be horrific. We will complain to our MP to stop this lunacy. Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr Beresford Walker: Object DM43.4 S42 I object to Policy DM43, reference Site 542 to build new homes on land to the East & West of Shirley Oaks Road. Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr & Mrs Panagakis: Object DM43.4 S42 Object to the use of land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road (reference number 542) for housing. Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2720/01/002</td>
<td>DM43.4/4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs C P Smith</td>
<td>Object to this site as this land was designated to residents of Shirley Oaks village as amenity open land in 1985 because of the undersized gardens and transferred to the management company. The land should remain Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2721/01/008</td>
<td>DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr A Zelisko</td>
<td>Object to the use of this site for housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2729/01/002</td>
<td>DM43.4/C</td>
<td>Mr G Simmonds</td>
<td>Object to site 542 as the site is undeliverable for the following: lack of evidence to support de-designation as the report relies entirely on opinion uninformed by actual specifics of land use and forms an important of Shirley's green infrastructure. The land is used for recreation and its loss would be contrary to the Mayor's Pan Policy 17.7 which highlights the positive aspects of MOL such as play areas for children and amenity areas for grandparents to play with their children, play areas for kids going home from school and also for others such as dogwalkers. The land should be retained as MOL as it meets the criteria set out by the London Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am writing to object to:
The use of the following five sites for housing:
• Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128
• Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504
• Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541
• Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542
• Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. People buy property on Shirley Oaks Village because of the green open spaces, the peace and tranquility, the beautiful old Oak Trees. You cannot suddenly take that away these surroundings; people have spent hard earned money to live on this Village. Residents also pay for maintaining these green open spaces. The service road will not take any more traffic; two buses can hardly pass, and indeed were not supposed to drive round the estate together because of the small service road. There is a hospital and ambulance station on the estate, and any increase in traffic will interfere with their services.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr Ian K White
Object
I object to the use of the Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 for housing.
Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr E Tilly
Object
Object to this site as building on it would lead to a loss of greenspace between Shirley oaks and the surrounding area
Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mrs Frances Pearce
Object
Soundness - Justified
I am writing regarding the Council’s plans for a massive redevelopment in the Shirley Area. More houses mean more traffic on our already crowded roads. I no longer go into Croydon because of the journey times. How long would it be before the Council considered bringing in a congestion charge. When you build all these properties do you consider the local amenities and the effect that more people would have on these. Where are the school places for all of these children? Regarding doctors. Unless it is an emergency I have to wait at least a week for an appointment. This waiting time can only increase if there are more patients. Is it the Council’s policy to build over green belt land to the detriment of locals? I sincerely hope not. I think you need to seriously reconsider these plans.
Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr David Jenner
Object
By building on this land the risk of Subsidence and Heave would increase substantially
Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2758/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr David Jenner</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 S42</td>
<td>By building on this Site the risk of flooding to properties on Shirley Oaks and those adjoining Shirley Oaks would increase substantially.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2758/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr David Jenner</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 S42</td>
<td>Currently this site is designated as Metropolitan Open Land as per Part 3D.10 from the London Plan there is no indication that Croydon Council have the approval of the Mayor Of London to this de-designation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2758/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr David Jenner</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 S42</td>
<td>This site is currently owned by Shirley Oaks Management and the agreement under Section 52 of the Town and Country planning Act 1971 requires the site to be held as amenity open space and prevents any development of the site and therefore this site is not deliverable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2758/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr David Jenner</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 S42</td>
<td>There are a large number of protected trees on Shirley Oaks which would be removed to allow the development being proposed by Croydon Council on the Site. There are a large number of badgers and other wildlife currently resident on Shirley Oaks, Site S42. If the proposed development is carried out then this wildlife is likely to be killed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2758/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr David Jenner</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 S42</td>
<td>When the development was originally constructed by Heron Homes the road system was deliberately laid out in a manner to not only reduce the amount of traffic but also the type of vehicles travelling through Shirley Oaks. Currently the road network is at saturation and could not cope with increase in traffic that the proposed development will bring. This will inevitably lead to an increase in road accidents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These open spaces are collectively designated as Metropolitan Open Land. It would be disastrous to lose a link in this chain.

**THE SHIRLEY GREEN CHAIN**
The green open spaces of Shirley Oaks Village provide several links in the Shirley Green Chain. This chain starts at the South Norwood Country Park in the north and runs south through Ryland Fields, Long Lane Woods, Ashburton Playing Fields, the open spaces of Shirley Oaks Village, Trinity School playing fields, Shirley Park Golf Course and up to the Shirley Hills. From there the Green Chain continues through Heathfield, Bramley Bank Nature Reserve, Littleheath Woods and via Selsdon Park to Kings Wood at Hamsey Green. These open spaces are collectively designated as Metropolitan Open Land. It would be disastrous to lose a link in this chain.

**Planning Policy Guidance Note 9**
This guidance stresses the importance of nature conservation, not only on nationally important sites, but also suggests that many urban sites for nature conservation have enhanced local importance as a consequence of the relative lack of wildlife sites in built up areas. Statutory and non-statutory sites which provide wildlife corridors, links or stepping stones from one habitat site to another, all help to form a network necessary to endure the maintenance of the current range and diversity of our flora and fauna.

The Green Spaces in Shirley Oaks were designated as Metropolitan Open Land and today still meet the criteria for this protection. The sites (1) contain conservation and habitat interest of value at a metropolitan level and (2) forms part of the Shirley Green Chain. These are two of the criteria for Metropolitan Open Land. The Green Spaces in Shirley Oaks Village were designated as Metropolitan Open Land and today still meet the criteria for this protection.

These sites possibly have a section 52 agreement, and are part ownerships shared by each of the Shirley Oaks Village residents.

Re-designation of MOL falls foul of

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
the London Plan.

Existing dwellings to be retained or demolished? If retained the Site Area should be adjusted to take account of the existing dwellings: The Lodge, Beech House & Ash House? On the East site And the Synagogue and the two house (can’t read their names) on the West side.

Infrastructure not specified to support development.

Schools are oversubscribed; GP Surgeries oversubscribed

Road system could not cope with the increase in traffic during peak travel times

Area has high water table and is subject to flooding.

London Plan

POLICY 7.17 METROPOLITAN OPEN LAND

Strategic

A The Mayor strongly supports the current extent of Metropolitan Open Land (MOL), its extension in appropriate circumstances and its protection from development having an adverse impact on the openness of MOL.

Planning decisions

B The strongest protection should be given to London’s Metropolitan Open Land and inappropriate development refused, except in very special circumstances, giving the same level of protection as in the Green Belt. Essential ancillary facilities for appropriate uses will only be acceptable where they maintain the openness of MOL.

LDF preparation

C Any alterations to the boundary of MOL should be undertaken by Boroughs through the LDF process, in consultation with the Mayor and adjoining authorities.

D To designate land as MOL boroughs need to establish that the land meets at least one of the following criteria:

a) it contributes to the physical structure of London by being clearly distinguishable from the built up area
b) it includes open air facilities, especially for leisure, recreation, sport, the arts and cultural activities, which serve either the whole or significant parts of London
c) it contains features or landscapes (historic, recreational, biodiversity) of either national or metropolitan valued it forms part of a Green Chain or a link in the network of green infrastructure and meets one of the above criteria.
The policy guidance of paragraphs 79-92 of the NPPF on Green Belts applies equally to Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). MOL has an important role to play as part of London's multifunctional green infrastructure and the Mayor is keen to see improvements in its overall quality and accessibility. Such improvements are likely to help human health, biodiversity and quality of life. Development that involves the loss of MOL in return for the creation of new open space elsewhere will not be considered appropriate. Appropriate development should be limited to small scale structures to support outdoor open space uses and minimise any adverse impact on the openness of MOL. Green chains are important to London's open space network, recreation and biodiversity. They consist of footpaths and the open spaces that they link, which are accessible to the public. The open spaces and links within a Green Chain should be designated as MOL due to their London-wide importance.

2775/01/043/DM43.4/O Cllr Tim Pollard
London Borough of Croydon
Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4
Site 542, Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Shirley Avenue and Wickham Road.
Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

2776/01/043/DM43.4/O Cllr Helen Pollard
London Borough of Croydon
Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4
Site 542, Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Shirley Avenue and Wickham Road.
Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Object

The preferred approach is not the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3. The land is current Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land or otherwise designated green land and should not be built on. I disagree that it "does not contribute to the physical structure of London". Just because it has no facilities does not mean that it is not an asset to the life of London. Yes, it is deliverable but should not be delivered on that land. No, it is not sustainable because it removes the need for green space for future generations.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Soundness - Justified

Site 542, Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Shirley Avenue and Wickham Road.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Soundness - Justified

Site 542, Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Shirley Avenue and Wickham Road.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Soundness - Justified

Site 542, Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Shirley Avenue and Wickham Road.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 542, Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would totally change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Shirley Avenue and Wickham Road.</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential development on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and around Shirley Oaks Village (reference numbers 125, 404, 541, 542, 548) on Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals) This is Metropolitan Open Land which is accorded the same level of statutory protection as the Green Belt. Changing this designation in order to allow building amounts to an abuse of the planning process. The area is liable to localised flooding, which anyway makes it unsuitable for residential housing. There appears to be no provision for additional infrastructure which would support the building of up to 750 new homes. In particular, local roads are already inadequate; merging traffic queues are already common in this area, especially towards the town centre. The proposals cannot but fundamentally alter the character of this part of Shirley, again, for the worse</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object to the development at land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road as it is protected land as MOL</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The site is owned by Shirley Oaks Management Company. The site is currently designated MOL. There is a legal agreement which relates to the land and identifies an area of which the site is part. It requires that the site be transferred to a management company and be held as amenity open space. The company is the successor in the title to the original developer. The Section 52 agreement prevents development of the site and therefore it is not deliverable. The MOL designation should remain. Should the decision to de-designate the site as MOL, it should be designated at local green space. Development of the site would not comply with the NPPF nor would it be sustainable development for the reasons set out above and those identified in respect to the objection to Policy SP7. The highway network is already at saturation point and in any event any proposed residential development would generate an unacceptable amount of traffic. The site has a high water table.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the use of the following five sites for housing:
- Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 545.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I write concerning Croydon Council's proposals contained in the consultation document of the Croydon Local Plan that includes the re-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in Shirley and specifically within the confines of Shirley Oaks. I consider these proposals and others listed above to be inappropriate as they would significantly change the character of the area in which I have lived all 61 years of my life and I wish to add my voice to those already expressing concerns and objections about these proposals.

I strongly object to the proposal to re-designate Metropolitan Open Land to facilitate the building of new homes on land in Shirley Oaks and the provision of temporary or permanent traveller/gypsy sites in areas that are acknowledged by the Council to be in the green belt at Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries in Conduit Lane.

These proposals are totally out of keeping with the character of the area which predominantly comprise owner-occupied semi and detached homes. Surely areas considered to be brownfield sites are more appropriate than the unacceptable use of Metropolitan Open Land?

The proposals affecting the area surrounding Shirley Library are also of concern as this would adversely change the character of the area and potentially result in the establishment of additional unsightly car-parking sites on the south side of Wickham Road, similar to that at the front of the Shirley Medical Centre at 370 Wickham Road.
These areas allowed by Shirley Oaks Management Ltd. 488 residents are shareholders in this company. This land was transferred to the above company in 1985 and designated as open amenity land by Croydon Council for use of residents as the gardens of the dwellings built by Heron Homes were very small.

These areas of open amenity land are fully utilised by the residents and others for recreation and leisure and are clearly identified as private land. High density building in these areas would result in lack of pleasure and leisure amenity for present residents, increase traffic congestion and an increased risk to residents personal safety and health especially through high pollution levels.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object

I object to the use of the site for housing.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object

I raise strong objection to the allocation of this site for development. I am a shareholder in Shirley Oaks Management Company which owns the land and maintains it. I pay a quarterly charge towards its upkeep. The traffic is already too much for the road through the village. Please do not allow our village to be destroyed.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object

I raise strong objection to the allocation of this site for development. I am a shareholder in Shirley Oaks Management Company which owns the land and maintains it. I pay a quarterly charge towards its upkeep. The traffic is already too much for the road through the village. Please do not allow our village to be destroyed.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
The proposal to build new houses in Shirley Oaks Road does not fall within the Strategic Objectives because:-

Objective 2: This development will not foster an environment where existing enterprise can prosper, but will reduce enterprise.

Objective 4: This development will not reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation. It will not reduce unemployment, improve skills and education and improve environmental conditions, the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Objective 5: This development is not of high quality and will not enhance the borough's natural environment but will reduce the natural environment by turning a green area into housing.

Objective 7: This development will reduce the area as a safe, healthy and cohesive community but making the area overcrowded with residential property.

Objective 10: This development will reduce the quality and accessibility of green space and nature.

This proposed development of new housing in Shirley Oak Road is not within keeping of the current development within this area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with housing in the area. Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area and is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Building a travelers site will increase noise levels and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area.

Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. This development would diminish the area of green fields and recreational land within the area.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mrs Janet Hills

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 542

1) I own pt the Land and am not prepared to sell my Share!
2) This open pasturage is used by children (playing) and dog walkers from other parts of Shirley. I know this because friends of mine walk their dogs - and pick up their litter.
3) It will grossly decrease the value of my property. !!!
4) I am in my 70's (I moved here 8 yrs ago because of the tranquility) and haven't the energy to move again !
5) The Wickham Road is already congested a lot of the time, I can't imagine what it'll be like with the introduction of 750 'new builds' on Shirley Oaks + the plans for altering other parts of Shirley.
6) There are wild birds, and animals, living here as well as us you know!!

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Jane Bowden

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 542

2) I understand that the Council are seeking to de-designate various pieces of land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and around Shirley Oaks village, so that it is no longer Metropolitan Open Land, with a view to potentially building between 304 and 751 new homes. (Reference numbers 128, 504, 541, 542 & 548).

Open, green land is essential to maintain a pleasant living area, and to maintain the character of the area. In addition, this number of additional dwellings would seriously overwhelm the local infrastructure. In particular, the local road infrastructure could not cope with the additional traffic.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr John Helen

Object: DM43.4 542

Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542).

I will be objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I will also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

I am happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but I will be objecting to building on precious open space.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Our family has lived on Shirley Oaks Village approx 20 years ago and understood the village to be a Private estate and I am writing to object to the de-designation of the open land around the village and to the use of five sites for housing. The land rightfully belongs to the residents, the area and roads will become congested and property values will decrease.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

I am writing to object to the use of the Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, reference number 542, for housing:

1. The change in local designation and subsequent development would lead to a material reduction to an important green space and amenity within a basically urban area.
2. The effect and congestion on the local infrastructure which would be caused by the building of more housing to an already densely developed site.
3. The effect on existing property values of property to Shirley Oaks and surrounding areas caused by the reduced amenity and congestion.

I urge that the Council should take these and other objections in consideration and not continue with their plans to re-designate the areas described above.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Land currently designated as Metropolitan Open Land at Poppy Lane, Stroud Green Pumping Station, to the east of Shirley Oaks Road, to the west of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens has been identified as suitable for up to 741 homes (pages 445-446, 451-452, 453-454, 455-456, 457-458 Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference numbers 128, 504, 541, 542 and 548).

I object to these proposals on the grounds that:

This land is designated as Metropolitan Open Land and there is no justification for re designation. An increase of up to 741 homes on this land would put local services including schools, transport and already crowded roads under further pressure.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Once the area surrounding Shirley Oaks Village is re-designated the Council plans to build 751 homes on 5 separate sites. Supposing the average house is for 4 people, 3000 people in total will move to the area. The housing will attract families - potentially half being children. The Council mention no where in their 700 page document about the building of new schools (primary and secondary) nor the building of doctor surgeries, nor the expanding of the local shopping area let alone the already stretched local road infrastructure. Our local area can't cope as it is - St John's primary school has applied for an extension to cope with the current demand on its places. During rush hour buses frequently don't stop at bus stops because they are full. Traffic is often diverted down our road, Shirley Church Road, if there is an accident on Wickham Road or Gravel Hill. The dual carriage way (Shirley Park) is crawling along during rush hour. The council are planning to add another 1000 plus cars to this equation. Shirley is often described according to estate agents as leafy, popular, excellent schools. By building 751 more homes the character of the area will change completely.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3018/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Chris Lynam</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in the vicinity of Shirley Oaks Road and Shirley Oaks Village. The land should be at least designated as Local Green Space, for its protection from development. This open space provides a green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, and should be retained in its present form. Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the local schools are over-subscribed as well as the already-stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.</td>
<td>DM43.4 542</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3028/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Nick Barnes</td>
<td>Having read both local plans for the shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Road. None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.</td>
<td>DM43.4 542</td>
<td>Object - Justified</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3029/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Paul Newton</td>
<td>Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic. If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.</td>
<td>DM43.4 542</td>
<td>Object - Justified</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I strongly object to the proposed development plans for the Shirley Area. I have lived here all my life and have seen a steady influx of people, and a massive reduction in the green space in the area. The roads are already far too congested and the social infrastructure is already struggling to cope with the number of residents. There are many areas in the Croydon borough much more suited to such large scale development. I am thinking particularly of areas around Purley Way. There are also many brown field sites in the borough that could be put to more effective use as housing without affecting the green areas. I guess the council prefers to redevelop the green areas rather than the brown field areas due to cost. As I said I do not want my local area turned into a concrete jungle where there is nowhere for people to relax in the open.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr Brian Jacobs

I am writing to object to all the proposed changes and plans affecting the Shirley neighbourhood as advised to me by Gavin Barwell and the Executive Committee of Spring Park Residents Association.

1) I object strongly to any plans to change the definition of existing land and use.
2) When dealing with the further extension of Shirley Oaks site I am disturbed by the fact there are just two access points i.e. Shirley Road and Wickham Road the latter being onto the A232 which is very busy all day and particularly during rush hour periods, when traffic backs up westwards to the Shirley Road roundabout and beyond.
3) The proposals for Shirley Oaks, given to me indicate land being suitable for between 304 and 751 additional homes. As many properties nowadays have at least one car this will have a serious additional congestion to Shirley and Wickham Roads.
4) Additionally, development of this size would have a serious demand on existing schools (primary particularly), doctors and other local services.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Christine McCarthy

I object to all the proposals set out for new housing and travellers sites in Shirley. I feel it will ruin the area by taking up all the open spaces.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Claire Hunt  
Object DM43.4  
542

I am writing to express my objection to the proposals of development to the Shirley oaks estate, on website www.croydon.gov.uk/policiesmap on "Changes to the policy Map 43" those being:-
Ref:541. Shirley oaks road East side, up to 215 new homes!!!
Ref:542. Shirley oaks road west side, up to 238 new homes!!!
Ref:548. Land rear of honeysuckle gardens, up to 125 new homes!!!
Ref:128. Poppy lane, up to 107 new homes!!!
Ref:504. Up to 68 new homes or gypsy site at the water board HQ, primrose lane!!!!!!!!!!!

I brought my home on 5 Flag Close, Shirley Oaks, Surrey, CR0 8XT as it was on a green and pleasant estate and on the understanding this land was designated to us as because of our undersized gardens. We were told this land would never be built on and each of the properties on the estate are shareholders of this land as it was designated "amenity open land" by the Croydon council and transferred to our management company.

We are forming groups and seeking legal advice and looking into the legal implications and small print to your proposals and will not take this laying

Mr John Mills  
Object DM43.4  
542

I object to the use of the site for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?
Mrs Halina Tutt

Object DM43.4 542

This lovely part of Croydon seems to be the worst affected by the Council’s proposals. Croydon Council plans to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village. Metropolitan Open Land has the same protection from development as the Green Belt. The Council are proposing to remove this designation so that most of this land can be used for new housing. I am objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land. If the Council won’t keep it as such, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, but trust me, the local roads couldn’t cope with the additional traffic. If you ever travel on Wickham Road, Addiscombe Road or Lower Addiscombe Road at rush hour you will agree with me. The traffic is already horrendous and more housing would simply treble this problem.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr Paul Grosser

Object DM43.4 542

The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 542. I have friends who live in Shirley Oaks village and I know them and myself along with many others all object to the proposals to build on the green areas. This grass area is used by many and would totally change the area if built on and we don’t want it. Part of the charm of this area is those green areas and it has something that you don’t find often in Croydon so please let us keep the green areas as we all object to them being built on.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr Ben Lynam

Object DM43.4 542

I object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in the vicinity of Shirley Oaks Road and Shirley Oaks Village. The land should be at least designated as Local Green Space, for its protection from development. This open space provides a green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, and should be retained in its present form. Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the local schools are over-subscribed as well as the already-stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| DM43.4    | 1De-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village thus enabling the following sites to be built on.
|           |   a) Policy DM43, Reference 128 Land to build 51 to 107 homes in Poppy Lane
|           |   b) Policy DM43, Reference 504 Land to build 26 to 68 homes at Shroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane including conversion of the pumping station
|           |   c) Policy DM43, Reference 541 Land to build 80 to 215 homes to the east of Shirley road and rear of Beech House
|           |   d) Policy DM43, Reference 542 Land to build 88 to 236 homes to the west of Shirley Oaks Road
|           |   e) Policy DM43, Reference 548 Land to build 5 to 13 homes to the rear of 5 to 13 Honeysuckle Gardens This entails loss of green space, changing the character of the area and local road infrastructure unable to cope.  |
|           |        |        |
| DM43.4    | 2As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.  |
| DM43.4    | 3As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.  |
| DM43.4    | 4As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.  |
| DM43.4    | 5As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.  |
Object

DM43.4
542

I am writing to lodge my objection to some of the proposals contained in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals. In particular:

1. Shirley Oaks
The proposal to re-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on Shirley Oaks Road and around Shirley Oaks Village so that it can be used for new housing (page 68, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals).

My main objections are:
This would result in the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area. The local road network could not cope with the additional traffic. Insufficient local infrastructure to cope with the increased population.

Conclusion
The proposals I have highlighted can only be viewed as negative. If adopted, they will increase the local population – and the density of that population – without providing any supporting infrastructure. The new residents from the planned apartment blocks and traveller sites will need additional public services such as schools, medical services and shops. Older residents will give way to young families who require greater social support, yet no additional resources are identified to help manage the changing demographic. Traffic congestion along already busy roads will increase, as will pollution and accident black-spots. The few remaining green spaces will disappear. Overall, the proposals signal a reduction in the quality of life for both the existing residents and the newcomer.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I am writing to object to:
1. The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:
   • Coombe Lodge Nurseries (site ref 661)
   • Coombe Farm off Oaks Road (site ref 502)
   • Poppy Lane (site ref 128)
   • Stroud Green Pumping Station (site ref 504)
   • Shirley Oaks Road/Beech House (site ref 541)
   • Shirley Oaks Road (site ref 542)
   • Honeysuckle Gardens (site ref 548)
   • Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Cottage (site ref 755)

   All areas provide vital green space in already densely populated areas, and there is insufficient infrastructure to cope with the additional traffic/population. Some of these areas are in the Green Belt, others are in Metropolitan Open Land. They would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr David Harwood
Object DM43.4
542
(1) I object to residential development at the following sites & to the policy of de-designate of metropolitan open land at the following:
Land at the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference no 542

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

6 marigold way cr08yd objects to the planning proposals which are being planned for shirley oak village, this land rightfully belongs to the residents, leave our green areas alone.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr Graeme Monk

Object

I have read some of the planning proposals for Croydon, and I fear that some would seem to be poorly thought through. Any development around the Shirley Road area would need major road development also, which, in a major residential area would be catastrophic. Shirley Road has serious traffic congestion in both directions from the Lower Addiscombe Road to the Wickham Road; Addiscombe Road has congestion in both directions from Croydon; the Lower Addiscombe is congested from Croydon & towards Beckenham. If you add the number of houses in the green areas which you are proposing, we will have total gridlock. To think that these new developments will not own cars is living in a dream world. Buses will be in no better position to get through as there is no space for bus lanes. There are more suitable areas in Croydon for necessary housing which will cause less chaos for current residents, and a more pleasant environment for new residents.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr Jim Cowan

Object

Soundness - Justified

I have read Gavin Barwell’s assessment of policies and proposals in the Croydon Local Plan and totally agree that if implemented would destroy the character of Shirley. The infrastructure in Shirley is already stretched to the limit and can not withstand any further burdens.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Sonya Millen

Object

I am also objecting to any of these sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I have major concerns over the planned development of the Shirley Area. This is currently one of the nicest areas of Croydon and you plan to swamp it with a number of housing developments and some travellers sites. This will be very detrimental to the whole area.

I understand that nationally we need to have more accommodation for families. We need to achieve this with ought destroying the whole fabric of our society. This scale of development will transform the whole area into a old fashioned “Estate”.

There are not sufficient services in the wider area to support such an influx of families.

The road infrastructure already struggles at time and these developments will make the whole situation much worse.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
1. I am writing to object to re-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and the intention to build on open sites at Poppy Lane (ref 128), Primrose Lane (ref 504), Shirley Oaks Road (refs 541 & 542) and Honeysuckle Gardens (ref 548).

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

I am therefore writing to formally object to:

1. de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;
2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   • land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   • Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   • land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   • land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
   • land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?
Shirley Beddoes

We bought our property at the original building phase in Shirley Oaks many years ago and were informed that there would be no further development in this area and that all grassed areas were to remain undeveloped and were for the use of residents and local people at leisure, further to this we have paid yearly a maintenance cost to ensure these areas were up kept for this use. This is the main reason we invested in this property. The grassed areas are in constant use and development of these areas would change the natural village atmosphere that exists here and is one of the few areas of Croydon that there is an abundance of wildlife close to an urban area. The proposed development and designation of our grass areas is unacceptable and would infringe our rights as in our original contracts with Heron homes who built the site.

Mr & Mrs Nair

I write further to the recent proposals to develop on our green areas. I have been a resident for over 30yrs and strongly oppose these changes. Roads will be congested and property values will decline should these go ahead.

This land is private and belongs solely to residents who have been paying maintenance charges for the upkeep of the area.

I object to the new build on this land which will turn our quiet and safe community into an overpopulated area.

Please reconsider these proposals as none of the residents are in support of this.

Mr Peter Kenny

I am writing to object to The use of the following sites for housing: Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128 Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane Reference number 504 Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541 Land to the West is Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548 If the council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should be at least designated as Local Green Spaces.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
The area of Shirley Oaks Village and its adjacent road infrastructure is already at breaking point. Any slight build up of traffic seriously hinders movement for residents. The 2 main arterial routes into Croydon or towards Bromley (being wickham road & lower addiscombe road) are extremely busy with traffic and often lead to extended journey times for those of us who wish to head in to one of these town centres or further afield in to London for work. As proven only yesterday when a traffic accident in the Shirley area led to a 3 hour journey home from bromley back to Shirley. The road network around here is poor. The interlink between Shirley Oaks village and it's surrounding area is poor. To add hundreds of houses within this area will only lead to increased volume of traffic on the surrounding roads and leave Shirley itself in an almost permanent state of gridlock. Shirley Oaks Road is always busy with vehicles parked up. This is due to a number of reasons; The excessive traffic on wickham road leading to people abandoning their vehicles to try and walk nearer to Croydon to catch a tram or bus. The unreliable 367 bus route which is often hindered by traffic or accidents outside of Shirley Oaks Village leading to people driving closer to other bus routes. The use of the local synagogue. Combine these issues above with the additional housing being proposed and the vehicles that come with them, Shirley Oaks will become even cut off than it already is. There are many elderly residents in this area that rely on carers (friends etc) being able to visit them. They often complain about the issues I have raised above and I can only see this getting worse should the proposals for Shirley go ahead. Croydon is a massive borough so there must be other areas that these proposals could be met.

I object to the use of the site for housing. If the Council will not it as Metropolitan Open Land, it should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on it would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID: 3278/01/003/DM43.4/O</th>
<th>Tracey Lewin</th>
<th>Object DM43.4 542</th>
<th>It has been brought to my attention that there are proposals for new houses to be built on the green space behind my house in Shirley Oaks. Whilst I understand the need for new housing surely this can be built in brownfield spaces? I choose to live in my house because of the green area behind my garden, we are not overlooked at all and have the trees and wildlife. I do not wish to be overlooked and have the added noise, this will have a direct input into the value of my property or are you going to compensate for the loss of value to my house? It will increase the traffic in the area and we already struggle with traffic jams in the rush hours! It is a struggle to get children into local schools now and the strain on the local Dr's surgeries are also apparent. I am strongly opposed to these proposals and would like to be kept informed of what is going on.</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document ID: 3278/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Terry Lewin</td>
<td>Object DM43.4 542</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daila Bradley</td>
<td>To help you identify my specific objections, the five proposals mentioned so far and to which I wish to object as being detrimental to the character of the area are: the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 128); Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 504); land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 541); land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 542); and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 548).</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Roger Willaimes</td>
<td>Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic. If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3354/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Dr Bob Wenn</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 542</td>
<td>I object to the site for use for housing.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3355/01/002/DM43.4/O | Mr John Mullis | Object | DM43.4 542 | In response to your notices for the development of the greenfield sites on Shirley Oaks Village and the intention to change the status of this land, I make the following observations: In 1985 Croydon Council designated land within Shirley Oaks Village as "Amenity Open Land" because our gardens were small due to the layout and construction of the area by Heron Homes. This amenity land is owned collectively by the property owners who own 1 share each. The shares are held by the current trust company - First Port, who also maintain this estate. Is compulsory purchase envisaged? If a total of some 700 homes the village would need vast changes to its infrastructure to accommodate these properties. The present main road - Primrose Lane/Shirley Oaks Road is barely able to cope now - with just a single decker bus allied to a growing number of cars. There is a regular flooding problem during heavy downpours - particularly from Primrose Lane into Laburnum Gardens. The loss of a wildlife conservation area is surely against wider interests including many present owners. | Change | As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan. |

| 3356/01/005/DM43.4/O | Mr Rishi Gohill | Object | DM43.4 542 | Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic. If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. | Change | As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan. |
Objecting to the decision to designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

Change

Regarding the proposal to build around Shirley Oaks Rd. I wish to register my disapproval and hope the land will remain Open Land.

Change

As a shareholder of the open space in Shirley Oaks I would like to object to the proposals made in Policy Map 43.

One of the reason I bought the property was for the nice open spaces that surround the houses.

Building unnecessarily on this land will change the whole look and feel of the community of Shirley Oaks Village. We have one road in and out of the village and cramping in 700+ homes onto our lovely open space will also create congestion on the one road.

Shirley Oaks is privately owned and we take pride in our village and how it looks and will fight against these proposals.

Change

I strongly object to these plans as a resident of hazel close I am a shareholder of Shirley oaks management and feel strongly that the land be left as it is as we have very small gardens and pay for these open land areas to be kept and maintained for our use and enjoyment. Also these plans especially the ref 504 will devalue my property immensely and will downgrade the area dramatically.

Change
One of the requirements of the Pitt review of 2007 was for the Environment Agency to provide some warning for surface water flooding, as was already the practise for river and coastal flooding. The result was the LIDAR returns which are provided on the Environment Agency’s website under ‘what’s in my backyard’. This shows clearly how the lie of the land amongst the Shirley Oaks Estate causes surface water to run from South to North joining another stream which runs in from the SW from Shirley road into Primrose Lane. On numerous occasions over recent wet winters we have had a constant stream of water running across the kerb into Primrose Lane which has on occasion caused substantial amounts of ice to form. No doubt your winter maintenance department could confirm this is an area where they have to regularly do spot treatments of rock salt- since they do Primrose lane as it is a bus route, when other parts of the network are totally dry and do not require treatment.

From the Pitt Review of 2007, RECOMMENDATION 7: There should be a presumption against building in high flood risk areas, in accordance with PPS25, including giving consideration to all sources of flood risk, and ensuring that developers make a full contribution to the costs both of building and maintaining any necessary defences. Section 5.14 of the report reiterates that PPS25 applies to all sources of flood risk. This states that an SFRA (surface flooding risk assessment) should assess surface water flood risk and identify critical drainage areas. Good information is therefore needed from sewerage undertakers and other sources, including local knowledge, historic flooding and risk modelling. Local authorities should ensure that SFRAs carried out on their behalf adequately address this type of flooding. I find it difficult to believe this has been done as otherwise there would have never been a suggestion of using the remaining green parts of the estate in this way.

Any increase in the built up area around the estate would thus exacerbate the already on occasion saturated surface. Having investigated in detail the benefits in the reduction of flooding by the provision of trees, I have found that Oak trees can use up to 50 gallons a day and some trees on a hot day will utilise 150-200 gallons (wiki-answers.com). Trees admittedly are most effective when we are in the
growing season at excess water removal, but that is also when we tend to have the most extreme rainfall events. Having looked at ‘Heavy falls in a day’ and ‘Heavy falls in short Periods’ both produced in part for British Rainfall by the Met Office (my employer), I have found that invariably the most extreme rainfall happens in SE England between June and September. This is just when a tree is in full leaf so not only intercepts falling rain by the size of its canopy, but also as it is growing, that rain which reaches the soil is quickly extracted for use in the tree’s transpiration. Preliminary research results from the University of Manchester indicate that trees can reduce runoff by as much as 80% compared to asphalt. Thus the best way to alleviate summer extreme rainfall surface water flooding is not to remove trees.

The soil on which Shirley Oaks is located is of a clay type and is therefore impervious; another reason why it reacts to surface water flooding the way it does. The large area of grassland is ideal for ‘making room for water’ as a water storage area; thus to remove this pooling facility will mean the rain will have to find somewhere else to go, which would inevitably mean flooding for Shirley Oaks residents. Also I have learned, from Meteorological Office memorandum No 80 the properties of soils in NW Europe, that the root system of grassland provides a channel through which some rainfall does manage to slowly percolate through beneath the surface even with clay soils. However, without the grassland root system the water just tends to form bodies of water lying on the surface. This effect of our grassland is very helpful in alleviating the surface water flooding in winter, which occurs when prolonged rainfall totally saturates the area, and the trees are no longer as effective at its removal.

So in conclusion:
- We need trees to mitigate effects of extreme rainfall in summer, something which will become increasingly frequent with global warming.
- We need open grassland for water to accumulate in winter when trees are less effective at water removal from the system, whilst in addition their root systems help to aid percolation beneath the soil reducing surface flooding. Over the last 40 years winter rainfall has been increasing throughout the UK.
- Soil behaviours also dictate risk of flooding. We have issues because:
1) We are on a clay soil type so low permeability and heavy rain does not soak in but floods.
2) We are on sloping ground with tendency for run off to flow south to north across the site.
3) We, also because of having a clay soil, have a high water table, so in winter many areas of the site are wet and all parts stay damp throughout. Thus water-logging very quickly occurs and there would with the proposed building work be less and less places for the water to flow to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>542</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>I am writing to you to object to the council's planned proposals Ref:541 Ref:542 Ref:548 Ref:128 Ref:504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I moved to the area with the understanding that the grass areas had protection from being built upon and I strongly object to the council proposing the new developments as referenced above. This will make the area I live in with my family crowded and I bought my property with the understanding that the grass areas would not be built on.
First, the Council plans to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village (page 68, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals). Metropolitan Open Land has the same protection from development as the Green Belt. The Council is proposing to remove this designation so that most of this land can be used for new housing. The draft Local Plan identifies five sites:

- the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 128);
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 504);
- land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 541);
- land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542); and
- land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548).

I will be objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If
the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I will also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

I have only lived on Shirley Oaks for 5 years, but one of the things I love the most is walking my children over to the grass areas so they can play. As you probably already know, our gardens are quite small so it's really nice to have space to take full advantage of. Another thing that disappoints me, is that one of the selling points of our house, is the fact that all the land around the estate is protected from building on. I strongly disagree with any of your plans to build upon this land, and along with other Shirley Oaks residents will do my best to get our voices heard.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr Alan Heathcote

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

542

This is to object strongly to your ill-conceived proposals for high density dwellings on greenbelt parkland, on existing semi-detached housing areas, and gardens in the Shirley Oaks / Library region. Also for travellers sites in the vicinity of Coombe farm. All as outlined in Gavin Barwell’s email.

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Ms A Pavon-Lopez

Object: DM43.4

542

I object to the use of the site for housing.

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr & Mrs Cyril Nazareth

Object: DM43.4

542

As a resident of Croydon Borough and in particular Shirley Oaks, I am contacting you to voice my objection to the following development proposals: Ref: 542 Shirley Oaks Road West Side

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr Chris McInerney

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

542

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Mr Daniel Nuthall</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I would like to object to the following Metropolitan open land proposals - Poppy Lane - Ref 125 -Stroud Green Pumping Station - Ref 504 -Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House - ref 541 -land to the west of Shirley Road ref 542 -land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens ref 548. The Metropolitan land provide several links in the Shirley Garden Chain. Under the Planning Policy Guidance Note 9 the importance of nature conservation is stressed. This combined with the extra traffic seems unacceptable. Three of the proposed sites are owned by the residents of Shirley Oaks Village of which my house backs onto. We have several friends that live there all of which have raised the problems regarding such a development. The three areas are - Ref 541 - land east of Shirley Oaks Road - Ref 542 - land west of Shirley Oaks Road - Ref 548 - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Mr Donald Speakman</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Site 542, Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 86-236 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Shirley Avenue and Wickham Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr David Wilson

Object

DM43.4

542

We wish to object in the strongest terms to the plans being discussed regarding the proposed development of land for new housing in the Shirley area, specifically the building of Gypsy/Traveller sites on our doorstep, and the inherent increase in crime and anti-social behaviour that always follows, and can be seen in many examples nationally. Not only this, but the whole ‘Village’ feel of the area will be completely obliterated, and the very things that attracted us to move to Shirley (off Orchard Ave) will be no more. Of course people need a place to live and raise families, but time and again we have seen the resultant decline of neighbourhoods, with rubbish, noise and theft frequent occurrences. We urge you to think again and take heed of Gavin Barwell’s very real concerns, and those of what I’m sure are many of his constituents, and other Shirley dwellers. We are particularly concerned that you should take into account the fears of ordinary hard working people like us, who want to enjoy life (we’re not ‘oldies’) in a pleasant community, and think again about the following proposals:

- land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542);

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr D Lane

Object

DM43.4

542

I object to the use of the Land to the West of Shirley Oaks Road to be used for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

02 September 2016
Mr E King OBE

Object Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 S42

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mrs E Thomas

Object DM43.4 S42

I wish to log my objection to the borough-wide planned changes Croydon Council are proposing to make in their Local Plans for 2016-2036. These proposals are 750 new homes in Shirley Oaks and 35 new homes on the Shrublands Estate. Also the proposed work to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Coombe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Coombe Road.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr & Mrs Proctor

Object DM43.4 S42

We are writing to object most strongly to the Croydon Council's Local Plan for housing on Green Belt land, with particular reference to Shirley.

Our Green Belt should be protected at all costs and brown field sites must be targeted. In this respect, we support our MP Gavin Barwell’s objections, which you will doubtless have received.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr F Kurum

Object DM43.4 S42

I am writing to object to the use of the following five sites for housing:
- land at poppy lane (128)
- Stroud Green pumping station, 140 Primrose Lane (504)
- land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House (541)
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks road (542)
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens (938)

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Space.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I would like to oppose the redevelopment of Shirley Oaks Village most strongly, we brought our property 8 years ago and were told that no further building would happen as our property runs along the side of one of your proposed sights. My understanding was that we paid a quarterly maintenance for the upkeep of our surrounding therefore making us shareholders of the estate nobody to date has said anything to us as shareholders except the posters on lamp post, a couple of years ago we had to pay extra to keep gypsy out of our village now you are proposing to invite them to come and live with us. Croydon is not a nice place to live and the only escape we have is our home and now you want to take that away from us. The development would have a fast impact on the schooling, utility’s hospital ect in the area where and when will this all stop we pay our rates are law abiding citizens and feel all you are interested in is destroying all we have worked hard for.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

I am writing to you to object to the use of the following sites for housing development.
- The land at Poppy Lane. Ref. No. 128
- Strudwick Green Pumping Station. Ref. No. 504
- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and rear of Beech and Ash House. Ref no. 541
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road. Ref no. 542
- Land to rear of part of Honey Suckle Gardens. Ref no. 548

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

I object to the these proposals to build on the land ref 542, the land should be left as it is

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I wish to lodge a serious objection to the proposals for the building of houses on Shirley Oaks Village. That name speaks for itself. I have lived on Shirley Oaks Village for 30 years and during that time have paid the management company a contribution to maintain the amenity open land. The residents each own a share of the land and over the years the open areas have been enjoyed by families for games walking and enjoying the lovely trees not to mention the wildlife. When the land was sold by Lambeth in 1984 the intention was to create a village. Has any thought been given to the effect on the infrastructure by adding 751 properties? The pressures on the roads in particular.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Object DM43.4

542

The proposal to build new houses in Shirley Oaks Road does not fall within the Strategic Objectives because:

Objective 2: This development will not foster an environment where existing enterprise can prosper, but will reduce enterprise.

Objective 4: This development will not reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation. It will not reduce unemployment, improve skills and education and improve environmental conditions, the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Objective 5: This development is not high quality and will not enhance the borough’s natural environment but will reduce the natural environment by turning a green area into housing.

Objective 7: This development will reduce the area as a safe, healthy and cohesive community but making the area overcrowded with residential property.

Objective 10: This development will reduce the quality and accessibility of green space and nature. This development will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The development will change the outlook and community within the South Croydon area and future generation will suffer because of this. This proposed development of new housing in Shirley Oak Road is not within keeping of the current development within this area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with housing in the area.

Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area and is not in keeping with the surrounding area. Building a travellers site will increase noise levels and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area. Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. This development would diminish the area of green fields and recreational land within the area.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr Gary Stewart  
Object  
DM43.4 542  
Re the above proposals with Ref nos 541, 542, 548, 504, and 128 I wish to object in the possible strongest sense. This land was not designated for this use and hence our homes all have very small gardens to protect this open space. We already have problems with the road through the estate and it cannot possibly take any more traffic. The allowed parking on this road particularly on the curves gives cause for real concern. I have avoided two accidents only by making an emergency stop. If the council goes ahead with these proposals then we will fight and please note we are depending on support from local councillors and our MP. Think again please

Helen Silk  
Object  
DM43.4 542  
I am writing to object to the plans to build gypsy/traveller sites in the area of Shirley and the building of anything on any area of green belt land, green spaces or back gardens

Mr Ian Marsh  
Object  
DM43.4 542  
I wish to object strongly to the proposed developments at Shirley Oaks - Ref 542, Shirley Oaks Road West side - 236 new homes

Gaynor Lawrence  
Object  
DM43.4 542  
Please see this email as my objection to the proposed housing. This is ridiculous. The village is small and the road going through the village would NOT suffice the extra traffic! I pay a maintenance charge and moved here as it is a quiet location. I have been burgled a couple years back due I believe to the travellers that squatted on the land here and I do not want that fear again. Please rethink this crazy idea and let me know how I can further stop this.
Mr Gary Smithers
Object: DM43.4
542
The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 542
I have friends who live in Shirley oaks village and I know them and myself along with many others all object to the proposals to build on the green areas. This grass area is used by many and would totally change the area if built on and we don't want it. Part of the charm of this area is those green areas and it has something that you don't find often in Croydon so please let us keep the green areas as we all object to them being built on.

Mr Gary Kenney
Object: DM43.4
542
I am writing to show that I object to a number of your plans around the Shirley area. I contest that you need to build on our green sites and bring in new ‘traveler’ sites into Shirley.

On top of this I cannot understand the need to bring ‘medium’ high rise buildings in and around Shirley, including Devonshire way and the new proposals around Hartland way.

Please can you let me know if my objection has been noted and how I can make it more official?

Mr John Albert
Object: Soundness - Justified
DM43.4
542
As a long term resident and shareholder residing in Shirlry Oaks Village, I and my partner object to the proposals to Changes to the Policy Map 43 - REF’s 541, 542, 548, 128 & 504
These areas have metropolitan open land and had protection from being built on!

Our land was designated by Croydon Council in 1985, as Amenity Open Land because of our under sized gardens and transferred to the management company whom we our shareholders of and this land is for our use and want it to stay this way!! Having lived here for 20 years we do not want it further condensed by more homes and totally not fit for purpose!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3508/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Jennifer Worstall</td>
<td>Object DM43.4 542</td>
<td>I object to proposals to destroy open green spaces in Shirley Village. The Council wants to take away the status of Metropolitan Open Land for some of these green spaces, to make them easier to build on. What is the necessity or precedent for this? If all the open spaces in Shirley Village are to be built over with blocks of flats, the character of the area (green spaces with 2/3 storey houses/flats) will be changed forever. There is potentially a problem with drainage too as the open green spaces absorb much of the heavy rainfall we experience now. The local roads in this development as it is now, are far too small to cope with the increase there would be in traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3510/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Katrina Neal</td>
<td>Object DM43.4 542</td>
<td>As a long term resident of Shirley/West Wickham and one who has seen many changes over the years, I am strongly objecting to Land to west of Shirley Oaks Road - ref 542 for housing use. If these are not kept as MOL then at least keep them as Local Green Spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3511/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Jenny Hayden</td>
<td>Object DM43.4 542</td>
<td>The proposals for Shirley will have a huge impact on the area, the current infrastructure is already at bursting point and the building of new homes on green spaces will add further stress to the current situation. Ref nos. 128,504,541,542, 548... these relate to the building of additional homes. From the information available in the Council's documentation, this could be up to 800 new homes. I would like to know what sort of homes these are likely to be... social, housing associations or private... I doubt that any of them would be affordable homes for first time buyers. How will the local roads cope with the extra traffic. There will be a need for more schools, doctors' surgeries etc to support the intended increase to the local population. I would therefore like to object to the Council's decision to use these five sites for future residential development. Apart from putting extra burden on the local roads, it would also mean losing valuable green spaces. I believe any new residential development should be on brownfield sites. The addition of so many extra homes would have an adverse affect on the character of Shirley, in my opinion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I write with reference to your document ‘Changes to the Policies Map (Policy DM43)’, and in specific reference to sites 541, 542, 548, 128 and 504. These sites are all open space surrounding the development known as Shirley Oaks Village.

I wish to object to the proposals to re-classify the land and make it eligible for planning permission and the building of homes. In my opinion it is essential to preserve the open space for the use of local residents. It is well used for recreation, dog walking etc. It is also an important part of the character of Shirley Oaks Village and would change the nature of that development.

I bought a house on Primrose Lane in June 2015 and a large factor in my decision to buy was the amount of open space available locally. I understand that Croydon Council designated this land as ‘Amenity Open Land’ in 1985 because of under-sized gardens in Shirley Oaks Village and transferred it to the Shirley Oaks Management Company, which has maintained it ever since. As a house owner I am a shareholder in that company.

I strongly object to your proposals.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

As a local affected resident, I am registering my comments and objections to the proposals as documented in the Croydon Local Plans CLP1.1 and CLP2.

I object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in the vicinity of Shirley Oaks Village. The land should be at least designated as Local Green Space, for its protection from development. This open space provides a green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, and should be retained in its present form.

Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the local schools are over-subscribed as well as the already-stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.
I am writing to object to the Council's proposals to allow the land in Shirley Oaks Village to be acceptable for development. The areas have been Metropolitan Open Land and had protection from being built upon. Our land was designated by the Council in 1985 as "Amenity Open Land" because of our under-sized gardens and transferred to the Management Company. Each property owner is a shareholder in the Management Company and we pay towards the upkeep and maintenance of the land. I object to the Council's proposal to change the title of the land in order to proceed with development plans. This is Our land and for our use.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become "white land" (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

SHIRLEY OAKS VILLAGE-
I refer to the proposed changes to the planning policies to allow Croydon Council to build new homes on the Amenity Open Land at the above. The Amenity Open Land was granted in part, due to the extremely small rear gardens. Also I and other people in the village for many years here contributed to its upkeep at no cost to Croydon Council. To lose this land will greatly impact on the peaceful enjoyment that I and my neighbours have in using this land as well as the general impact on the area of high density building, changing the character of our village forever.

No doubt this development will result in many trees and flowers being sacrificed which help to sustain the urban wildlife such as various birds, bats, foxes, badgers and bees etc. There seems to be little consideration for this urban oasis!

Whilst I understand central government's drive for more houses, I find it hard to believe that Croydon Council needs this land in order to fulfil its housing quota, given the Westfield and other developments proposed in Croydon. There are also other lands, such as those owned by the local NHS hospital that would be suitable for development and at the same time give ready money to the NHS.

Furthermore, the existing main roads are already inadequate to service the village without adding a further 751 homes along with the years of road works that will be associated with upgrading the utilities, make traveling through the village more difficult and dangerous. I urge you to reconsider your plans.
Mr Mark Hawkins

Object

DM43.4

542

3546/01/007/DM43.4/O

Kindly note that as a homeowner (and shareholder) of Shirley Oaks Village, resident here for over 25 years, I am deeply concerned that Croydon Council seems to think it has the right to change the nature of the estate from being protected Metropolitan land to being unprotected land ripe for excessive building. Not only is the green space around the current estate, a much loved feature, it also provides a sanctuary for wildlife and allows for nice walks for local people. The road was built to be narrow and already there are problems with passing places for traffic to the hospital and synagogue. Last year the council allowed a resident to build a fence which obstructs drivers vision when turning out of Cornflower Lane and has caused several minor incidents. Simply put, the roads here were not built for traffic! The idea of ruining my neighbourhood by cramming more housing onto unsuitable roads, lacking shops and facilities whilst depriving me of the green spaces I love and part own makes me sick to my stomach. There are so many brownfield sites that could be built on and provide more suitable housing in and around Croydon that I feel that this attack on Shirley is politically motivated. I formally ask the council to reconsider the proposals.

Mr I Fuell

Object

DM43.4

542

3547/01/007/DM43.4/O

I am writing to object to:

3. The use of the following 5 sites for housing:

- Land at Poppy Lane: reference number 126;
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane: reference number 504;
- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House; reference number 541;
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road; reference number 542; and
- Land to the rear of 5 – 13 Honeysuckle Gardens; reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these 5 sites should at least be designated as local green spaces.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Object We have got objection for above proposal. We are not happy, it would cause lots of traffic and not ideal for residents.

Object DM43.4

I would like to raise my objection to the proposed land changes for the following references:
Ref. 542 - Shirley Oaks road west side - up to 236 new homes. The land was designated by Croydon council in 1985 as "Amenity Open Land", because of our under-sized gardens and transferred to the Management Company - with each property owner as a shareholder in that company. As for looking at a Gypsy site, you should have seen what a mess they made when they camped illegally at Shirley Oaks just over a year ago – it was disgusting!

Object DM43.4

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

Object DM43.4

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object DM43.4

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 542</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Mr Mike Jones</td>
<td>The de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village in particular such as the use of the following for housing:- land at Poppy Lane Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. There is a lot of history around here and the loss of the Shirley Lodge in the late 1990s was a big mistake. Generally in Croydon there is no room for more traffic that new building will generate and judging from what I have seen around Croydon squeezed housing units with small garages not fit to store cars and little or no off street parking will only add to stress and problems in the future.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Mr Peter Newsham</td>
<td>I wish to register my objection in the strongest possible terms to the proposal for new housing, (ref. 542), in these areas of Metropolitan Open Land, which is essential for recreational purposes in an already overcrowded place, is unacceptable and the proposed re-designation of the land so that it can be used for high-density urban development will find no local support, but instead, a huge and vocal opposition.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I wish to object to the detailed proposal in Policy DM43 in relation to land west of Shirley Oaks Road, reference number 542 (Site). The Site is owned by Shirley Oaks Management Limited (Company). There are over 480 shareholders of which I am one. The Site is presently protected by the designation of the Metropolitan Open Land. Separate objections have been made in relation to the proposal to designate this land as MOL. Those objections are repeated for the purpose of this representation. The designation as MOL should remain. If its decided de-designation proceeds, the Site should be designated as Local Green Space.

Proposed development of the Site in the event that the present designation remains or that re-designation takes place as Local Green Space would not be consistent with national policy under the NPPF and such a proposal would be incompatible. The proposed approach is not appropriate nor would it enable sustainable development for the reasons set out above and those identified in respect to the objection to Policy SP7. The highway network is already at saturation point and in any event any proposed residential development would generate an unacceptable amount of traffic. The site also has a high water table.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Please see my objections to your proposals as detailed below. DM43
Ref 541 Land east of Shirley Oaks Road
Ref 542 Land west of Shirley Oaks Road
Ref 548 Land to rear Honeysuckle Gardens

These areas of Metropolitan Open Land are not "incidental open spaces" or "Grassland with a few detached houses" as your report states. These areas were designated by Croydon Council as residents "Amenity Open Spaces" under a section 52 agreement on the 4th December 1985. This was to ensure that the residents were provided with adequate open space following a dispute between the Council and Heron Homes, the developer. These areas were then handed over to the Shirley Oaks Management Limited, a company with the property owners as shareholders.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3582/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Leeroy Purcell</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I have seen a poster for some proposed developments. It was attached to a lamppost. I am a resident of Shirley Oaks Village. I am concerned about these development proposals. I do not think it is a good idea. I believe it will have a negative impact on the area and the residents. How likely is it that there will be residential developments built in this area? Is there any further information relating to this proposed developments in shirley oaks village? I cannot find relevant information on the croydon council website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3591/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Nick Barnes</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Road. None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mrs Margaret Hawkins

Object

DM43.4

542

Ref. 542 - Land West of Shirley Oaks Road

I am objecting to the proposal for de-designation of this area as Metropolitan open land, with a view to "working with the landowner" to bring development of up to 236 houses forward. It is a vital part of the green chain and wild-life corridor through Shirley. This can clearly be seen by viewing Google satellite photos of the area. This land contains hedgerow and meadow habitats as well as some mature trees. On the Northernmost part of this land meadow flowers have been sown by the management company to encourage insects and other wildlife. Most of this land is jointly owned by 500 equal share-holders, which would make "working with the landowner" a complex issue. The council would be unlikely to get the co-operation of all 500 shareholders. Part of this land is consecrated land owned by the Jewish community. The Synagogue, car park and frontage I understand will not willingly be sold. Development of this area would put extra stress on the road junction between Shirley Oaks Road and the A232 Wickham Road. Traffic in this area is already extremely slow at peak times. If you look back through the records, planning permission was once sought for a supermarket where the synagogue now stands. It was denied on the basis of the increased traffic and stress on the road junction. Putting all the parcels of Shirley Oaks land (for which the council has plans) together (ref 541, 542, 548 and 128) would potentially add 683 new homes. Peak road traffic would be extremely problematic.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Cllr J Cummings

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

542

Site 542, Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Shirley Avenue and Wickham Road.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Ms J Fasham

Object DM43.4 542

I object to the Councils proposal to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land of Shirley Oaks Road and Shirley Oaks Village as the local infrastructure could not cope. Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mrs J Horton

Object DM43.4 542

I wish to log my objection to the borough-wide planned changes Croydon Council are proposing to make in their Local Plans for 2016-2036. These proposals are 750 new homes in Shirley Oaks and 35 new homes on the Shrublands Estate. Also the proposed work to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Coombe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Coombe Road. Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Ms J Stokes

Object DM43.4 542

I object to the proposals to completely change Shirley Oaks Road which is a green lung for that part of the Borough. The amount of car ownership will rise significantly as the bus service is infrequent. The traffic will dog the Wickham Road even more than now. St. John's school has already plans for more classrooms and the intake will rise in all the local schools. Also pulling down established houses and putting up more flats is detrimental to the character of the area. We had a once in a lifetime chance to improve the look of Croydon, on a human scale. Instead of which we are building hideous tower blocks, while in other parts of the country they are pulling them down. Nobody should have to raise a family in a block 44 stories high. They will eventually become the slums of the future. Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Jenny Tighe

Object DM43.4 542

Development of these sites will have a negative impact on the local area by changing the character of Shirley, and well as being a loss of green space, wildlife habitat and a vital green corridor Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 Sept</td>
<td>3723/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs J Middleton</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>I object to the site for use for housing.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Sept</td>
<td>3726/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Miss Amanda Smithers</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 542. My partner is a resident of Bletney close Shirley oaks village and we definitely do not want the surrounding areas to be built on.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Sept</td>
<td>3733/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms Jennifer Addis</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>I strongly object to the development proposals by the council for the above areas on Shirley Oaks Village. All the gardens on our houses are tiny so this green land which was designated as 'Amenity Open Land' was supposed to be for the use of the residents. There are enough houses on this area already! This will have a huge detrimental effect on all the residents in the area.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Sept</td>
<td>3735/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Tim Duce</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>I strongly object to any plan to build on Metropolitan Open Land. There are plenty of brown field sites available in Croyton and the MOL should be re-designated as Local Green Space.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Sept</td>
<td>3737/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr J Patel</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>I am writing to record my objection to various planning as follows. Your Ref No 128,504,541,542,548 and 938. I dont think it will be good for the area.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I live in Verdayne Avenue, on the odd side, and objecting to these plans sounds like simple "NIMBY ism" but, literally this development is in my back garden. With this development what little is left of the "green" character of Shirley will lost under a wave of concrete. Surely all the "brown field" sites should be identified and developed first. When the Shirley Oaks estate was first built the fact that the houses had small gardens was compensated by the greenery of the area around them, that "compensation" is now going to disappear. The plans for the new homes seem to show that these buildings will be of greater density and crowding. On the plans there doesn't appear to be any infrastructure planed to go with the homes. The schools, in Shirley, are full, filled by children "bussed" in from other parts of the borough. Does this, then, mean the children from the new homes will have to catch buses out of Shirley to attend schools else where? Though the bus routes through Shirley are good most of the time there is chaos at school times especially in the afternoon as the schools empty and the pupils leave the area to go home. It would appear that the whole of the school population of Croydon will be moving every morning and evening. The transport system on the Wickham Road works at the moment but extra traffic, people and cars, would put it under considerable strain. The tram stops are not close enough to Shirley to help dissipate the human traffic. Will the roads around the area be widened, especially in the Shirley Oaks estate, to take extra vehicle traffic? At present the buses and refuse lorries have difficulty negotiating the narrow road. The same argument goes for doctors. Again the surgeries, in Shirley, are full at present, where in the plans are the provision for this new health centres? Are they suppose to attend the A&E department at "Mayday" hospital which even now has problems coping. There have been previous plans to build on the land but they have failed due to the unsuitability of the ground, high water table etc. These problems, I take it, have "gone" away?
Mr K George

Object DM43.4

542

I am also concerned that you consider there is space for up to 751 houses in the Shirley Oaks Road area. References 128, 504, 541, 542, 548. This would lead to the elimination of green space in that area and therefore I think at least 3 of these areas should be Local Green Spaces if not Metropolitan open land.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr & Mrs Walker

Object DM43.4

542

RE: LAND ON EITHER SIDE OF SHIRLEY OAKS ROAD, SHIRLEY OAKS VILLAGE, POPPY LANE; STROUD GREEN PUMPING STATION; COOMBE FARM, COOMBE LODGE NURSERIES off Conduit Lane, land west of Shirley Oaks Road, rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens OBJECTION TO DE-DESIGNATION GREEN BELT; SHIRLEY, NEW ADDINGTON, FOREST HILL

We have lived in the Borough of Croydon for 30 years and value its vibrancy and diversity.

As Croydon ratepayers we object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land generally, especially land detailed above, which will change forever Croydon’s character.

We would ask you to encourage policies/development to:

1. Build new housing on brownfield sites by all means AND preserve invaluable green space for the benefit of the community of Croydon;
2. Protect green belt land and preserve the green corridors we desperately need for wildlife and biodiversity;
3. Amend the tall buildings policy and keep the tall building zone where it is suited in the centre of town;
4. Utilise brownfield sites for new low-level housing only where it can be developed alongside new GP surgeries, schools and improved public transport;

"Nowadays people know the price of everything and the value of nothing". Green Belt is vital and precious. Once lost for future generations and will not be replaced by developers.

We understand the need for housing, schools, hospitals and infrastructure. Are the Developers investing these also alongside their building investments?

Please protect our few remaining green spaces on the borough map, by making better use of brownfield sites.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
We are also writing to object to Croydon Council’s plans to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village, changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: We are objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council will not keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. We are also objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development.

Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure could not cope with the additional traffic.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I am writing this email to voice my deep concern about the planned development in the private estate that I have lived in for many years, namely:

• Ref 541, Ref 542, Ref 548, Ref 128 and Ref 504 – all on Shirley Oaks Village private estate.

Firstly, it would have been nice to be informed about any planning ideas in writing rather than see small notices pinned to lamp post around the estate. I would also like to draw your attention that our land was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as 'Amenity Open Land' for the residents and for which we pay a quarterly fee for maintenance of the green open land, but more importantly can I bring to your notice that this land was transferred to the Shirley Oaks Management Company, with each property owner as a shareholder in that company. This land is for our use and not for developing a concrete jungle on every single green inch of land in Croydon.

The Shirley Oaks estate has a great community spirit and has become a real sought after location for families to live due to the community nature and the lovely open land that we have, by developing on this land you will be taking away all of the good that has been built up over the years by the many residents we have as well as making the village overcrowded, bringing in more traffic thus resulting in more danger on the main Primrose Lane for people crossing and driving, congestion for parking and so on. I can also bring to your attention that we have already had a couple of fatalities on that main road that runs through the village and this will make it worse for the safety of our kids.

I am sure you have now had many hundreds of emails from residents like myself voicing the same concerns with your planning proposals!

This land belongs to us as residents so I feel its harsh to take this away and start your own developments.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Object DM43.4

Jenny Greenland I object to the de-designation of the site in Shirley as MOL. If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I enjoy this space every weekend and meet many like-minded people. I also be object to the site being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic as it struggles now. I am happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but I object to building on open space.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object DM43.4

Mr Paul Slaughter Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object DM43.4

Mr Simon Bradley To save you looking it up, and to help you identify my specific objections, the five sites mentioned so far and to which I wish to object as being detrimental to the character of the area are:

Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542).
Second, the Council plans to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village (page 68, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals). Metropolitan Open Land has the same protection from development as the Green Belt. The Council is proposing to remove this designation so that most of this land can be used for new housing. The draft Local Plan identifies five sites:

- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542)

I object to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I also object to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

---

I object to the use of the land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 for housing:

- If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Site 542, Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Shirley Avenue and Wickham Road.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I write to you with my objections to the proposed Croydon Local Plan, specifically on the points below.

- The land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 128).
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 504).
- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 541).
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542).
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548).

I object to the decision to designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I also object to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr Ian Leonard

Object

DM43.4

542

Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542); I object to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council will not keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I also object to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, thereby disastrously changing the character of the area, additionally, the local road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional traffic.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mrs & Mrs Linter

Object

DM43.4

542

I object to land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542); I object to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council will not keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I also object to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, thereby disastrously changing the character of the area, additionally, the local road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional traffic.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr Ross Aitken

Object

DM43.4

542

I would like to object to these proposals:

Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542;

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Yasmeen Hanifa

Support

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4

542

I write to you having received this email from Gavin Barwell MP, the tone of which I find inflammatory and discriminatory towards the Gypsy and Traveller communities, and smacks of "not in my backyard". I write as a resident of Addiscombe who recognises the huge problem of lack of affordable housing to buy and to rent in London promulgated by this Conservative government and the previous coalition government. I fully support Croydon Council's proposals.

Welcome support
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3826/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms L Pinkney</td>
<td>I object to site 542</td>
<td>Change as this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become &quot;white land&quot; (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3844/01/007/DM43.4/O | Lee Kirby-Walker | I object to:  
- Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128  
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504  
- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541  
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 and  
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 546  
If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated a Local Green Spaces. | Change as this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become "white land" (land with no designation) in the Local Plan. |
| 3845/01/005/DM43.4/O | Mr M Foster | I wish to lodge an objection to all five sites where the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open space land and to build housing upon them, not only would we be losing vital open space and change the very character of the area, I believe the local road infrastructure would not cope with any more traffic, why must the council continual to try and ruin areas that people like. At the moment this area as a rural feel to it, nice green spaces and a open aspect which we would loose if these plans were to go ahead. I would ask the council to think very hard before implementing these plans before we have another area that people want to move out of. Instead of to, these plans will not improve the area quite the reverse, where at the moment people like to live here. | Change as this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become "white land" (land with no designation) in the Local Plan. |
Miss Rebecca Thomas

Object

I email to express my formal concern and objection to the proposal to build additional housing in the green areas of Shirley Oaks Village. I currently reside in Beckenham, 1 Hamilton House, Orchard Way, BR3 3ER, on the Shirley boarder, and was previously a resident of Shirley for 30 years. The addition of these houses will not only bring down the areas reputation, spoil views from current properties but also cause additional congestion to an already busy area. We should be looking to preserve our green areas, and Shirley Oaks Village should remain just that, a village! I believe that the Wickham Road has already been flagged as one of the busiest roads in the area, with a fatal road accident occurring both this year and last. Additional housing/congestion will only add to this danger. This proposal will cause residents of the local area to be driven from their homes unfairly, I am sure that they did not purchase properties to be overlooked and to lose the view of the land that they have been paying to maintain for, in most cases, a number of years. 

I am contactable on my home address/phone should wish me to validate my views further.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Ms M Torres Ward

Object

I am writing to express my objection to the planning proposals in the Shirley Oaks area. The land has been set aside for our use as we have very undersized gardens on the estate and we have also paid to keep those areas in a well maintained condition. The road around Shirley Oaks only has 2 exits as well, so would make it very congested as there are only 2 options for traffic to leave and enter and there are already a lot of problems at the Wickham Road end as people drive in and out.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr Nicholas Barnes

Object

Soundness - Justified

Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans. This includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Road.

None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr M Lockyear Object DM43.4

I wish to register my objection to these proposals for the following reasons: I purchased my property on the understanding that all the open grassed land surrounding the village was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as "Amenity Open Land" because of our under-sized gardens and transferred to the Management Company, with each property owner as a shareholder in that company.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Ms M Gibson Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4

With regard to the 'very scant' notices that have been posted on Shirley Oaks Village, in places that are not in visible of all residents, I must object VERY STRONGLY to these plans.

(1) The land is owned by the residents with a covenant on it. Our houses are condensed with tiny gardens, the compensation for which is the open ground (owned by all residents) that we are able to use. My understanding is that the original development was curtailed by the then council because of the density of housing/population on Shirley Oaks.

(2) Drainage on Shirley Oaks is very poor. I am given to understand that the water table is very high and indeed during the winter months the open spaces are sodden, holding water which could probably present a flooding problem. It is so bad in some places that the ducks move in!

(3) Could the services (sewerage etc) really support the number of properties proposed. There have already problems from time to time, especially down Shirley Oaks Road.

(4) Realistically, whatever type of property would be built, you could expect an average of two cars per dwelling. Shirley Oaks Road/Primrose Lane are extremely hazardous and would not be able to sustain another probably 500/1000 cars. Where would people park.

There are enough problems on here already with regard to car parking, deliveries etc. Both Shirley Oaks Road at the Wickham Road end and Primrose Road at the Shirley Road end are used as car parks and quite often it takes a bit of delicate manoeuvring to get round, especially if you meet a bus.

(5) Planning permission has been refused for the plot in Poppy Lane (128) a number of times. The area was declared as a nature reserve some time back and I was unaware that this had changed. Part of the reason for the last planning application was the high water table, so how come there has been a change of mind?

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Edwina Morris

Object DM43.4 542

I object to the use of the Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 for housing:

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mrs Barbara Cumming

Object DM43.4 542

I object to the planned five sites being used for residential development in Shirley, Croydon: Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road identified as suitable for 88-236 homes.

Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional traffic.

Whilst I agree that we desperately need new housing, it should be built on brownfield sites - not our remaining precious green spaces!

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Ms M Bailey

Object DM43.4 542

The Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks and all around Shirley Oaks Village should not be de-designated, but designated as Local Green space. It is very important that Croydon needs green spaces as these give the feeling of openness and a pleasant environment in which to live. Upwards of approximately 700 hundred odd homes could be built in this area which will lead to possible flooding of areas as rain water will not be able to drain away as easily as it would if it was left as a green belt area. Secondly the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic stemming from these additional homes, and this includes public transport. Thirdly are the NHS facilities in the area able to cope with this large influx?

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Jan Payne

Object DM43.4 542

I object to the use of the site for housing.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Every year we get proposals and consultations for building more homes or structures on Shirley Oaks green land. But must admit the above proposal is the worst and the most ridiculous so far. From what we read, the proposal suggests to build around 750 new homes on what’s left of green patches in the village.

The village is already over crowded with Shirley Oaks road and Primrose road looking like a huge PARKING LOT throughout the day. One cannot begin to imagine what it would like with more residents and obviously with at least double the number of cars to that of the number of the new homes proposed.

We bought our property back in 1989, paying above market value at the time, for the sole purpose that the village is quiet and has some green land. Our home was one of the last phases of any buildings to be erected in the village, or so we were promised and confirmed in writing. Since then, a synagogue was built, bus 367 goes through the narrow winding road, every year for the last few years we get proposals to use our green land for one suggestion or another and now this proposal.

We completely oppose this proposal and hope that the council will appreciate that it’s not all about the money and just building more houses, but quality of life matters just the same. On one hand the government and councils encourage and push people to plant more trees, grow their veg, recycle etc... Yet on the other hand come up with proposals to use every last green patch to build more structures and homes. Doesn’t make any sense.

Site 542, Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road. Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Shirley Avenue and Wickham Road.
3899/02/005/DM43.4/O Ms E Rudduck

Object

I object to the use of the Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 for housing:

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

3901/01/005/DM43.4/O Mr & Mrs Frederick Banjo

Object Soundness - Justified

As property owners/Residents and shareholders in the company that manages Shirley Oaks Village, we are writing to state our objection to the above mentioned proposal

The land/s in question is designated as 'Amenity open Land' for the use of the property owners and residents of Shirley Oaks Village and must not be built upon.

The proposal to build on these lands will simply destroy the peace & tranquility of the village. The enjoyment of the open land by residents will be lost not to mentioned the increased traffic situation amongst other things

We strongly object to these proposals to build upon these lands.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

3923/01/004/DM43.4/O Ms A Smithers

Object

The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 542. I object to this as Shirley oaks village and surrounding areas are lovely and people go there for their green space to walk their dogs and have a nice time, this would ruin the whole area and what it currently stands for and I amongst many will be upset if the green areas are built on.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Peter & Brenda Mullings

Object

DM43.4
542

We object to the proposals for this site.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become "white land" (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr & Mrs Mollison

Object

DM43.4
542

I would like to object on behalf of my Husband - John Mollison and myself Carol Mollison to the building of any houses or anything on the Metropolitan Open Land (Green Belt) pursuant to Shirley Oaks Village. Our green land should stay as green land and not be built on. Please accept this email as our strongest objection to this plan.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become "white land" (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr & Mrs Thacker

Object

DM43.4
542

I object to the use of the site for housing.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become "white land" (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr Scott Hunter

Object

DM43.4
542

I object to the use of the site for housing.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become "white land" (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr Steve Murray

Object

DM43.4
542

I object to the use of the site for housing.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become "white land" (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>3948/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr C Rudduck</td>
<td>I object to the use of the Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 for housing:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>3948/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr K Rudduck</td>
<td>I object to the use of the Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 for housing:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mrs J Jeffery-Reynolds

Object Reference Policy Numbers:- DM31.4 DM28 DM2

Reference:- 128 504 541 542 548

I am a resident of Shirley and strongly object to the current proposals to build on green belt land on the Shirley Oaks and surrounding areas.

There are plenty of brown sites that are unoccupied and could fulfill the purpose of providing new homes. Shirley is already tight for school places. St John's, in Spring Park Road, is increasing to 2 form entry already with the number of children living locally requiring education. The 367 bus serving the Shirley Oaks Village is infrequent and much more transport will be required. Parking is already a nightmare and with the lack of parking contemplated with the new build supply the problem will only get worse. There will be an incredible build up of traffic on the already congested Wickham Road and other local roads.

I believe this proposed building of traveller's sites and homes will change the whole ethos of Shirley and cause resentment and the lowering of living standards. This is a particular area of standard housing and should not be changed by the building of blocks of houses. Garden land should not be built on and this is an inappropriate development and should not be allowed to go ahead. Metropolitan Open Land has the same protection as the Green Belt and the rules should be followed accordingly.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mrs L McLoughlin

Object DM31.4

Having lived on Shirley Oaks for almost 30 years, I strongly feel that any changes to the current planning policies would have serious and negative consequences for the current residents. Not only would properties lose significant value, the estate would also lose its 'village-like' feel that lead us to move there in the first place. We were also told at the time of purchase that Shirley Oaks would always remain as metropolitan open land, and this also heavily influenced our purchase. To add to this, there is also the issue of increased traffic through the estate. There was a fatal accident only a couple of years ago by the bend of Poppy Lane and I feel that with the prospect of even more houses being added to the estate there will be a significantly higher risk of further accidents.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Object: DM43.4

Ms M D Chandler

I object on the grounds of appalling overcrowding, your plan would bring at least 2000 more vehicles onto the estate. It is already nearly impossible to get in and out of the estate by car at rush hours. The roads on the estate can barely cope as it is with the bus route. The extra vehicles would include many commercial vans which would be parked over night and weekends causing havoc on the narrow roads of the estate. A single bus route as at present running every 20 mins causes problems how do you intend to increase public services more bus routes and more frequent timetables...more chaos! I along with others pay to maintain and the open space as a share holder. Your proposal would seriously devalue our properties and I for one will be seeking serious compensation for this. I trust Croydon has very big capital reserves to meet our legal challenges and compensation. Our gardens are small this is why the land has been designated open land so we have some open space in common with the surrounding houses. Your plans are ill conceived and will effectively destroy Croydon further. There are large areas of open land in Addington which Croydon could use and I presume already own without spending our money attempting to purchase land which will be extremely costly to Croydon in terms of the compensation that you will need to pay out and in the legal fees entailed.

Change:
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object: DM43.4

Mr N Oratis

I object to the decision to de-designate this land as metropolitan open land for the use of residential development for the following reasons. These areas are also being used every day and regularly by myself, family members, neighbours, friends and many visitors wanting to take there dog for a walk or spending time with family and kids. Ref 548, 542, 541, and 128 are owned by Shirley oaks management. 488 residents are shareholders in this company. There was a decision in 1985 for this land to be open for use by the local residents because the gardens of all homes were considered small. I would also like to mention the increase in road traffic and pollution due to the development. So for those reasons I would once again like to object to building on this land.

Change:
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Ms S Ikpa

Object: The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Patricia Wood

Object: I am writing to object to the designation of Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village; in particular to the use of the following five sites for housing: i) land at Poppy Lane reference number 128 ii) Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504 iii) land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541 iv) land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 v) land to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548

If the Council cannot keep this land as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should be at least designated as Local Green Spaces.

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr P Andrews

Object: I wholly disagree with the plans to develop the land on Shirley Oaks Village. This is metropolitan land and will not be built on.

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I am therefore writing to formally object to:

1. de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;
2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   - land at Poppy Lane REFERENCE NO. 128;
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane REFERENCE NUMBER 504;
   - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Ash House REFERENCE NUMBER 541;
   - land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road REFERENCE NUMBER 542, and
   - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens REFERENCE NUMBER 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building houses on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built upon. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr & Mrs Turner

We are writing to object to the following sites for housing and traveller sites.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr R Horton

I wish to log my objection to the borough-wide planned changes Croydon Council are proposing to make in their Local Plans for 2016-2036. These proposals are 750 new homes in Shirley Oaks and 35 new homes on the Shrublands Estate. Also the proposed work to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Coombe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Coombe Road.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>Email Content</th>
<th>Change Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4008/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr R Kiley</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 542</td>
<td>am writing this email to register my objection to the misuse of building on green belt land in Shirley, and elsewhere. All our lives are stressful now and we need these green belt areas to maintain our quality of life. I am objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I will also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.</td>
<td>Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4010/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr R Morley-Smith</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 542</td>
<td>Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.</td>
<td>Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4022/01/008/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Ewin</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 542</td>
<td>Objection to Croydon Council’s proposal to provide sites for travellers &amp; the building of houses, etc on green land in Shirley &amp; other areas.</td>
<td>Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
am a resident at 35 Primrose Lane, Shirley Oaks Village, along with 4 other members of my family.

I am writing to express my objection/disagreement to the following:
- Object to the de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and in particular to the use of the following five sites for housing:
  - Land at Poppy Lane ref 128
  - Stroud Green Pumping Station, ref 504
  - Land to east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, ref 541
  - Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, ref 542
  - Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, ref 548

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

---

Object

I am writing to express my objection/disagreement to the following:
- 2. The use of the following five sites for housing:
  - Land at Poppy Lane ref 128
  - Stroud Green Pumping Station, ref 504
  - Land to east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, ref 541
  - Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, ref 542
  - Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, ref 548

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

---

Object

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

---

Object

The planning permission proposals below I object to ref 542. We don't want building on the green areas in Shirley oaks people live there because they have choose a quiet place with green areas good for their mental and physical well being, this is a place for others to enjoy as well as residents there is no where else the same as this in Croydon.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>542</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>4040/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs S Smithers</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 542 Shirley Oaks Village is lovely I go walking round the green areas there and this is such a lovely area. We do not want houses built here and to loose our land that we really like to use.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>4041/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr s Hlu Abdo</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ref: 541, 542, 548, 128 and 504 in Shirley Oaks Village I was shocked to learn about the changes proposed to our grass areas. These changes, if implemented, will change the very nature of our village. It will not only deprive the residents of very essential open green areas, but it will make the whole place very crowded, much more polluted and quite uglier. This would rob us of essential attractions that made us come to this village in the first place. I strongly object to any of these changes and trust that every resident on this estate feels the way I feel. I did not speak to everyone, but the many I spoke with feel as strongly as I do towards this unfair proposal. I have been living in this village with my family since 1985. I would like to see the Croydon Council improve it rather than ruin it. I hope the Council will reconsider its plans.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am grateful to the Council for consulting on the detailed policies and proposals that will make up the Croydon Local Plan. There is much in the document that I agree with, but some of the proposals would, in my opinion, change the character of parts of Croydon very much for the worse. I hope you will forgive me if I focus on these areas of contention. I am therefore writing to formally object to:

1. de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;

2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   - land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   - land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
   - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

   If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

3. the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:
   - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502;
   - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; and
   - Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 756.

As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site Change. As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
of Nature Conservation Interest.

Policy E of Planning Policy for
Traveller Sites, published by the
Government in August, says very
clearly:

“Traveller sites (temporary or
permanent) in the Green Belt are
inappropriate development”.

The Council’s approach is clearly in
breach of that policy. All three sites
are also some distance from public
services and they are all in the same
part of the borough (two are in
Heathfield ward, one just over the
border in Croham). Why has
Heathfield been singled out in this
way? If the Council really needs, as
it claims, to quadruple the number of
gypsy/traveller sites in the borough -
which I would question - they should
look elsewhere (for example, off the
Purley Way where the existing site is);

4. focussed intensification associated
with gradual change of an area’s
local character under Policy DM31.4
of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade,
Shirley local centre and Forestdale.
Shirley Road Shopping Parade is
surely worthy of protecting rather than
replacing with medium-rise blocks?
Shirley local centre is defined not just
as a stretch of the Wickham Road
(where some intensification may be
appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue,
Wickham Avenue, Peregrine
Gardens, West Way Gardens, the
northern section of Hartland Way and
the western parts of Bennetts Way
and Devonshire Way. Replacing the
largely semi-detached buildings in
these residential roads with medium-
rise blocks would completely change
the character of Shirley. Replacing
the largely terraced housing and
small blocks of flats in Forestdale
with medium-sized blocks would
completely change that area too;

5. Policy DM2 on development on
garden land, which is too subjective
and therefore too weak. There
should be a much stronger
presumption against development on
garden land; and

6. Policy DM28, which should allow
higher levels of parking in
developments of low public transport
accessibility. Restricting parking
spaces in such areas doesn’t lead to
fewer people owning their own car; it
just leads to greater competition for
existing spaces.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4051/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Matt Knight</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4053/01/005/DM43.4/C</td>
<td>Mr S Sasankan</td>
<td>I am resident at 35 Primrose Lane, Shirley Oaks Village, along with 4 other members of my family. I am writing to express my objection/disagreement to the following: 1. De-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village. 2. The use of the following five sites for housing: Land at Poppy Lane ref 128 Stroud Green Pumping Station, ref 504 land to east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, ref 541 Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, ref 542 Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, ref 546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4058/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Mary Gray</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4059/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Shirley Lidbury</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr & Mrs Keith & Susan Hobbs  I object to the use of the site for housing. Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr & Mrs Whitehead  Soundness - Justified

As residents whose small rear garden backs onto part of the Shirley Oaks Metropolitan Open Land, we know full well what impact proposals 128, 504, 541, 542 and 548 would have to the area.

There would be an increase in noise from 1) the building work, 2) increased traffic

There would be a substantial impact on the road system. Wickham Road already gets gridlocked at busy hours and school start/end times. The roads into Shirley Oaks are already too narrow for cars to pass if there are any cars parked, which there are always many of since the majority of driveways are too short to accommodate reasonable size car parking for many.

Shirley Road also has a problem with queuing traffic towards Long Lane which will also be compounded by these proposals.

These developments would increase the drainage issues this area suffers from. The whole area is built on London clay and regularly these areas suffer standing water which has gone through our property in the past. Increasing the density of building in Shirley Oaks will increase this problem too.

The lands around Shirley Oaks remain because of the compact nature of the village, whose properties, as well as our own, have small garden areas and as such these areas are used daily for sports activities, exercise and dog walking.
4065/01/005/DM43.4/O Mr Clive Jarvis
Object DM43.4 542 I object to the use of the site for housing. Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

4066/01/009/DM43.4/O Dr Chandra Pawa
Object DM43.4 542 the use of land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542 for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area; Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

4067/01/005/DM43.4/O Mrs Marilyn Loader
Object DM43.4 542 I object to the use of the site for housing. Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

4068/01/005/DM43.4/O Mr S Soundararajan
Object DM43.4 542 I am writing to object to strongly the De-designation of the following five pieces of land as Metropolitan Open Land and their proposed use as housing - Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 the site is owned by the residents of Shirley Oaks Village through the Shirley Oaks Management Company in which every freeholder has a share. Your proposal will lead to a huge set of issues for the local residents. I strongly object to the plan and proposal Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

4075/01/004/DM43.4/O Kaljit Gata-Aura
Object DM43.4 542 The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 542. I have friends who live in Shirley oaks village and I know them and myself along with many others all object to the proposals to build on the green areas. This grass area is used by many and would totally change the area if built on and we don't want it. Part of the charm of this area is those green areas and it has something that you don't find often in Croydon so please let us keep the green areas as we all object to them being built on. Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Melissa Chu: The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

Mr. Reuben Gata-Aura: The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane - Ref 128, Stroud Green Pumping Stn - Ref 504, land to east of Shirley Oaks Road - Ref 541, land to west of Shirley Oaks Road - Ref 542, land to rear of Honeysuckle Grdns - Ref 548. If the Council will not keep them as MOP, these 5 sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Victoria Moore: Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542).

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr Vince Hemment

Object

DM43.4 542

I am therefore writing to formally object to:

de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village; the use of the following five sites for housing:

- land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
- land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
- land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542, and
- land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Terrence & Jacqueline Spriggs

Object

DM43.4 542

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Ms V Cruickshank

Object

DM43.4 542

I object to the use of the following five sites for housing:

Land at Poppy Lane: reference number 128;
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane: reference number 504;
- land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House; reference number 541;
- land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road; reference number 542; and
- land to the rear of 5 – 13 Honeysuckle Gardens; reference number 548.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I'm writing in response to your notice for development of the greenfield sites on the Shirley Oaks Village estate to change the status of this land to allow development of 751 new homes. When I bought my house 18 months ago it was purchased on the understanding that together with the other householders on the estate that we would have joint ownership in the land directly surrounding the estate and that a quarterly bill would be levied to cover the maintenance of the land. I purchased the property in the knowledge that there were designated areas of green space surrounding the estate and was led to believe that these would remain. I strongly object to the proposal of building any further houses on the land surrounding the estate on the grounds that the main road through the estate is dangerous enough as it is. To more than double the amount of residents using the estate is ludicrous. The road was designed to cope with a certain amount of traffic and is already dangerous at time.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Site 542, Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Shirley Avenue and Wickham Road;

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

I object to the de-designation of land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village as Metropolitan Open Land, page 68 of the Policies Map.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Councillor M. Fisher

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 542

Site 542, Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, Shirley Oaks Road, is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would totally change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Shirley Avenue and Wickham Road.

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr. Christopher Swan

Object

DM43.4 542

land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455–456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542);

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr. Edward Swan

Object

DM43.4 542

I would like to strongly object to the planned five sites being used for residential development in Shirley, Croydon: land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455–456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Radial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542);

Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional traffic.

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mrs S Rudduck

Object

4137/01/005/DM43.4/O

I object to the use of the land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 for housing:

- If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

- Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

- I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Ms S Rao

Object

4138/02/004/DM43.4/O

The use of the land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road (site ref 542) for housing

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr & Mrs Andrews

Object

4145/01/005/DM43.4/O

Soundness - Justified

I am grateful to the Council for consulting on the detailed policies and proposals that will make up the Croydon Local Plan. There is much in the document that I agree with, but some of the proposals would, in my opinion, change the character of parts of Croydon very much for the worse. I hope you will forgive me if I focus on these areas of contention; I am therefore writing to formally object to:

1. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   - land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   - land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
   - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

2. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Object  DM43.4 542  These proposals to build up to 750 homes on land (assuming it is de-designated) will mean the loss of vital open spaces and will place burdens on local transport, roads, schools and medical facilities which are already under pressure.

Change  As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Object  DM43.4 542  The de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land status on Shirley Oak will be vigorously opposed. I can see no reasoned explanation in the planning document for such a course of action nor is there any evidence of the thinking of the Council in the previous plan or 2012 Inspector's Report to explain how MOL status has been revisited with the conclusion that MOL designation be withdrawn. It also seems to have escaped the planning process that Shirley Oaks is governed by a Section 52 Agreement under the 1971 Town and Country Planning Act controlling development of the 'amenity lands' on Shirley Oaks. Further, the land is owned by the 488 Shirley Oaks resident property owners as shareholders of Shirley Oaks Management Ltd that owns the land. There is, therefore, no likelihood of the land ever being sold voluntarily. In summary, this part of the proposed Local Plan is undeliverable.

Change  As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
We are writing to object to the proposals to:
1. de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village.
2. the use of the following sites for housing:
   • land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   • Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   • land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   • land to the West of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542;
   • land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548;

The Shirley Oaks Village site currently provides a balance of high density housing offset by areas of green space. The proposals for de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land and additional housing on the areas of green space would disrupt that balance and greatly increase the density of housing to an unacceptable level. Access to the Shirley Oaks site is by way of Poppy Lane and Shirley Oaks Road which feed into Shirley Road and Wickham Road respectively. Both Shirley Road and Wickham Road are used heavily throughout the day and subject of long delays particularly at peak times. This has resulted in Poppy Lane and Shirley Oaks Road experiencing heavier traffic flows than they were designed for as commuters cut through between Shirley Road and Wickham Road.

Public transport within the Shirley Oaks site is limited to a small single decker bus due to the road infrastructure and road system. Whilst there are bus services which serve Shirley Road and Wickham Road these are already oversubscribed and subject to delay due to existing traffic congestion.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr Trevor Watkins

Object

The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Carol Holmes

Object

I object to both the de-designation and also to the subsequent house-building at the following sites:
• Land at Poppy Lane (reference number 128);
• Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane (reference number 504);
• Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House (reference number 541);
• Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road (reference number 541);
• Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens (reference number 548).

The very minimum designation for the proposed sites should be as Local Green Spaces, in order to give some protection against over-development.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr B Williams

Object

I object to the de-designation of the land as Metropolitan Open Land and its proposed use for housing. The open spaces are collectively designated as Metropolitan Open Land and provide several links in the Shirley Green Chain. They help to form the sort of network necessary to ensure the maintenance of the current range and diversity of our flora and fauna. In addition this is a floodplain. There is a sink pond to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens and if this overflows any properties would be flooded. There is also the potential for flooding of future planned properties. The one road through Shirley Oaks Village could not cope with the additional traffic and its exit on to the A232 would cause yet another bottleneck on this already congested road.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4200/01/005/DM43.4/O</th>
<th>Mr G Furmanski</th>
<th>Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 542</th>
<th>I am writing to object to the following matters in this document: -  2. the use of the following five sites for housing:  a) Ref No. 128— land at Poppy Lane  b) Ref No. 504— Stroud Green Pumping station  c) Ref No. 541 — land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Ash House and Beech House  d) Ref No. 542 — land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road  e) Ref No. 548— land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens  If the Council do not keep these sites as Metropolitan Open Land, then at least these five sites should be designated as Local Green Spaces.</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4203/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr J Beaven</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 542</td>
<td>I am writing to submit my objection to:  2. The use of the following five sites for housing:  - Land at Poppy Lane, reference number 128  - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, reference number 504  - Land to the east of Shirley Oaks road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, reference number 541  - Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, reference number 542, and  - Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, reference number 538.  If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at a minimum be designated as Local Green Spaces</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4205/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr J Tenten</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 542</td>
<td>This land is owned by Shirley Oaks Management Ltd of which I am a shareholder. There is a section 52 legal agreement in place which requires this site to be transferred to a management company and be held as amenity open space.  The highway network is already at saturation point and in any event any proposed development would generate an unacceptable amount of traffic.  The site has a high water table.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Document Reference</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4209/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs King</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 542 I object to Policy DM43, reference Site 542 to build new homes on land to the East &amp; West of Shirley Oaks Road</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4213/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs DB Good</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 542 I object to Policy DM43, reference Site 542 to build new homes on land to the East &amp; West of Shirley Oaks Road</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4218/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Ms Morgan &amp; Mason</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 542 I object to the use of the site for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4223/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Mary Lane</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 542 I object to the site for use as housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document ID</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Policy Reference</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4228/01/010/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Sheila Newman</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 542</td>
<td>The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeybourne Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4232/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Farrow</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 542</td>
<td>I object to Policy DM43, reference Site 542 to build new homes on land to the East &amp; West of Shirley Oaks Road</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4238/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Miss B Hall</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 542</td>
<td>As 541, 542 &amp; 548 would consist of 750 residences, the present utilities, particularly the drains, are likely to be inadequate. I assume that provision will be made for Shirley Oaks Hospital to function during the building and afterwards with the increase in traffic, pollution and NHS ambulance access to their base. Healthcare facilities for such an increase in local residents cannot be sustained for the area. If the Council will not keep bullet points 1 &amp; 2 as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4244/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Kellty</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 542</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4245/01/005/DM43.4/O Mr & Mrs Maguire Object I object to the use of the site for housing. Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

4268/01/010/DM43.4/O Mr D Nesterovitch Object The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area. Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

4278/01/009/DM43.4/O Mr Melvin Howard Object If the Council will not keep the site as MOL, the site should at least be designated as Local Green Space. Building on this site will not only mean the loss of vital green space it will over burden local services and road infrastructure. Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

4294/01/004/DM43.4/O S Wallace Object I object to land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542); Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mrs Glenna Fullick

Object DM43.4

I object to Policy DM43, reference Site 542 to build new homes on land to the East & West of Shirley Oaks Road

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mrs Kathleen Swan

Object DM43.4

I would like to strongly object to the planned five sites being used for residential development in Shirley, Croydon; land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Radial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542); Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional traffic.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mrs Rita Evans

Object DM43.4

The proposal to de-designate Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and use it for five housing sites surely flies in the face of current recommendations to preserve Green Belt equivalent land as a vital amenity and ecological asset?

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Doreen Jansen

Object DM43.4

Objection to site. Schools in the area are already over-subscribed, so the number of homes proposed will increase the problem

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>DM43.4 542</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>4327/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs J Furmanska</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the following matters in this document: -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. the use of the following five sites for housing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Ref No. 128 — land at Poppy Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Ref No. 504 — Stroud Green Pumping station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Ref No. 541 — land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Ash House and Beech House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) Ref No. 542 — land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e) Ref No. 548 — land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If the Council do not keep these sites as Metropolitan Open Land, then at least these five sites should be designated as Local Green Spaces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>4333/01/010/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr P Bhanji</td>
<td>The use of the following five sites for housing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542, and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>4358/01/010/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms B Fontaine</td>
<td>The use of the following five sites for housing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542, and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document ID</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4365/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>The Judge Family</td>
<td>We object to Policy DM43, reference Site 542 to build new homes on land to the East &amp; West of Shirley Oaks Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4366/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms Gemma Sturgeon</td>
<td>I object to Policy DM43, reference Site 542 to build new homes on land to the East &amp; West of Shirley Oaks Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in the vicinity of Shirley Oaks Road and Shirley Oaks Village. The land should be at least be designated as Local Green Space, for its protection from development.

This open space provides a green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, and should be retained in its present form.

I also object to the following specific proposals for the building of new homes on this site, as detailed in Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan, Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan, Detailed Policies & Proposals:

- Policy DM43, reference 128 to build new homes at Poppy Lane
- Policy DM43, reference 504 to build new homes at Stroud Green Pumping Station (including the conversion of the pumping station which is a locally-listed building)
- Policy DM43, reference 542 to build new homes on land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road
- Policy DM43, reference 548 to build new homes on land to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens

Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the already-stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.

Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the already-stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.

For the reasons given above:

1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in the vicinity of Shirley Oaks Road and Shirley Oaks Village. The land should be at least be designated as Local Green Space, for its protection from development. This open space provides a green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, and should be retained in its present form.

I also object to the following specific proposals for the building of new homes on this site, as detailed in Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan; Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan, Detailed Policies & Proposals:

- Policy DM43, reference 128 to build new homes at Poppy Lane
- Policy DM43, reference 504 to build new homes at Stroud Green Pumping Station (including the conversion of the pumping station which is a locally-listed building)
- Policy DM43, reference 542 to build new homes on land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road
- Policy DM43, reference 548 to build new homes on land to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens

Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the already-stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.

Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the already-stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.

For the reasons given above:

1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Jennifer Carrozzo Object DM43.4 542 I am writing to object to the use of the following five sites for housing:
-land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128;
-Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504;
-land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541;
-land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542, and
-land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548;
If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces;

Ms N Nesterovich Object DM43.4 542 The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542, and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

Mrs Janet Baine Object DM43.4 542 I object to the use of the land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 for housing;

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I object to the use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane reference number 128; Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504; land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541; land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. The Council should focus on developing other land in the Croydon borough such as unused office blocks, derelict corporate buildings/factories/warehouses which have not been occupied for years instead of attacking the green areas which are enjoyed by the residents in their respective areas. The proposals to build circa 700 houses in such a small area will cause the following detrimental effects to the local residents: depreciation of the value of the houses purchased in the relevant areas, too much strain on the water and sewerage systems in the locality where there is already a high water table. This could result in undue flooding and drainage problems, structural problems in years to come as the land is not fit for such intensive building, increase in traffic on Shirley Road, Wickham Road, Lower Addiscombe and Addiscombe which is already congested. This will unduly increase pollution levels which are already toxic. This will undoubtedly cause an increase in the health problems of the people in the locality such as lung cancer and other respiratory illnesses which will in turn place greater stress on the NHS services, cause more people to take sick days which will result in lower incomes obtained and eventually less tax revenue generated. This will have a knock on effect on the economy which is to say at the very least, bleak, the three green spaces in the Shirley Oaks Village are owned by the 488 Freeholders. Each Freeholder owns one share in the nominee company, Shirley Oaks Management Limited which owns the land on behalf of its shareholders. Building upon this land would serious undermine the value of the land purchased by the Freeholders and reduce quality of life. If the residents wanted to move, it would prove near impossible because of the resulting lower sale prices of their respective houses imposed by the Council’s building plans. This would appear to be unfair for the Council to impose

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
such hardship on the residents. I would urge the council to build upon land in the Croydon borough which is derelict and contains buildings which have not been used for years. These buildings can be knocked down to build the much needed housing for generations to come. These unused or derelict buildings serve no purpose to the local residents and are of no value to the residents. The Council should endeavour to create value where it is needed. This will in turn improve the condition of the abandoned areas. This will also prevent squatting and other unlawful uses of such buildings. I witnessed one example last year where the old post office building next to East Croydon Station was used as a rave containing over 1,000 people. This posed a risk to the safety of the passers by and the increase in crime. The Council's redevelopment of such spaces could be highly beneficial to the area. The green spaces are however of great importance to the local residents. The residents enjoy these spaces for walking their dogs, recreational and outdoor activities, space for children to play, piece of mind for the resident who works in the city and comes home to a peaceful environment and it provides space for those residents who already have very small back gardens.

7284/01/008/DM43.4/O Dr I Jayamanne

Object | Soundness | Change
--- | --- | ---
I wish to protest vehemently about your plans to destroy Shirley which is a village by building hundred of homes and setting up a Gypsy and Traveller site. You will destroy the Green Belt and increase the traffic in the area thus polluting the environment and the air we breathe. | Justified | As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
The use of the following five sites for housing:
- Land at Poppy Lane (ref number 128)
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane (ref number 504)
- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House (ref number 541)
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road (ref number 542)
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens (ref number 548)

When the London Borough of Lambeth closed the children’s home, known as Shirley Oaks, Croydon Council determined to keep the building redevelopment of the site broadly in line with the building density that had existed for most of the previous hundred years and subsequent applications by the then developer for increased housing density were rejected. There were a number of reasons for maintaining the original policy amongst which were the need to maintain the established green corridor, retain the character of the area and to maintain the surrounding traffic volumes at a manageable level. The decision to designate the land as Metropolitan Open Land was to ensure that in future further building on the land could not take place thus re-affirming the principles established by the original policy decisions. Nothing has changed in the ensuing years to justify any variation to that policy.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I am dismayed at the consideration being given to the above, particularly concerning that proposed in the Shirley area.

I have been a Shirley resident for almost 30 years and to date have enjoyed what the area does offer both for the community and with regard to open green spaces, which are precious to the health and wellbeing of all ages. Why should future generations be unable to continue to benefit from an outdoor environment as hitherto?

I strongly object to de-designation of the current Metropolitan Open Land and would hope that at least it could be protected as Local Green Space with regard to future development. This is particularly pertinent with regard to the proposals being considered for the Shirley Oaks area. The present road infrastructure through the estate leaves a lot to be desired and any more traffic will be a great cause for concern, to say nothing of the loss of wildlife and spacious living. If we had wanted to live in a highly densely populated area, we would not have chosen the Shirley area to relocate into, rather the centre of the town. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is more acceptable and there must be many of these in the Croydon area to develop without encroaching on valued green spaces.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become ‘white land’ (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
I wish to formally object to:
1. All the proposed policies relation to the re-designation of land to allow building development at Shirley Oaks Road and land around Shirley Oaks Village.
2. The land at Poppy Lane (reference 128)
3. Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane including the conversion of the locally listed pumping station (reference 504)
4. Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House (reference 541)
5. Land to the West of Shirley Oaks Road (reference 542)
6. Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens (reference 548)
These proposals are NOT appropriate for Croydon to meet its Strategic Objectives.
Additionally the proposals are NOT DELIVERABLE or SUSTAINABLE as:
• Croydon have already announced that it is not necessary to deliberately destroy MOL to reach their housing requirements.
• National and London Plans do NOT require or expect Local Authorities to degrade MOL to generate additional housing.
• The loss of this MOL will entail the LOSS of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks through to Ashburton Playing fields, across to South Norwood Park and surrounding Areas.
• The above areas are vital to sustain the drainage of surrounding flood areas.
• The above mentioned areas are referred to the "lungs of Croydon" as they sustain carbon dioxide capture (photosynthesis), oxygen release (photosynthesis) and biodiversity. Local wildlife includes badgers and bats.
• Green areas increase the character, desirability and amenity of residential areas.
Green areas have a strong positive impact of the character of surrounding residential areas.
• The proposed increase in housing will put an additional burden on public transport, roadways and street parking and other services. The additional volume of traffic will create additional road hazards.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
Mr John Carley

Object Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 542

I object to the de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village; reference Numbers, 128, 604, 541, 542 and 548. This is currently Green Space and provides vital green recreational area and buffer between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding area.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

P L Johnson

Object

DM43.4 542

I wish to object to the use of the following sites for housing:
- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road (ref no 541)
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road (ref no 542)

We should preserve these pastoral and woodland sites for environmental reasons; for nature and humanity. Due to high traffic usage of the A232 and Upper Shirley Road - particularly when the M25 gets closed - the air quality in this area is not perfect.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

Mr Steve Westray

Object

DM43.4 542

The de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and either side of Shirley Oaks Road. At present I understand that Metropolitan Open Land has the same protection as the Green Belt and I believe that it is vitally important to retain the controls around our green spaces in Shirley. If any additional homes were to be considered for this area then they should be restricted in number and carefully planned in order to retain the character of this area. The idea of building up to 750 new homes is totally out of keeping with this objective and would be considerable strain on local infrastructure and resources. New housing on this scale would lead to a significant increase in traffic along the Wickham Road which is already extremely busy not only servicing the residents of Shirley but as an important thoroughfare into Croydon.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7321/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Ann Sebire</td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 2. The use of the following five sites for housing: a) Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128) b) Stroud Green Pumping Station reference number 504 c) Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541 d) Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 and e) Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference numbers 543. I just hope that there has been enough consideration about the fact that Shirley is built on springs and Heron Homes and Wren both had problems with flooding the area down at Woodmere Avenue. As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7323/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs L Woods</td>
<td>In particular I have grave concerns about the choice of location for the proposed gypsy and traveller sites and also the building of 750 new homes at Shirley Oaks Village. The local schools are already struggling to cope with ever increasing numbers of children, and the journey from Shirley into Croydon can be extremely congested at peak times. The extra traffic generated by the proposals would cause misery in my opinion. The loss of green spaces in the proposed areas of development would also be most detrimental. I would therefore urge Croydon Council to consider and respect the very real concerns and fears of the majority of residents in the Shirley area. As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7324/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Olive Garton</td>
<td>Use of formerly open land for housing (references 128, 504, 541, 542 and 548): Again, this open land should not be lost. Furthermore, there is no infrastructure in place to support the huge increase in population density that such development would represent. Development of the site of the former pumping station (reference 504): It was established at the time the Shirley Oaks village was built that this land could not be built on, as there is an Artesian well on the land and any development would risk polluting the water source. Furthermore, a travellers’ site would be inappropriate on this site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8822/01/004/DM43.4/O Mrs M Davies

Object DM43.4 542

I am writing to object to the proposed use of:
- the land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road (541)
- The land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road (542)
- The land at Poppy Lane, Shirley Road (128)
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Pimrose Lane (504)
- Land to the rear of honeysuckle gardens (548)
- Open space land at shrublands estate (038)

DM43.4

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. Therefore the proposed allocation will not be carried forward into the Proposed Submission draft and the land will in effect become 'white land' (land with no designation) in the Local Plan.

0115/04/12/DM43.4/O Mr Bob Sleeman

Object DM43.4 548

I am therefore writing to formally object to:
- the use of the following five sites for housing:
  - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.
If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

DM43.4

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

0120/02/02B/DM43.4/O Addiscombe Residents Association

Object DM43.4 548

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, the five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces and not used for housing.

DM43.4

The site should be Local Green Space.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
I am therefore writing to formally object to:

1. de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;

2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   - land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   - land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
   - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
De-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land bordering Addiscombe Place (around Shirley Oaks Village) – OBJECT

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, the five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces and not used for housing:
Ref 128: Land at Poppy Lane
Ref 504: Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane
Ref 541: Land east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, Shirley Oaks Road
Ref 542: Land to west of Shirley Oaks Road, Shirley Oaks Road
Ref 548: Land to rear of, 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens

designate as Local Green Spaces and not use for housing

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 548

We object to the proposed development on green spaces, which should remain designated as part of the Shirley Oaks MOL (see comments on Policy SP7 (Table 9.1)).
This site meets criteria for Metropolitan Open Land, in terms of its nature conservation value.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 548

I am horrified at the proposals regarding Shirley. There may be a need for more housing but there are alternatives and it is up to the Council to find these rather than making it easier and more profitable for builders which is now happening.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
I hereby inform you of my STRONG OBJECTION to allow development on the land noted on your Policy Map 43.

Ref 541
Ref 542
Ref 548
Ref 128
Ref 504

This land forms the reason why I, along with the majority of my neighbors purchased our homes. As freehold property owners we each have a shareholding in the company owning the land and do not wish for this, OUR land to be built on.

We also find it unbelievable that the Council wishes to have a legal battle against 800 of its residents who not just own the land but are determined that the land keeps its “Metropolitan Open Land” protected status.

The idea of building on these main green spaces when the existing houses were built with minimal sized gardens is disastrous, such development would obviously not just spoil the look and value of the area but would damage the health of the residents.

This is the land where the residents catch the summer sun, go for walks, jog, children play, and has the most amazing natural wildlife that we all

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

I as resident of Shirley Oaks Village am against any change of our Metropolitan Land (with protection to being built on) being allowed as acceptable for development. I have been living in the Village for almost 30 years and paying for this land to be maintained as grass areas. We own the land as shareholder in our management company (Once designated as Amenity Open Land and transference to our Management company.) I strongly oppose any moves to develop on these grass areas.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
I am writing to express my objection to the planning proposals in the Shirley Oaks area. The land has been set aside for our use as we have very undersized gardens on the estate and we have also paid to keep those areas in a well-maintained condition.

The road around Shirley Oaks only has 2 exits as well, so would make it very congested as there are only 2 options for traffic to leave and enter and there are already a lot of problems at the Wickham Road end as people drive in and out.

I object to the following Ref Numbers:

Ref 541
Ref 542
Ref 548
Ref 128
Ref 504

I would appreciate any information you could send me in relation to upcoming meetings about the proposals.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1690/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Christine Clark</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016 Page 2780 of 4384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am writing to strongly object to the development of land on Shirley Oakes Village.

The land was shared between residents and in 1985 designated by Croydon Council as “Amenity Open Land” because of our undersized gardens. The land was transferred to the Management Company, with each property owner as a shareholder in that company. I intend to fight for the use of this land.

My front garden is approximately 6’ x 4’ and the lawn in my back garden is only 6’ x 5’. Both my parents and I use the land for exercising dogs as the gardens are so small. This whole thing has come as a huge shock to all of us.

With regard to the traveller site. Travellers move around the countryside so why put a traveller site in such a residential area.

I appreciate the Borough needs affordable homes but the land on the estate is so restricted in size and the in and out roads to the estate are already extremely dangerous owing to the bends in the road. Health and Safety issues need to be addressed.

I strongly object to this development and will explore every possible way to restrict the development of these homes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1691/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Daniela Reynolds</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016 Page 2780 of 4384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I wish to object to the following planned proposals; ref:541, ref:542, ref:548, ref:128 and ref:504

These planned proposals will not fit within the current aesthetics of the estate so please accept this email as an objection to the proposal.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
I am writing in response to your notices for development of the greenfield sites on the Shirley Oaks Village estate, changing the status of this land to allow development of around 700 new homes.

When I bought my house here 18 years ago, it was on the understanding that this had been designated by Croydon Council as metropolitan amenity open land, an attractive feature of the original development, important not least due to the relatively small gardens of some properties, a mixture of unit sizes in an harmonious design. Thus there is a mixture of family unit sizes and age groups at home here. For many years, I and my fellow-resident members of the Shirley Oaks Management Ltd company have contributed regularly to First Port Property Services and their predecessors under our common upkeep obligation, including provision of boundary posts at various points of these areas to ensure that visiting Travellers could not reoccupy them.

As I understand your plans, you now wish to "designate" this as non-metropolitan land, on which purchasers could build however suits their purposes. This does of course risk a complete change in the nature of our Village. I cannot pretend to understand how you can effectively cut a swathe through all of this, even if you do consider it justified. Some residents might I imagine now be considering the impact on their original investment and individual legal aspects. Against these general considerations, I would like to highlight some specific and practical concerns at the outset.

ROAD SAFETY
The perimeter road via Primrose Lane and Shirley Oaks Road is arguably no longer fit for purpose, increased car ownership and parking, fast through traffic including commercial and public transport all contributing. Buses on the 367 route for example frequently mount pavements to pass each other. There have been accidents, some serious, even fatal and involving elderly pedestrian residents. The road surface is nowadays subject to excessive heavy usage. Clearly, 700 new homes will surely accentuate these problems and dangers.

ENVIRONMENT
Your plans will effectively remove an important green-field area and with it much unique wildlife. Residents will lose many of the valuable areas for walking, exercise and fresh-air, as will visitors. Any balanced village appearance and community feel to the estate will be consumed by so many new properties of different designs.

In summary many will surely feel betrayed by a Council which proposes removing green-fields against all promises. Some might also suspect that, whatever the social arguments, their interests are being sacrificed against political and ultimately commercial imperatives.

| 1713/02/006/DM43.4/O | Alison Connor | Object | Soundness - Justified | DM43.4 548 | Once the area surrounding Shirley Oaks Village is re-designated the Council plans to build 751 homes on 5 separate sites. Supposing the average house is for 4 people, 3000 people in total will move to the area. The housing will attract families - potentially half being children. The Council mention no where in their 700 page document about the building of new schools (primary and secondary) nor the building of doctor surgeries, nor the expanding of the local shopping area let alone the already stretched local road infra structure. Our local area can't cope as it is – St John's primary school has applied for an extension to cope with the current demand on its places. During rush hour buses frequently don't stop at bus stops because they are full. Traffic is often diverted down our road, Shirley Church Road, if there is an accident on Wickham Road or Gravel Hill. The dual carriage way (Shirley Park) is crawling along during rush hour. The council are planning to add another 1000 plus cars to this equation. Shirley is often described according to estate agents as leafy, popular, excellent schools. Prices reflect this. Just walking around the area people look after their houses and take pride in living here. People pay more money to live in this area. By building 751 more homes the character of the area will change completely.

|                      |               | Change | As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development. |
We are also writing to object to Croydon Council’s plans to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village, changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan:

Your draft Local Plan identifies five sites:

1. the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, reference number 128);

2. Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, reference number 504);

3. land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, reference number 541);

4. land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542);

5. land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 467-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548).

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
As a resident of Shirley Oaks I am writing to object the proposals for housing development on the estate and surroundings. Having lived in Shirley all of my life I would be deeply disappointed to see it change unrecognisably. I envisage the property on Shirley Oaks Road will either be demolished or surrounded by high density housing. Either eventuality will be highly detrimental.

I have viewed the Detail Policies and Proposals on Croydon Councils website and object the following plans, references - Ref 128 Ref 504 Ref 541 Ref 542 Ref 548 Ref 938 Ref 502 Ref 661

Object to Site 548

Change  As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

Change  As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
I am writing to object to:

1. THE DE-DESIGNATION of the following five pieces of land as Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and their proposed use as housing:

   Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

   There is only one narrow very winding road which runs through the village and this could not cope safely with any additional traffic. It is single file around bends as it is and the local road infrastructure would be overburdened.

   These open spaces are collectively designated as Metropolitan Open Land and it would be unacceptable to lose a link to this chain.

   Additionally, this area is a flood plain and there is a sink pond to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens. There would be a detrimental effect and potential flooding of existing and planned properties.

   Three of these sites are owned by the residents of Shirley Oaks Village through the Shirley Oaks Management Company in which every freeholder has a share. The three land sites in question are:

   1. Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 541
   2. Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542
   3. Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
I am writing to voice my full-throated objections to the above proposals because of the irreparable damage it would do to the character of one of the leafier, more pleasant, parts of the borough. The council seeks de-designation of Metropolitan open land that, as a homeowner in Shirley Oaks Village, I own a share of, and it is protected by covenant. Such thoughtless destruction of our precious little green space (we were granted this Amenity Open Land in 1985 by the council due to our undersized gardens) is obnoxious, ill-conceived and damaging to the value of our properties, as planning blight could linger for a decade. Myriad other neglected parts of the borough are far more appropriate for such massive development and would not stir up so much ire from the current residents, nor would they require the politically-expedient moving of goalposts regarding land use. Our village simply does not currently have the infrastructure nor the capacity to expand in order to cope with these proposals. There is barely enough parking space available in the village at present, so quite where up to 683 other families will park and seek recreation, I do not know. Quite how all the construction vehicles involved in such huge building works would access the proposed sites without further detriment to the quality of life of the residents is another issue I raise. We are served by one bus route that can only use small, single decker buses. The roads are too narrow for larger vehicles. How would this be overcome? Additionally, the fact that the council would seek to house the travelling community so close to the town centre, on land where in 2012 a group of them set up an illegal encampment and defecated in our woodland, beggars belief. If the council has an inexplicable legal obligation to designate land to travellers, then expand capacity at their existing sites in Beddington Lane and Featherbed Lane rather than dispersing them further across the borough into otherwise salubrious areas. I do hope that common sense prevails and that all five of the above proposals are quickly abandoned. I chose to live in this area precisely because it is not blighted by these hideous developments. I am sure that many other residents echo my sentiments.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
also object to the following specific proposals for the building of new homes on this site, as detailed in Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan, Detailed Policies & Proposals:

Policy DM43, reference Site 128 to build new homes at Poppy Lane
Policy DM43, reference Site 504 to build new homes at Stroud Green Pumping Station (including the conversion of the pumping station which is a locally-listed building)
Policy DM43, reference Site 541 & 542 to build new homes on land to the East & West of Shirley Oaks Road
Policy DM43, reference Site 548 to build new homes on land to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens

Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the local schools are over-subscribed as well as the already-stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

Change:

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Mr C Johnson  

Object  

DM43.4 548  

This land is owned by Shirley Oaks Management Limited (SOML). This is the management company for the estate whose shareholders are the home owning residents. SOML owns and manages the open spaces on behalf of and for the benefit of the residents for whom the land is ‘amenity open land’ ie communal, recreational space. The land was transferred to SOML’s ownership in 1985 whilst the estate was under development. I believe that the developer had infringed planning regulations by reducing the sizes of the gardens included with the dwellings that it was building in order to increase the density of the housing beyond that which had been agreed with the local planning authority. The open land, which is currently being scrutinised as part of the Council’s policy proposals review, was effectively a penalty levied on the developer whereby an amount of green space was given over to SOML to own and manage as redress and compensation to the residents for skimping on the sizes of individual gardens. I am assured by a Director of SOML that the company has documentary proof of all of the above points. The residents pay a service charge that, inter alia, covers the cost of managing and maintaining these open spaces. SOML is bound by its covenants with the residents that this land shall be managed and maintained as communal open areas for the collective enjoyment and benefit of residents as long as the estate should be in existence. Thus, there is no scope on SOML’s part for participating in any effort to develop these spaces and any attempt to develop them undermines the importance of those spaces in providing amenity open land, as previously ordered by the local Council.

Change  

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

David Hurst  

Object  

DM43.4 548  

I object to the use of the site for housing.

Change  

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
1904/01/005/DM43.4/O Emma Smith
Object DM43.4 548
I am writing to object to the use of the following five sites for housing:
- Land at poppy lane reference number 128
- Stroud green pumping station, 140 primrose lane reference number 504
- Land to the west of shirley oaks road and to the rear of beech house and ash house reference number 542
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle gardens reference number 548
If the council will not keep them as metropolitan open land these five site should at least be designated as local green spaces

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

1913/01/006/DM43.4/O Andrea Swaby
Object DM43.4 548
I hereby would like to register my serious OBJECTION to the councils proposal to build 750 new homes in Shirley OAK road and 35 new homes on shrub lands estate to create gypsy traveller sites. As I live on Devonshire I also have serious object to allow 4 storeys in this area

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

1918/01/006/DM43.4/O Mr Gareth Champion
Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 548
Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

1923/01/004/DM43.4/O Jane Anson
Object DM43.4 548
I have just read a letter from Mick Hewish, Resident Director of Shirley Oaks Management Ltd and I would like to object to the proposals for developing areas around Shirley Oaks. These are as follows:
- Ref: 541 Shirley Oaks Road East side
- Ref: 542 Shirley Oaks Road West side
- Ref: 548 Land rear od Honeysuckle Gardens
- Ref: 129 Poppy Lane
- Ref: 504 Water Board HQ Primrose Lane

The high density of new homes would put considerable strain on the environment, including overcrowding, drainage, traffic and parking.

Objection to the allocation of Site 548 Land rear of Honeysuckle Gardens for proposed development as the high density of new homes would put considerable strain on the environment, including overcrowding, drainage, traffic and parking.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Object

1924/01/006/DM43.4/O Pamela Lees

I strongly object to many of the proposed developments within the Shirley area. I believe that allowing low rise developments around Shirley library will alter the balance of properties in that area, which are mainly detached and semi detached. People have moved to this ‘sought after area’ precisely because of its current character. I also object to the intensive developments proposed on the Metropolitan open land around Shirley Oaks. We need open land to reduce carbon emissions, for wildlife and for our own well being. Both of the above developments would put a huge strain on the services in the area, schools, doctors, busses and the already congested road system. I urge you not to progress with these proposals.

I also think that the two proposed travellers site in Shirley are inappropriate as they would be on Green Belt land, which is against your own policy and would be a blight on one of the few areas that are beautiful and wildlife friendly within Croydon.

I am always defending Croydon to those that mock it, saying that we have some lovely open spaces in which to walk and enjoy the diversity of nature. They only see the high rise blocks and litter. If these proposals go ahead, Croydon will have nothing left to commend itself.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Object

1926/01/044/DM43.4/O Councillor Luke Clancy

Site 548, Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Tower View, Edgewood View and Primrose Lane.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Object

1942/01/007/DM43.4/O Margaret West

Object to the dedesignation of Metropolitan Land and proposed use for housing at sites 128 504 502 541 542 and 548. If development is allowed it will impact on the sense of community and have an adverse impact of trees and could be subject to flooding. It would also impact on access arrangements and the wildlife

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
This land was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as "Amenity Open Land" because of our under-sized gardens & transferred to a Management Company, with each property owner as a shareholder in that company. If the council will not keep it as Metropolitan Open Land it should at least be designated as Local Green Space.

Object Soundness - Justified

John Coppard

DM43.4 548

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Object DM43.4 548

Graham & Kate Marsden

Shocked at the scale of proposals for Shirley and will fundamentally change the nature of the area. Front gardens are an asset to the local street scene. The proposals for focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an areas local character under Policy DM31.4 put this stability at risk, and may have an impact on the services we all need from the Council.

Object to the de-designation of MOL - at a minimum it should be designated as local green space. We object to this site being used for residential use as it would change the character of the area, overload the already difficult local road structure. It would damage the vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and reduce the habitat for wildlife.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Object DM43.4 548

Joe Rowe

Shirley Hills Residents Association

This land is designated as Metropolitan Open Land and there is no justification for re-designation. An increase of up to 741 homes on this land would put local services including schools, transport and already crowded roads under further pressure.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Object DM43.4 548

Mrs Lorraine Cox

I have just received a letter about proposals to Shirley Oaks Village open land being built upon. We have lived here happily for 13 years. We want to say we don't want houses or a gypsy site down the road. I will be writing to my local MP Gavin Barwell to defend our way of life in Shirley Oaks Village. Leave our open / green spaces alone.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
2066/01/028/DM43.4/C Councillor Dudley Mead
London Borough of Croydon

Comment
DM43.4
548

Site 548, Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Tower View, Edgewood View and Primrose Lane.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

2062/01/044/DM43.4/O Councillor Jason Perry
London Borough of Croydon

Object
Soundness - Justified
DM43.4
548

Site 548, Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Tower View, Edgewood View and Primrose Lane.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

2067/02/007/DM43.4/O Stephen Baker

Object
I also object to the development on Shirley oaks, as a resident who used to live there on Shirley oaks, any more development on this land would over burden what is already a road system that can not cope with the buses and tight turns that have been made on the estate, it's would also run the feel of Shirley.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

2071/01/044/DM43.4/O Councillor Mario Creatura
London Borough of Croydon

Object
Soundness - Justified
DM43.4
548

Site 548, Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Tower View, Edgewood View and Primrose Lane.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

2081/02/004/DM43.4/O Stuart & Monique Woodrow

Object
DM43.4
548

We do accept that Croydon does need to provide new housing but this has to be on-appropriate sites, i.e. previously developed land and not greenfield/metropolitan open land. We are firmly against this idea as it would set a precedent for inappropriate development/piecemeal development.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Development at this site would be detrimental to the openness, character, visual amenity and setting of Metropolitan Open Land. It would affect the residential amenity and result in the loss of trees and vegetation to the detriment of the surrounding area.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

I and many residents in Shirley object to the following. 700 new homes to be built in Shirley oaks village with no provision for extra facilities like schools, doctors etc.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

I object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land for the purpose of house building. My objection references MOL bearing the same protection from development as the Green Belt. If the Council will not agree to maintain the MOL status, designation as Local Green Space would lessen the negative impact on the local environment. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would totally change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Tower View, Edgewood View and Primrose Lane.

The site should be at least designated as Local Green Space.

The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 548. If the Council will not keep the land as MOL it should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. I am particularly concerned about the effect of local roads that the suggested development will have as, when Heron Homes built the original development some years ago they were prevented by the local council form building the number of houses now proposed because of inadequate access roads onto the estate. Under present conditions the A232 Wickham Road is particularly subject to traffic delays especially in term time. Your proposed developments would also have a detrimental effect on our already crowded local schools and doctor’s surgeries.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
It is unrealistic to develop this land which is at the far end of the estate due to poor accessibility. The land is privately owned. Residents purchased their property in the knowledge that the land is privately owned and designated such that it cannot be built on. The local management company has worked hard to maintain the green area and retain areas suitable for wildlife. The road is already congested with private cars making the bus route difficult. I do not consider it deliverable therefore it will not meet the present needs, let alone future needs. It is unrealistic to expect the land to sustain a limitless growth in population on relatively small patches. Transport will reach gridlock, the more land that is covered over leads to drainage issues. More pipes will be channeled underground to bring in services and take away waste. Changes to due to global warming etc will be exacerbated if the population continues to converge on small land masses rather than spreading over the planet. In addition to the physical problems we would be creating, social problems will occur with people living in closer proximity in congested space.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

I am writing to object: The de-designation of the five pieces of land as metropolitan open land and their proposed use of housing land at Poppy Lane reference number 128. I feel that building more houses on the green land would totally destroy the wildlife in the area and would ruin an area of beauty, and that the one road into the village wouldn't be able to cope with more traffic as it's already busy.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

I am writing at this time to record my objections on the following basis - the use of this site, 548, for housing

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
2185/01/005/DM43.4/O Jonathan E Miller

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 548</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I object to ref 548-I am writing to you with regard to the recent changes in Planning policies by Croydon Council and their impact on the designation of grass areas in Shirley Oaks Village. These areas were formerly designated as Metropolitan Open Land and had protection form being built on. However my understanding is that these areas may now be changed to no Metropolitan Land thus allowing their use for future housing developments. As a resident of Shirley I would like to point out that our land was designated as 'Amenity Open Land ' in 1985 by Croydon Council because of our undersized gardens and transferred to a Management Company, with each property owner as a shareholder of the Company. Whilst I fully accept the need for new housing in Croydon, in particular affordable housing for first time owners, it is clear the sheer scale of the proposed development and the resultant destruction of a precious greenfield site in Shirley Oaks Village that I object to. I would have no issue with a much smaller scale development of the village, as part of an overall plan for Croydon where new housing was primarily targeted toward development of brownfield sites under the council's jurisdiction. I urge you to consideration of my suggestions in the weeks ahead and look forward to receiving feedback in due course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2185/01/005/DM43.4/O Mrs Jane Smith | DM43.4 548 | Change |
| Object | | As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development. |

| 2185/01/005/DM43.4/O Breda Mohan | DM43.4 548 | Change |
| Object | | As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development. |

<p>| 2301/01/006/DM43.4/O | DM43.4 548 | Change |
| Breda Mohan | | As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>DM43.4 548</th>
<th>Brenda Stratford</th>
<th>The use of the following 5 sites for housing; ref no. 128, 504, 541, 542, 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as local green spaces.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brenda Stratford</td>
<td>Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>DM43.4 548</th>
<th>Alan Chitty</th>
<th>My objections are based on the fact that the proposals are not in the best interests of the electorate of the borough and that the proposals will only be harmful to the environment offering no benefits to the community. Building on the Green Belt is not the best option.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alan Chitty</td>
<td>Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>DM43.4 548</th>
<th>Christopher Palmer</th>
<th>I object to the use of the Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548 for housing: If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport. I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher Palmer</td>
<td>Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>DM43.4 548</th>
<th>Mr &amp; Mrs E Abdul-Nabi</th>
<th>Object to the use of this site for housing. If the Council will not keep it as Metropolitan Open Land it should be at least designated as Local Green Space.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs E Abdul-Nabi</td>
<td>Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object Soundness - Justified

Site 548, Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Tower View, Edgewood View and Primrose Lane.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Object DM43.4

I thoroughly object to these proposals, the traffic has built up over time and I wouldn't even want to begin to imagine what Shirley Oaks would be like if another 600+ homes where to be built, that would be practically doubling the size of Shirley Oaks as it is at present.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Object DM43.4

I will be objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I will also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
We strongly object to Croydon Council’s local planning proposals and plans for development to the site being used for residential development. We strongly object to the de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village. No more housing should be built on MO land and it is inappropriate for development since it would over-stretch the local road infrastructure with the additional traffic. The road in and out of Shirley Oaks Village is very narrow and there is hardly enough room for the bus to get by. The increased volume of traffic and parked vehicles would be unmanageable bringing traffic in all directions to a complete standstill.

We believe the council needs to rethink its proposals for the sites, but would hope that in any event, an overwhelming majority of homeowners living in the village will reject the council’s proposals. Not only would the area be an eyesore, but the proposal to build a whopping 700 new homes is unrealistic as the open green spaces are very small. You would also be destroying the wildlife by cutting down our precious trees and removing the open green spaces.

It was agreed, and we believe documented, that after the build of phase 5 on Shirley Oaks Village that no more houses would be built, and this was a deciding factor when individuals bought their properties on Shirley Oaks Village. If over 700 new homes are built, it would no longer be a village but instead an ugly built up housing estate, changing the character of the landscape completely.

From our perspective, if the proposals were approved, we would have no choice but to move away from the area. It would be too upsetting to see our open green spaces developed to excess with over 700 new homes. I have no doubt that developing the land would also devalue the property prices in the future.

We find the council’s proposals ludicrous and unreasonable. It is imperative that we protect the precious remaining green spaces around Shirley Oaks Village. On that basis, we vigorously object to the council’s proposal to develop the land.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2539/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Lydia Benady</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>We strongly object to the changes to designations of our grass areas. As a resident and shareholder I point out that our land was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as Amenity Open Land because of our under-sized gardens. This land is for our use. Not only would building be detrimental to our health and well being but also to the varied and protected wildlife that we have. There are plenty of rundown places in Croydon which should be regenerated and can be built on without impinging into our green spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2540/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Sandra Cooper</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I object to the designation of Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks enabling parts of this land to be used for housing and in particular site 548, with which I have an adjoining boundary. Should the Council not keep this land as Metropolitan Open Land these spaces should at the least be designated as Local Green Space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2541/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms Susanne Million</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing. If the Council will not keep this site as MOL, it should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2544/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Sara Palmer</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I object to the use of the Land to the rear of 5-13 Honey suckle Gardens reference number 548 for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport. I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Miss Margaret A Williams  

Object DM43.4 548  

I wish to register my objection to the proposed plans for the housing development on the green areas around the Shirley Oaks Estate.

Change  

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

M.K White  

Object DM43.4 548  

I strongly object to your proposed development plans for this site.

Change  

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mrs Shirley M Kall  

Object DM43.4 548  

Our Local Green Belt should remain as such and not dedesignated as Metropolitan Open Land which then could be used for new housing. I strongly object to this proposal. Plans for residential development:

Ref.No.128 - the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51-107 homes.
Ref.No.504 - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station is identified as suitable for 26-68 homes.
Ref.No.541 - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes.
Ref.No.542 - land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes.
Ref.No.548 - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes.

Development on any of these sites would change the whole character of the area, and surely add to the congestion of local roads which would increase the risk of accidents.

Change  

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
We wish to register our objection to the proposals to change the policy map 43 in relation to Metropolitan Open Land at Shirley Oaks Village. Like many residents we purchased our home on the understanding that the MOL was owned by the residents themselves and would not be developed. It was a strong factor in our decision to purchase our house. The land itself was transferred to the management company by a transfer dated 30 July 1991 made between Heron Homes Limited and Shirley Oaks Management Limited. The third schedule to this transfer contains restrictive covenants and I have attached the relevant clauses. These clauses state that the land is to be used as open space so I do not understand how you can ignore this and grant planning permission to build houses. We understand the need for more housing but feel that this is not the way forward. It would be far better to look at the buildings/land owned by the London Borough of Croydon first to see which could be used as residential properties. The old Ashburton Library in Ashburton Park is such a building that could be redeveloped and used for housing and I am sure there are many more.

Mrs S White

I object to the use of the Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548 for housing:

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Object Soundness - Justified

DM43.4
548

Please note that I wish to object to the proposals set out in reference numbers 504, 541, 542, 548 and 128, for the following reasons:

- There has been insufficient notice of the consultation period, and the proposals are not clearly set out as pertaining to Shirley Oaks Village.
- This land is designated as Metropolitan Open Land, and I do not agree that it does not meet the criteria, as it does contribute to the physical structure of London, and there currently are open-air facilities, which serve significant parts of London.
- Increasing the housing density in this development will have a detrimental effect on the overall environment, and will decrease the value of these homes, as the development contains smaller gardens than those originally planned, and the surrounding green spaces were left vacant to compensate for the lack of adequate open space.
- Any change in the restrictions will adversely affect the accessibility to nature and wildlife of the area, which contains features of metropolitan importance.
- There is inadequate infrastructure in the locality to accommodate such an increase in population.
- There has not been a true ‘fit for purpose’ investigation of the ‘brownfield sites’, which already exist in the borough, or of other open land which could be used without.

In view of the above please register my objection to all five proposals, and please acknowledge receipt of this email.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Land at Poppy Lane and Primrose Lane, Shirley Oaks Village. Residential development.

Can you please inform me why?

- All three consultation documents have only appeared in the last few days, yet the consultation meetings are for 25th and 28th of November? This is surely insufficient notice.
- I have tried to view the proposals on your website without success. Why would this be?

In view of the insufficient notice and lack of both digital as well as hard information, please register this email as an objection.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2572/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Keith Simmonds</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>As a resident I would like to object to you proposals to build homes on the existing amenity land on Shirley Oaks due to the fact that the infrastructure could not cope and these areas are of natural beauty and full of wildlife, this is a sanctuary that must not be removed</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2573/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Keith Harris</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>Development Reference Numbers 541,542,548,128,504</td>
<td>This we cause dangerous increase traffic through Shirley Oaks Road &amp; Primrose Lane, and also increase parking by the Synagogue which is bad at the best of times</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2574/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Lewis Reynolds</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I wish to object to planned proposals; ref:548.</td>
<td>These planned proposals will not fit within the current aesthetics of the estate so please accept this email as an objection to the proposal.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2578/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Tau Wey</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I am concerned about this proposal. When I bought my house in Angelica Gardens, Shirley Oaks Village, it was my understanding that I would also become a communal owner of the surrounding Amenity Open Land. This was guaranteed by each freeholder in Shirley Oaks owning a share of the Shirley Oaks Management Limited, which in turn owns and manages the Amenity Open Land. Like many residents, I purchased my house partly due to the pleasant areas of green space available in my surroundings. I also think that the character of the current surrounding gives each property the value that it currently has. I would also object to attempts by Croydon Council or other agencies to attempt to purchase the land from Shirley Oaks Management Limited in the future.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Steven Hunt

Object

2580/01/008/DM43.4/O

DM43.4 548

I am emailing to outline my objections to the planning notices in relation to the above reference numbers which concern land near to Shirley Oaks Road, Honeysuckle Gardens, Poppy Lane and Primrose Lane.

I object to these proposed developments for the following reasons:

1. The move to unravel the protection of Metropolitan Open Land from significant housing developments is a disappointing and avoidable move by Croydon Council. This sets an unnecessary precedent. This land should be protected by its designation and the council has sufficient options elsewhere in the borough on land that has no such designation.

2. Much of the land concerned was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as "Amenity Open Land" because of the under-sized gardens of many of the Shirley Oaks property. I live with a young family on Shirley Oaks with a very small garden and object to the loss of this open land which is regularly used by young families and residents of the area who do not have large gardens or any gardens at all in some instances.

3. Such proposals will unduly change the character and desirability of the local area which is defined by its open space. Shirley Oaks remains one of the few genuine peaceful residential areas within the borough and such thoughtless development will threaten this.

4. The roads leading to Shirley Oaks are roads not given to significant volumes of traffic. Increasing the density of the population within the immediate area as substantially as you are proposing creates challenges for traffic and parking. The scale of these developments will exponentially increase the volume of traffic and create challenges for parking.

Eli Simmonds

Object

2581/01/003/DM43.4/O

DM43.4 548

Soundness - Justified

As a resident I would like to object to you proposals to build homes on the existing amenity land on Shirley Oaks due to the fact that the infrastructure could not cope and these areas are of natural beauty and full of wildlife, this is a sanctuary that must not be removed.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Ms Ellie London

Object

DM43.4 548

I object to the use of the site for housing.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Sue Ridenton

Object

DM43.4 548

I would like to raise my objection to the proposed land changes for the Ref. 548 - Land to rear of Honeysuckle Gardens - up to 125 new homes.

The land we are talking about above was designated by Croydon council in 1985 as Amenity Open Land, because of our under-sized gardens and transferred to the Management Company - with each property owner as a shareholder in that company.

No one in the village will want any more homes built the open space keeps the village unique and a nice place to live. Any more homes will not enhance the village at all and of course will lower our house prices and a GYPSY site what on earth are the council thinking!!

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Ms Rachel James

Object

DM43.4 548

I object to the following proposal for Shirley oaks village.

Ref. 541, Ref. 542, Ref. 548, Ref. 128, Ref. 504 I love my home currently on Shirley Oaks our gardens are considerably in the small side and I daily take walks on to the land with have with my 2 children and husband. I feel this would depreciate the area and I wouldn't be happy with any of the above plans.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
I am writing to register my household's objection to the proposed developments in Shirley. The projected number of homes will impact dramatically not only on the existing residents and the open feel of the site, but essentially on the transport infrastructure. Wickham Road is a major route, prone to congestion at peak hours and any significant increase in road users will have a dramatic knock on effect not for residents and also for commuters in all directions. The Trinity roundabout is a major junction with many bus routes passing through, this would grind to even more of a halt. The potential number of proposed properties is unacceptably high.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, the five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces and not used for housing.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

The Society objects to the proposals to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and on land surrounding Shirley Oaks Village, in particular the proposals on page 68. This land is currently protected from development similar to protection of green belt land.

The Society objects to the proposals to de-designate land currently held as Metropolitan Open Land. Even if parts of the areas were designated as local green space, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, there would still be a huge loss of open space.

If development were allowed in these areas it would be detrimental to the amenity value of the area for the benefit of the public.
Having lived in Shirley for over 50 years I strongly object to Croydon Council plans to de-designate the Metropolitan open land so that most of this land can be used for new housing. At the moment it has the same protection as Green Belt.

Firstly, this would entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding area, changing the character of the area. More importantly, the road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic. Try getting out to the Wickham Road from Orchard Avenue in rush hour.

Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Tower View, Edgewood View and Primrose Lane.

The more specific site allocations represent a large reduction in the amount of designated and non-designated open space. While we acknowledge the need to build new homes and associated infrastructure such as schools, Croydon’s growing population also needs quality open spaces for all the human amenity and ecosystem services which they provide.

We object to the proposed development on green spaces, which are currently designated, and should remain designated, as part of the Shirley Oaks MOL. As mentioned as part of our response to SP7, we feel that most of the site still warrants its MOL designation. We object to the following site allocations as they will fragment the green space impacting on residents’ amenity and wildlife’s use of the area (both current and potential).

Contrary to the council’s statement in the Draft Local Plan, this site meets criteria for MOL in terms of its ecological value including nature conservation and habitat interest, with its mature trees and biodiversity, and has potential to be enhanced as per the NPPF and London Plan for leisure and recreation activities site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2720/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs C P Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2721/01/010/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr A Zelisko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2729/01/003/DM43.4/C</td>
<td>Mr G Simmonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am writing to object to:

- The use of the following five sites for housing:
  - Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128
  - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504
  - Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541
  - Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542
  - Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548

- If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

People buy property on Shirley Oaks Village because of the green open spaces, the peace and tranquillity, the beautiful old Oak Trees. You cannot suddenly take that away these surroundings; people have spent hard earned money to live on this Village. Residents also pay for maintaining these green open spaces.

The service road will not take any more traffic; two buses can hardly pass, and indeed were not supposed to drive round the estate together because of the small service road. There is a hospital and ambulance station on the estate, and any increase in traffic will interfere with their services.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Mr Ian K White

Object

DM43.4
548

I object to the use of the Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548 for housing:

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr E Tilly

DM43.4
548

Object to this site as building on it would lead to a loss of greenspace between Shirley oaks and the surrounding area

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mrs Frances Pearce

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4
548

I am writing regarding the Council’s plans for a massive redevelopment in the Shirley Area. More houses mean more traffic on our already crowded roads. I no longer go into Croydon because of the journey times. How long would it be before the Council considered bringing in a congestion charge. When you build all these properties do you consider the local amenities and the effect that more people would have on these. Where are the school places for all of these children? Regarding doctors. Unless it is an emergency I have to wait at least a week for an appointment. This waiting time can only increase if there are more patients. Is it the Council’s policy to build over green belt land to the detriment of locals? I sincerely hope not. I think you need to seriously reconsider these plans.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr David Jenner

Object

DM43.4
548

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
These open spaces are collectively designated as Metropolitan Open Land. It would be disastrous to lose a link in this chain.

THE SHIRLEY GREEN CHAIN

The green open spaces of Shirley Oaks Village provide several links in the Shirley Green Chain. This chain starts at the South Norwood Country Park in the north and runs south through Ryland Fields, Long Lane Woods, Ashburton Playing Fields, the open spaces of Shirley Oaks Village, Trinity School playing fields, Shirley Park Golf Course and up to the Shirley Hills. From there the Green Chain continues through Heathfield, Bramley Bank Nature Reserve, Littleheath Woods and via Selston Park to Kings Wood at Hamsey Green. These open spaces are collectively designated as Metropolitan Open Land. It would be disastrous to lose a link in this chain.

Planning Policy Guidance Note 9

This guidance stresses the importance of nature conservation, not only on nationally important sites, but also suggests that many urban sites for nature conservation have enhanced local importance as a consequence of the relative lack of wildlife sites in built up areas. Statutory and nonstatutory sites which provide wildlife corridors, links or stepping stones from one habitat site to another, all help to form a network necessary to endure the maintenance of the current range and diversity of our flora and fauna.

The Green Spaces in Shirley Oaks Village were designated as Metropolitan Open Land and today still meet the criteria for this protection. The sites (1) contain conservation and habitat interest of value at a metropolitan level and (2) forms part of the Shirley Green Chain. These are two of the criteria for Metropolitan Open Land. The Green Spaces in Shirley Oaks Village were designated as Metropolitan Open Land and today still meet the criteria for this protection. The sites (1) contain conservation and habitat interest of value at a metropolitan level and (2) form part of the Shirley Green Chain. These are two of the criteria for Metropolitan Open Land.

These sites possibly have a section 52 agreement, and are part of the Shirley Oaks Village residents.

Re-designation of MOL falls foul of...
the London Plan.

Existing dwellings to be retained or demolished? If retained the Site Area should be adjusted to take account of the existing dwellings: The Lodge, Beech House & Ash House? On the East site And the Synagogue and the two house (can't read their names) on the West side.

Infrastructure not specified to support development.

Schools are oversubscribed; GP Surgeries oversubscribed

Road system could not cope with the increase in traffic during peak travel times

Area has high water table and is subject to flooding.

London Plan

POLICY 7.17 METROPOLITAN OPEN LAND

Strategic

A The Mayor strongly supports the current extent of Metropolitan Open Land (MOL), its extension in appropriate circumstances and its protection from development having an adverse impact on the openness of MOL.

Planning decisions

B The strongest protection should be given to London's Metropolitan Open Land and inappropriate development refused, except in very special circumstances, giving the same level of protection as in the Green Belt.

Essential ancillary facilities for appropriate uses will only be acceptable where they maintain the openness of MOL.

LDF preparation

C Any alterations to the boundary of MOL should be undertaken by Boroughs through the LDF process, in consultation with the Mayor and adjoining authorities.

D To designate land as MOL boroughs need to establish that the land meets at least one of the following criteria:

   a) it contributes to the physical structure of London by being clearly distinguishable from the built up area
   b) it includes open air facilities, especially for leisure, recreation, sport, the arts and cultural activities, which serve either the whole or significant parts of London
   c) it contains features or landscapes (historic, recreational, biodiversity) of either national or metropolitan value
   d) it forms part of a Green Chain or a link in the network of green infrastructure and meets one of the above criteria.
The London Plan 7.56

The policy guidance of paragraphs 79-92 of the NPPF on Green Belts applies equally to Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). MOL has an important role to play as part of London’s multifunctional green infrastructure and the Mayor is keen to see improvements in its overall quality and accessibility. Such improvements are likely to help human health, biodiversity and quality of life. Development that involves the loss of MOL in return for the creation of new open space elsewhere will not be considered appropriate. Appropriate development should be limited to small scale structures to support outdoor open space uses and minimise any adverse impact on the openness of MOL. Green chains are important to London’s open space network, recreation and biodiversity. They consist of footpaths and the open spaces that they link, which are accessible to the public. The open spaces and links within a Green Chain should be designated as MOL due to their London-wide importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 548, Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure, impacting Tower View, Edgewood View and Primrose Lane.</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 548, Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure, impacting Tower View, Edgewood View and Primrose Lane.</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2791/05/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Peter Staveley</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2812/01/044/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Cllr Jan Buttinger</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2829/01/044/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Cllr Margaret Mead</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2841/01/031/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Cllr Vidhi Mohan</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Do you think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3? Whether yes or no please state your reasons:

- No, the land is current Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land or otherwise designated green land and should not be built on. I disagree that it "does not contribute to the physical structure of London". Just because it has no facilities does not mean that it is not an asset to the life of London. Yes, it is deliverable but should not be delivered on that land. No, it is not sustainable because it removes the need for green space for future generations.

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Object:

Site 548. Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Tower View, Edgewood View and Primrose Lane.

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Object:

Site 548. Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Tower View, Edgewood View and Primrose Lane.

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Object:

Site 548. Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Tower View, Edgewood View and Primrose Lane.

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2842/01/044/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Cllr Richard Chatterjee</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Site 548, Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Tower View, Edgewood View and Primrose Lane.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2857/01/008/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Philip Talmage</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Residential development on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and around Shirley Oaks Village (reference numbers 128, 504, 541, 542, 548) on Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals) This is Metropolitan Open Land which is accorded the same level of statutory protection as the Green Belt. Changing this designation in order to allow building amounts to an abuse of the planning process. The area is liable to localised flooding, which anyway makes it unsuitable for residential housing. There appears to be no provision for additional infrastructure which would support the building of up to 750 new homes. In particular, local roads are already inadequate; morning traffic queues are already common in this area, especially towards the town centre. The proposals cannot but fundamentally alter the character of this part of Shirley, again, for the worse</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2879/01/006/DM43.4/C</td>
<td>Mr Roy Saunders</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>object to the development at rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens as it is protected land as MOL</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object DM43.4 548

The site is owned by Shirley Oaks Management Company. The site is currently designated MOL. There is a legal agreement which relates to the land and identifies an area of which the site is part. It requires that the site be transferred to a management company and held as amenity open space. The company is the successor in the title to the original developer. The Section 52 agreement prevents development of the site and therefore it is not deliverable. The MOL designation should remain.

Should the decision to de-designate the site as MOL it should be designated at local green space. Development of the site would not comply with the NPPF nor would it be sustainable development for the reasons set out above and those identified in respect to the objection to Policy SP7. The highway network is already at saturation point and in any event any proposed residential development would generate an unacceptable amount of traffic. The site has a high water table.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Object DM43.4 548

The site is owned by Shirley Oaks Management Company. The site is currently designated MOL. There is a legal agreement which relates to the land and identifies an area of which the site is part. It requires that the site be transferred to a management company and held as amenity open space. The company is the successor in the title to the original developer. The Section 52 agreement prevents development of the site and therefore it is not deliverable. The MOL designation should remain.

Should the decision to de-designate the site as MOL it should be designated at local green space. Development of the site would not comply with the NPPF nor would it be sustainable development for the reasons set out above and those identified in respect to the objection to Policy SP7. The highway network is already at saturation point and in any event any proposed residential development would generate an unacceptable amount of traffic. The site has a high water table.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 548

I object to the use of the following five sites for housing:

• Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
• Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
• Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
• Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
• Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 545;

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
I write concerning Croydon Council’s proposals contained in the consultation document of the Croydon Local Plan that includes the re-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in Shirley and specifically within the confines of Shirley Oaks. I consider these proposals and others listed above to be inappropriate as they would significantly change the character of the area in which I have lived all 61 years of my life and I wish to add my voice to those already expressing concerns and objections about these proposals.

I strongly object to the proposal to re-designate Metropolitan Open Land to facilitate the building of new homes on land in Shirley Oaks and the provision of temporary or permanent traveller/gypsy sites in areas that are acknowledged by the Council to be in the green belt at Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries in Conduit Lane.

These proposals are totally out of keeping with the character of the area which predominantly comprise owner-occupied semi and detached homes. Surely areas considered to be brownfield sites are more appropriate than the unacceptable use of Metropolitan Open Land?

The proposals affecting the area surrounding Shirley Library are also of concern as this would adversely change the character of the area and potentially result in the establishment of additional unsightly car-parking sites on the south side of Wickham Road, similar to that at the front of the Shirley Medical Centre at 370 Wickham Road.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2924/01/08/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Roohi F Khan</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>These areas allowed by Shirley Oaks Management Ltd. 488 residents are shareholders in this company. This land was transferred to the above company in 1985 and designated as open amenity land by Croydon Council for use of residents as the gardens of the dwellings built by Heron Homes were very small. These areas of open amenity land are fully utilised by the residents and others for recreation and leisure and are clearly identified as private land. High density building in these areas would result in lack of pleasure and amenity for present residents, increase traffic congestion and an increased risk to residents personal safety and health especially through high pollution levels. Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2931/01/010/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr John Newman</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing. Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2948/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Carolyn Dare</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I raise strong objection to the allocation of this site for development. I am a shareholder in Shirley Oaks Management Company which owns the land and maintains it. I pay a quarterly charge towards its upkeep. The traffic is already too much for the road through the village. Please do not allow our village to be destroyed. Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2948/02/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Carolyn Dare</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I raise strong objection to the allocation of this site for development. I am a shareholder in Shirley Oaks Management Company which owns the land and maintains it. I pay a quarterly charge towards its upkeep. The traffic is already too much for the road through the village. Please do not allow our village to be destroyed. Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2969/01/003/DM43.4/O Mrs Janet Hills Object 1) I own pt the Land and am not prepared to sell my Share!
2) This open pastureland is used by children (playing) and dog walkers from other parts of Shirley. I know this because friends of mine walk their dogs - and pick up their 'litter'. We're all being encouraged to exercise more yet you're taking away the possibilities of doing so on our own 'home ground'!
3) It will grossly decrease the value of my property. !!!
4) I am in my 70's (I moved here 8 yrs ago because of the tranquility) and haven't the energy to move again!
5) The Wickham Road is already congested a lot of the time, I can't imagine what it'll be like with the introduction of 750 'new builds' on Shirley Oaks + the plans for altering other parts of Shirley.
6) There are wild birds, and animals, living here as well as us you know!!

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

2974/01/007/DM43.4/O Jane Bowden Object Soundness - Justified 2) I understand that the Council are seeking to de-designate various pieces of land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and around Shirley Oaks village, so that it is no longer Metropolitan Open Land, with a view to potentially building between 304 and 751 new homes. (Reference numbers 128, 504, 541, 542 & 548). Open, green land is essential to maintain a pleasant living area, and to maintain the character of the area. In addition, this number of additional dwellings would seriously overwhelm the local infrastructure. In particular, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

3001/01/008/DM43.4/O Mr John Helen Object land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548).

I will be objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I will also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

I am happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but I will be objecting to building on precious open space.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
3002/01/008/DM43.4/O  Mr John Hitchcock  
**Object**  
DM43.4  
548  
Our family has lived on Shirley Oaks Village approx 20 years ago and understood the village to be a Private estate and I am writing to object to the de-designation of the open land around the village and to the use of five sites for housing.  

The land rightfully belongs to the residents, the area and roads will become congested and property values will decrease.

**Change**  
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

3005/01/005/DM43.4/O  Mr John Roberts  
**Object**  
DM43.4  
548  
I am writing to object to:  

The use of the Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, reference number 548 for housing:  

If the Council will not keep these areas as Metropolitan Open Land, these 5 sites should at least be designated as Local Green Space.  

My objections are based on the following:  

i. The change in local designation and subsequent development would lead to a material reduction to an important green space and amenity within a basically urban area,  

ii. The effect and congestion on the local infra-structure which would be caused by the building of more housing to an already densely developed site,  

iii. The effect on existing property values of property to Shirley Oaks and surrounding areas caused by the reduced amenity and congestion.  

I urge that the Council should take these and other objections in consideration and not continue with their plans to re-designate the areas described above

**Change**  
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Land currently designated as Metropolitan Open Land at Poppy Lane, Stroud Green Pumping Station, to the east of Shirley Oaks Road, to the west of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens has been identified as suitable for up to 741 homes (pages 445-446, 451-452, 453-454, 455-456, 457-458 Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference numbers 128, 504, 541, 542 and 548).

I object to these proposals on the grounds that:

This land is designated as Metropolitan Open Land and there is no justification for re-designation. An increase of up to 741 homes on this land would put local services including schools, transport and already crowded roads under further pressure.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Once the area surrounding Shirley Oaks Village is re-designated the Council plans to build 751 homes on 5 separate sites.

Supposing the average house is for 4 people, 3000 people in total will move to the area. The housing will attract families - potentially half being children. The Council mention no where in their 700 page document about the building of new schools (primary and secondary) nor the building of doctor surgeries, nor the expanding of the local shopping area let alone the already stretched local road infrastructure. Our local area can't cope as it is - St John's primary school has applied for an extension to cope with the current demand on its places. During rush hour buses frequently don't stop at bus stops because they are full. Traffic is often diverted down our road, Shirley Church Road, if there is an accident on Wickham Road or Gravel Hill. The dual carriage way (Shirley Park) is crawling along during rush hour. The council are planning to add another 1000 plus cars to this equation. Shirley is often described according to estate agents as leafy, popular, excellent schools. By building 751 more homes the character of the area will change completely.
3028/01/008/DM43.4/O Mr Nick Barnes
Object  Soundness - Justified  DM43.4 548
Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Road.
None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.

Change  As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

3029/01/006/DM43.4/O Mr Paul Newton
Addington Village Residents Assoc
Object  Soundness - Justified  DM43.4 548
Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.
If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

Change  As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

3041/01/005/DM43.4/O Sarah Minter
Object  DM43.4 548
I strongly object to the proposed development plans for the Shirley Area. I have lived here all my life and have seen a steady influx of people, and a massive reduction in the green space in the area. The roads are already far too congested and the social infrastructure is already struggling to cope with the number of residents. There are many areas in the Croydon borough much more suited to such large scale development. I am thinking particularly of areas around Purley Way. There are also many brown field sites in the borough that could be put to more effective use as housing without affecting the green areas. I guess the council prefers to redevelop the green areas rather than the brown field areas due to cost. As I said I do not want my local area turned into a concrete jungle where there is nowhere for people to relax in the open.

Change  As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

3045/01/007/DM43.4/O Mr Stuart Marsh
Object  DM43.4 548
I object to the use of the site for housing.

Change  As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
I am writing to object to all the proposed changes and plans affecting the Shirley neighbourhood as advised to me by Gavin Barwell and the Executive Committee of Spring Park Residents Association. 

1) I object strongly to any plans to change the definition of existing land and use.

2) When dealing with the further extension of Shirley Oaks site I am disturbed by the fact there are just two access points i.e., Shirley Road and Wickham Road the latter being onto the A232 which is very busy all day and particularly during rush hour periods, when traffic backs up westwards to the Shirley Road roundabout and beyond.

3) The proposals for Shirley Oaks, given to me indicate land being suitable for between 304 and 751 additional homes. As many properties nowadays have at least one car this will have a serious additional congestion to Shirley and Wickham Roads.

4) Additionally, development of this size would have a serious demand on existing schools (primary particularly), doctors and other local services. 

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
I am writing to express my objection to the proposals of development to the Shirley oaks estate, on website www.croydon.gov.uk/policiesmap on "Changes to the policy Map 43" those being:-

Ref:541. Shirley oaks road East side, up to 215 new homes!!
Ref:542. Shirley oaks road west side, up to 236 new homes!!
Ref:548. Land rear of honeysuckle gardens, up to 125 new homes!!!
Ref:128. Poppy lane, up to 107 new homes!!
Ref:504. Up to 68 new homes or gypsy site at the water board HQ, primrose lane!!!!!!!!!!

I brought my home on 5 Flag Close, Shirley Oaks, Surrey, CR0 8XT as it was on a green and pleasant estate and on the understanding this land was designated to us as because of our undersized gardens. We were told this land would never be built on and each of the properties on the estate are shareholders of this land as it was designated “amenity open land” by the Croydon council and transferred to our management company.

We are forming groups and seeking legal advice and looking into the legal implications and small print to your proposals and will not take this laying change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

I object to the use of the site for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Mr Paul Grosser

Object

DM43.4
548

The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 548.

I have friends who live in Shirley Oaks Village and I know them and myself along with many others all object to the proposals to build on the green areas. This grass area is used by many and would totally change the area if built on and we don’t want it. Part of the charm of this area is those green areas and it has something that you don’t find often in Croydon so please let us keep the green areas as we all object to them being built on.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr Derrick Thurley

Object

DM43.4
548

1 De-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village thus enabling the following sites to be built on:

a) Policy DM43, Reference 128 Land to build 51 to 107 homes in Poppy Lane
b) Policy DM43, Reference 504 Land to build 26 to 68 homes at Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane including conversion of the pumping station
c) Policy DM43, Reference 541 Land to build 80 to 215 homes to the east of Shirley road and rear of Beech House
d) Policy DM43, Reference 542 Land to build 88 to 236 homes to the west of Shirley Oaks Road

e) Policy DM43, Reference 548 Land to build 5 to 13 homes to the rear of 5 to 13 Honeysuckle Gardens

This entails loss of green space, changing the character of the area and local road infrastructure unable to cope.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr Richard Horton

Object

DM43.4
548

I wish to log my objection to the borough-wide planned changes Croydon Council are proposing to make in their Local Plans for 2016-2036. These proposals are 750 new homes in Shirley Oaks and 35 new homes on the Shrublands Estate. Also the proposed work to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Coombe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Coombe Road.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr Dominic Quinn

A3 Architecture London LTD

Object

DM43.4
548

Object to the dedesignation of MOL around Shirley Oaks Village as it will change the character of the area. If they are not MOL they should at least be Local Open Land. Building Houses on them would lead to the loss of a vital green corridor and set a precedent.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
I am writing to lodge my objection to some of the proposals contained in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals. In particular:

1. Shirley Oaks

The proposal to re-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on Shirley Oaks Road and around Shirley Oaks Village so that it can be used for new housing (page 68, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals).

My main objections are:

- This would result in the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area.
- The local road network could not cope with the additional traffic.
- Insufficient local infrastructure to cope with the increased population.

Conclusion

The proposals I have highlighted can only be viewed as negative. If adopted, they will increase the local population - and the density of that population - without providing any supporting infrastructure. The new residents from the planned apartment blocks and traveller sites will need additional public services such as schools, medical services and shops. Older residents will give way to young families who require greater social support, yet no additional resources are identified to help manage the changing demographic. Traffic congestion along already busy roads will increase, as will pollution and accident black-spots. The few remaining green spaces will disappear. Overall, the proposals signal a reduction in the quality of life for both the existing residents and the newcomer.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Carolyn Heath

Object DM43.4 548

I am writing to object to:
1. The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:
   • Coombe Lodge Nurseries (site ref 661)
   • Coombe Farm off Oaks Road (site ref 502)
   • Poppy Lane (site ref 128)
   • Stroud Green Pumping Station (site ref 504)
   • Shirley Oaks Road/Beech House (site ref 541)
   • Shirley Oaks Road (site ref 542)
   • Honeysuckle Gardens (site ref 548)
   • Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Cottage (site ref 755)

All areas provide vital green space in already densely populated areas, and there is insufficient infrastructure to cope with the additional traffic/population. Some of these areas are in the Green Belt, others are in Metropolitan Open Land. They would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

David Harwood

Object DM43.4 548

(1) I object to residential development at the following sites & to the policy of de-designate of metropolitan open land at the following:
Land at the rear of 5-13 Honey Suckle Road reference number 548

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Jim Cowan

Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 548

I have read Gavin Barwell’s assessment of policies and proposals in the Croydon Local Plan and totally agree that if implemented would destroy the character of Shirley. The infrastructure in Shirley is already stretched to the limit and can not withstand any further burdens.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Sonya Millen

Object DM43.4 548

I am also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Object DM43.4

I have major concerns over the planned development of the Shirley Area. This is currently one of the nicest areas of Croydon and you plan to swamp it with a number of housing developments and some travellers sites. This will be very detrimental to the whole area.

I understand that nationally we need to have more accommodation for families. We need to achieve this with ought destroying the whole fabric of our society. This scale of development will transform the whole area into a old fashioned “Estate”.

There are not sufficient services in the wider area to support such an influx of families.

The road infrastructure already struggles at time and these developments will make the whole situation much worse.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Object DM43.4

I have major concerns over the planned development of the Shirley Area. This is currently one of the nicest areas of Croydon and you plan to swamp it with a number of housing developments and some travellers sites. This will be very detrimental to the whole area.

I understand that nationally we need to have more accommodation for families. We need to achieve this with ought destroying the whole fabric of our society. This scale of development will transform the whole area into a old fashioned “Estate”.

There are not sufficient services in the wider area to support such an influx of families.

The road infrastructure already struggles at time and these developments will make the whole situation much worse.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Object DM43.4

As a resident of Shirley Oaks from Day one, I totally oppose any new buildings to be approved or built on my private estate.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3208/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Mr Stephen Smith</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I am writing to object to re-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and the intention to build on open sites at Poppy Lane (ref 128), Primrose Lane (ref 504), Shirley Oaks Road (refs 541 + 542) and Honeysuckle Gardens (ref 548).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3215/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Mr Steve White</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shirley Beddoes

We bought our property at the original building phase in Shirley Oaks many years ago and were informed that there would be no further development in this area and that all grassed areas were to remain undeveloped and were for the use of residents and local people at leisure, further to this we have paid yearly a maintenance cost to ensure these areas were up kept for this use. This is the main reason we invested in this property. The grassed areas are in constant use and development of these areas would change the natural village atmosphere that exists here and is one of the few areas of Croydon that there is an abundance of wildlife close to an urban area. The proposed development and designation of our grass areas is unacceptable and would infringe our rights as in our original contracts with Heron homes who built the site.

Mr Peter Kenny

I am writing to object to The use of the following sites for housing: Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128 Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane Reference number 504 Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541 Land to the West is Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548. If the council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should be at least designated as Local Green Spaces.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
The area of Shirley Oaks Village and its adjacent road infrastructure is already at breaking point. Any slight build up of traffic seriously hinders movement for residents. The 2 main arterial routes into Croydon or towards Bromley (being Wickham Road & Lower Addiscombe Road) are extremely busy with traffic and often lead to extended journey times for those of us who wish to head into one of these town centres or further afield in to London for work. As proven only yesterday when a traffic accident in the Shirley area led to a 3 hour journey home from Bromley back to Shirley. The road network around here is poor. The interlink between Shirley Oaks village and its surrounding area is poor. To add hundreds of houses within this area will only lead to increased volume of traffic on the surrounding roads and leave Shirley itself in an almost permanent state of gridlock. Shirley Oaks Road is always busy with vehicles parked up. This is due to a number of reasons; The excessive traffic on Wickham Road leading to people abandoning their vehicles to try and walk nearer to Croydon to catch a tram or bus. The unreliable 367 bus route which is often hindered by traffic or accidents outside of Shirley Oaks Village leading people driving closer to other bus routes. The use of the local synagogue. Combine these issues above with the additional housing being proposed and the vehicles that come with them, Shirley Oaks will become even more cut off than it already is. There are many elderly residents in this area that rely on carers (friends etc) being able to visit them. They often complain about the issues I have raised above and I can only see this getting worse should the proposals for Shirley go ahead.

Croydon is a massive borough so there must be other areas that these proposals could be met.

Mr Terrence McCarthy

Object
DM43.4
548

I object to the use of the site for housing. If the Council will not list it as Metropolitan Open Land, it should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on it would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Terry Lewin
Object
I object to the use of the site for housing.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Daila Bradley
Object
Soundness - Justified
To help you identify my specific objections, the five proposals mentioned so far and to which I wish to object as being detrimental to the character of the area are:
• the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 128);
• Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 504);
• land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 541);
• land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542); and
• land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548).

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Mr Roger Williams

Object Soundness - Justified

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Dr Bob Wenn

Object DM43.4 548

I object to the site for use for housing.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr John Mullis

Object DM43.4 548

In response to your notices for the development of the greenfield sites on Shirley Oaks Village and the intention to change the status of this land, I make the following observations:

- In 1985 Croydon Council designated land within Shirley Oaks Village as “Amenity Open Land” because our gardens were small due to the layout and construction of the area by Heron Homes. This amenity land is owned collectively by the property owners who own 1 share each. The shares are held by the current trust company - First Port, who also maintain this estate. Is compulsory purchase envisaged? If a total of some 700 homes the village would need vast changes to its infrastructure to accommodate these properties. The present main road - Primrose Lane/Shirley Oaks Road is barely able to cope now - with just a single decker bus allied to a growing number of cars. There is a regular flooding problem during heavy downpours - particularly from Primrose Lane into Laburnum Gardens.

The loss of a wildlife conservation area is surely against wider interests including many present owners.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
3356/01/006/DM43.4/O Mr Rishi Gohill
Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 548
Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic. If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

3358/01/006/DM43.4/O Joy Harris
Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 548
Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic. If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

3370/01/006/DM43.4/O Claire Rutland
Object DM43.4 548
As a shareholder of the open space in Shirley Oaks I would like to object to the proposals made in Policy Map 43.
One of the reason I bought the property was for the the nice open spaces that surround the houses.
Building unnecessarily on this land will change the whole look and feel of the community of Shirley Oaks Village. We have one road in and out of the village and cramping in 700+ homes onto our lovely open space will also create congestion on the one road. Shirley Oaks is privately owned and we take pride in our village and how it looks and will fight against these proposals. Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

3371/01/006/DM43.4/O Claire Corper
Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 548
To who this may concern
Ref:541
Ref:542
Ref:548
Ref:128
Ref:554
I strongly object to these plans as a resident of hazel close I am a shareholder of Shirley oaks management and feel strongly that the land be left as it is as we have very small gardens and pay for these open land areas to be kept and maintained for our use and enjoyment. Also these plans especially the ref 554 will devalue my property immensely and will downgrade the area dramatically. Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
One of the requirements of the Pitt review of 2007 was for the Environment Agency to provide some warning for surface water flooding, as was already the practise for river and coastal flooding. The result was the LIDAR returns which are provided on the Environment Agency’s website under ‘what’s in my backyard’. This shows clearly how the lie of the land amongst the Shirley Oaks Estate causes surface water to run from South to North joining another stream which runs in from the SW from Shirley road into Primrose Lane. On numerous occasions over recent wet winters we have had a constant stream of water running across the kerb into Primrose Lane which has on occasion caused substantial amounts of ice to form. No doubt your winter maintenance department could confirm this is an area where they have to regularly do spot treatments of rock salt- since they do Primrose lane as it is a bus route, when other parts of the network are totally dry and do not require treatment.

From the Pitt Review of 2007, RECOMMENDATION 7: There should be a presumption against building in high flood risk areas, in accordance with PPS2S, including giving consideration to all sources of flood risk, and ensuring that developers make a full contribution to the costs both of building and maintaining any necessary defences. Section 5.14 of the report reiterates that PP525 applies to all sources of flood risk. This states that an SFRA (surface flooding risk assessment) should assess surface water flood risk and identify critical drainage areas. Good information is therefore needed from sewerage undertakers and other sources, including local knowledge, historic flooding and risk modelling. Local authorities should ensure that SFRAs carried out on their behalf adequately address this type of flooding. I find it difficult to believe this has been done as otherwise there would have never been a suggestion of using the remaining green parts of the estate in this way.

Any increase in the built up area around the estate would thus exacerbate the already on occasion saturated surface. Having investigated in detail the benefits in the reduction of flooding by the provision of trees, I have found that Oak trees can use up to 50 gallons a day and some trees on a hot day will utilise 150-200 gallons (wiki-answers.com). Trees admittedly are most effective when we are in the Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
growing season at excess water removal, but that is also when we tend to have the most extreme rainfall events. Having looked at ‘Heavy falls in a day’ and ‘Heavy falls in short Periods’ both produced in part for British Rainfall by the Met Office (my employer); I have found that invariably the most extreme rainfall happens in SE England between June and September. This is just when a tree is in full leaf so not only intercepts falling rain by the size of its canopy, but also as it is growing, that rain which reaches the soil is quickly extracted for use in the tree’s transpiration. Preliminary research results from the University of Manchester indicate that trees can reduce runoff by as much as 80% compared to asphalt. Thus the best way to alleviate summer extreme rainfall surface water flooding is not to remove trees.

The soil on which Shirley Oaks is located is of a clay type and is therefore impervious; another reason why it reacts to surface water flooding the way it does. The large area of grassland is ideal for ‘making room for water’ as a water storage area; thus to remove this pooling facility will mean the rain will have to find somewhere else to go, which would inevitably mean flooding for Shirley Oaks residents. Also I have learned, from Meteorological Office memorandum No 80-the properties of soils in NW Europe, that the root system of grassland provides a channel through which some rainfall does manage to slowly percolate through beneath the surface even with clay soils. However, without the grassland root system the water just tends to form bodies of water lying on the surface. This effect of our grassland is very helpful in alleviating the surface water flooding in winter, which occurs when prolonged rainfall totally saturates the area, and the trees are no longer as effective at its removal.

So in conclusion:
- We need trees to mitigate effects of extreme rainfall in summer, something which will become increasingly frequent with global warming.
- We need open grassland for water to accumulate in winter when trees are less effective at water removal from the system, whilst in addition their root systems help to aid percolation beneath the soil reducing surface flooding. Over the last 40 years winter rainfall has been increasing throughout the UK.
- Soil behaviours also dictate risk of flooding. We have issues because:
1) We are on a clay soil type so low permeability and heavy rain does not soak in but floods.
2) We are on sloping ground with tendency for run off to flow south to north across the site.
3) We, also because of having a clay soil, have a high water table, so in winter many areas of the site are wet and all parts stay damp throughout. Thus water-logging very quickly occurs and there would with the proposed building work be less and less places for the water to flow to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3377/01/004/DM43.4/O</th>
<th>Mr Stuart Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Object</strong></td>
<td>DM43.4 548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ref:</strong></td>
<td>Ref:541 Ref:542 Ref:548 Ref:128 Ref:504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am writing to you to object to the council’s planned proposals.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

I moved to the area with the understanding that the grass areas had protection from being built upon and I strongly object to the council proposing the new developments as referenced above. This will make the area I live in with my family crowded and I bought my property with the understanding that the grass areas would not be built on.
First, the Council plans to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village (page 68, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals). Metropolitan Open Land has the same protection from development as the Green Belt. The Council is proposing to remove this designation so that most of this land can be used for new housing. The draft Local Plan identifies five sites:

- the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 128);
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 504);
- land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 541);
- land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542); and
- land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548).

I will be objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If
the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I will also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, but the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

3381/01/008/DM43.4/O  Mr Daniel James  Object  DM43.4 548  I am writing to object to the councils proposition to allow the development at the following sites:-Ref: 541, 542, 548, 128 and 504 in Shirley Oaks Village

I have only lived on Shirley Oaks for 5 years, but one of the things I love the most is walking my children over to the grass areas so they can play. As you probably already know, our gardens are quite small so it’s really nice to have space to take full advantage of. Another thing that disappoints me, is that one of the selling points of our house, is the fact that all the land around the estate is protected from building on. I strongly disagree with any of your plans to build upon this land, and along with other Shirley Oaks residents will do my best to get our voices heard.

Change  As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

3391/01/005/DM43.4/O  Ms Aileen Deeney  Object  DM43.4 548  I wish to register my objection to the above proposals to allow the development of new homes on the designated Amenity Open Land which is available for my use and that of my fellow residents. This use was allowed by Croydon Council because of the undersized gardens which is a negative feature of the current development and which hinders enjoyment and comfort of my property. For example, it is not possible for children to play with footballs/other toys /play noisily without disturbing the adjoining and physically very close neighbours. You are no doubt aware that there are no nearby children’s parks. Also my garden can easily be overlooked by at least 4 sets of neighbours which I believe is typical of the other gardens on the development. Having the Amenity Open Land available is some compensation for the above lack of privacy and if it was to be withdrawn it would have a detrimental impact on

Change  As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
This is to object strongly to your ill-conceived proposals for high density dwellings on greenbelt parkland, on existing semi-detached housing areas, and gardens in the Shirley Oaks / Library region. Also for travellers sites in the vicinity of Coombe farm. All as outlined in Gavin Barwell’s email.

I object to the use of the site for housing. This will amount to a complete destruction of local character, a huge increase in local population without any increase in local services or access, and a destruction of green space which is currently protected.

As a resident of Croydon Borough and in particular Shirley Oaks, I am contacting you to voice my objection to the following development proposals: Ref: 548 Land to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens.

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Mr Daniel Nuthall Object DM43.4 548 I would like to object to the following Metropolitan open land proposals - Poppy Lane - Ref 125 - Stroud Green Pumping Station - Ref 504 - Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House - Ref 541 - Land to the west of Shirley Road ref 542 - Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens ref 548. The Metropolitan land provide several links in the Shirley Garden Chain.

Under the Planning Policy Guidance Note 9 the importance of nature conservation is stressed. This combined with the extra traffic seems unacceptable. Three of the proposed sites are owned by the residents of Shirley Oaks Village of which my house backs onto. We have several friends that live there all of which have raised the problems regarding such a development.

The three areas are
- Ref 541 - Land east of Shirley Oaks Road
- Ref 542 - Land west of Shirley Oaks Road
- Ref 548 - Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr Donald Speakman Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 548 Site 548, Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Tower View, Edgewood View and Primrose Lane.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Mr David Wilson

Object

We wish to object in the strongest terms to the plans being discussed regarding the proposed development of land for new housing in the Shirley area, specifically the building of Gypsy/Traveller sites on our doorstep, and the inherent increase in crime and anti-social behaviour that always follows, and can be seen in many examples nationally. Not only this, but the whole ‘Village’ feel of the area will be completely obliterated, and the very things that attracted us to move to Shirley (off Orchard Ave) will be no more. Of course people need a place to live and raise families, but time and again we have seen the resultant decline of neighbourhoods, with rubbish, noise and theft frequent occurrences. We urge you to think again and take heed of Gavin Barwell’s very real concerns, and those of what I’m sure are many of his constituents, and other Shirley dwellers. We are particularly concerned that you should take into account the fears of ordinary hard working people like us, who want to enjoy life (we're not ‘oldies’) in a pleasant community, and think again about the following proposals:

- land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548).

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr D Lane

Object

I object to use of Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic. If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

I wish to log my objection to the borough-wide planned changes Croydon Council are proposing to make in their Local Plans for 2016-2036. These proposals are 750 new homes in Shirley Oaks and 35 new homes on the Shrublands Estate. Also the proposed work to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Coombe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Coombe Road.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

We are writing to object most strongly to the Croydon Council’s Local Plan for housing on Green Belt land, with particular reference to Shirley. Our Green Belt should be protected at all costs and brown field sites must be targeted. In this respect, we support our MP Gavin Barwell’s objections, which you will doubtless have received.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

I would like to oppose the redevelopment of Shirley Oaks Village most strongly, we brought our property 8 years ago and were told that no further building would happen as our property runs along the side of one of your proposed sights. My understanding was that we paid a quarterly maintenance for the upkeep of our surrounding therefore making us shareholders of the estate nobody to date has said anything to us as shareholders except the posters on lampost a couple of years ago we had to pay extra to keep gypsy out of our village now you are proposing to invite them to come and live with us. Croydon is not a nice place to live and the only escape we have is our home and now you want to take that away from us. The development would have a fast impact on the schooling, utility’s, hospital etc in the area where and when will this all stop we pay our rates are law abiding citizens and feel all you are interested in is destroying all we have worked hard for.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Mr & Mrs Hobbs

Object: DM43.4

I am writing to you to object to the use of the following sites for housing development.

- The land at Poppy Lane. Ref. No. 128
- Strudwick Green Pumping Station. Ref. No. 504
- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and rear of Beech and Ash House. Ref no. 541
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road. Ref no. 542
- Land to rear of part of Honey Suckle Gardens. Ref no. 548

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr Dave Brown

Object: DM43.4

I object to the these proposals to build on the land ref 548, the land should be left as it is

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Sheila Desmond

Object: DM43.4

Ref 541
Ref 542
Ref 548
Ref 128
Ref 504

I wish to lodge a serious objection to the proposals for the building of houses on Shirley Oaks Village That name speaks for itself I have lived on Shirley Oaks Village for 30 years and during that time have paid the management company a contribution to maintain the The amenity open Land The residents each own a share of the Land and over the years the open areas have been enjoyed by families for games walking and enjoying the lovely trees not to mention the wildlife. When the land was sold by Lambeth in 1984 the intention was to create a village It has any thought been given to the effect on the infrastructure by adding 751 properties? the pressures on the roads in particular.

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
3486/01/005/DM43.4/O Mr Gary Stewart Object DM43.4 548 Re the above proposals with Ref nos 541, 542, 548, 504, and 128 I wish to object in the possible strongest sense. This land was not designated for this use and hence our homes all have very small gardens to protect this open space. We already have problems with the road through the estate and it cannot possibly take any more traffic. The allowed parking on this road particularly on the curves gives cause for real concern. I have avoided two accidents only by making an emergency stop. If the council goes ahead with these proposals then we will fight and please note we are depending on support from local councillors and our MP. Think again please.

3492/01/005/DM43.4/O Helen Silk Object DM43.4 548 I am writing to object to the plans to build gypsy/traveller sites in the area of Shirley and the building of anything on any area of green belt land, green spaces or back gardens.

3498/01/004/DM43.4/O Mr Ian Marsh Object DM43.4 548 I wish to object strongly to the proposed developments at Shirley Oaks - Ref 548 Land to rear of Honeysuckle Gardens - 125 new homes.

3501/01/008/DM43.4/O Gaynor Lawrence Object DM43.4 548 Please see this email as my objection to the proposed housing. This is ridiculous. The village is small and the road going through the village would NOT suffice the extra traffic! I pay a maintenance charge and moved here as it is a quiet location. I have been burgled a couple years back due I believe to the travellers that squatted on the land here and I do not want that fear again. Please rethink this crazy idea and let me know how I can further stop this.
Mr Gary Smithers
Object
The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 548
I have friends who live in Shirley oaks village and I know them and myself along with many others all object to the proposals to build on the green areas. This grass area is used by many and would totally change the area if built on and we don't want it. Part of the charm of this area is those green areas and it has something that you don't find often in Croydon so please let us keep the green areas as we all object to them being built on.

Mr Gary Kenney
Object
I am writing to show that I object to a number of your plans around the Shirley area. I contest that you need to build on our green sites and bring in new 'traveler' sites into Shirley.
On top of this I cannot understand the need to bring 'medium' high rise buildings in and around Shirley, including Devonshire way and the new proposals around Hartland way.
Please can you let me know if my objection has been noted and how I can make it more official?

Mr John Albert
Object
As a long term resident and shareholder residing in Shirlry Oaks Village, I and my partner object to the proposals to Changes to the Policy Map 43 - REF's 541, 542, 548, 128 & 504 These areas have metropolitan open land and had protection from being built on!
Our land was designated by Croydon Council in 1985, as Amenity Open Land because of our under sized gardens and transferred to the management company whom we our shareholders of and this land is for our use and want it to stay this way!! Having lived here for 20 years we do not want it further condensed by more homes and totally not fit for purpose!

Katrina Neal
Object
As a long term resident of Shirley/West Wickham and one who has seen many changes over the years, I am strongly objecting to Land to rear of Honeyeuckle Gardens - ref 548 for housing use. If these are not kept as MOL: then at least keep them as Local Green Spaces.
Jenny Hayden

Object DM43.4

The proposals for Shirley will have a huge impact on the area, the current infrastructure is already at bursting point and the building of new homes on green spaces will add further stress to the current situation.

Ref nos, 128,504,541,542, 548... these relate to the building of additional homes. From the information available in the Council's documentation, this could be up to 800 new homes. I would like to know what sort of homes these are likely to be... social, housing associations or private... I doubt that any of them would be affordable homes for first-time buyers. How will the local roads cope with the extra traffic. There will be a need for more schools, doctors' surgeries etc to support the intended increase to the local population. I would therefore like to object to the Council's decision to use these five sites for future residential development. Apart from putting extra burden on the local roads, it would also mean losing valuable green spaces. I believe any new residential development should be on brownfield sites. The addition of so many extra homes would have an adverse affect on the character of Shirley, in my opinion.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Rhodri Flower

Object DM43.4

I write with reference to your document 'Changes to the Policies Map (Policy DM43)', and in specific reference to sites 541, 542, 548, 128 and 504. These sites are all open space surrounding the development known as Shirley Oaks Village.

I wish to object to the proposals to reclassify the land and make it eligible for planning permission and the building of homes. In my opinion it is essential to preserve the open space for the use of local residents. It is well used for recreation, dog walking etc. It is also an important part of the character of Shirley Oaks Village and would change the nature of that development.

I bought a house on Primrose Lane in June 2015 and a large factor in my decision to buy was the amount of open space available locally. I understand that Croydon Council designated this land as 'Amenity Open Land' in 1985 because of under-sized gardens in Shirley Oaks Village and transferred it to the Shirley Oaks Management Company, which has maintained it ever since. As a house owner I am a shareholder in that company.

I strongly object to your proposals.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
I refer to the proposed changes to the planning policies to allow Croydon Council to build new homes on the Amenity Open Land at the above. The Amenity Open Land was granted in part, due to the extremely small rear gardens. Also I and other people in the village for many years here contributed to its upkeep at no cost to Croydon Council. To lose this land will greatly impact on the peaceful enjoyment that I and my neighbours have in using this land as well as the general impact on the area of high density building, changing the character of our village forever. No doubt this development will result in many trees and flowers being sacrificed which help to sustain the urban wildlife such as various birds, bats, foxes, badgers and bees etc. There seems to be little consideration for this urban oasis! Whilst I understand central government's drive for more houses, I find it hard to believe that Croydon Council needs this land in order to fulfil its housing quota, given the Westfield and other developments proposed in Croydon. There are also other lands, such as those owned by the local NHS hospital that would be suitable for development and at the same time give ready money to the NHS. Furthermore, the existing main roads are already inadequate to service the village without adding a further 751 homes along with the years of road works that will be associated with upgrading the utilities, make traveling through the village more difficult and dangerous. I urge you to reconsider your plans.
Mr Mark Hawkins

Object

Kindly note that as a homeowner (and shareholder) of Shirley Oaks Village, resident here for over 25 years, I am deeply concerned that Croydon Council seems to think it has the right to change the nature of the estate from being protected Metropolitan land to being unprotected land ripe for excessive building. Not only is the green space around the current estate, a much loved feature, it also provides a sanctuary for wildlife and allows for nice walks for local people. The road was built to be narrow and already there are problems with passing places for traffic to the hospital and synagogue. Last year the council allowed a resident to build a fence which obstructs drivers vision when turning out of Cornflower Lane and has caused several minor incidents. Simply put, the roads here were not built for traffic! The idea of ruining my neighbourhood by cramming more housing onto unsuitable roads, lacking shops and facilities whilst depriving me of the green spaces I love and part own makes me sick to my stomach. There are so many brownfield sites that could be built on and provide more suitable housing in and around Croydon that I feel that this attack on Shirley is politically motivated. I formally ask the council to reconsider the proposals.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr I Fuell

Object

Soundness - Justified

I am writing to object to:

3. The use of the following 5 sites for housing:

- Land at Poppy Lane: reference number 128;
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane: reference number 504;
- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House; reference number 541;
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road; reference number 542; and
- Land to the rear of 5 – 13 Honeysuckle Gardens; reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these 5 sites should at least be designated as local green spaces.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
We have got objection for above proposal. We are not happy; it would cause lots of traffic and not ideal for residents.

I would like to raise my objection to the proposed land changes for the following references:
Ref. 548 - Land to rear of Honeysuckle Gardens - up to 125 new homes. The land was designated by Croydon council in 1985 as "Amenity Open Land", because of our under-sized gardens and transferred to the Management Company - with each property owner as a shareholder in that company. As for looking at a Gypsy site, you should have seen what a mess they made when they camped illegally at Shirley Oaks just over a year ago - it was disgusting!

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Mr Mike Jones

Object

DM43.4 548

The de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village in particular such as the use of the following for housing:

- land at Poppy Lane
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane
- land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House
- land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road
- land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens

Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. There is a lot of history around here and the loss of the Shirley Lodge in the late 1990s was a big mistake. Generally in Croydon there is no room for more traffic that new building will generate and judging from what I have seen around Croydon squeezed housing units with small garages not fit to store cars and little or no off street parking will only add to stress and problems in the future.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr Peter Newsham

Object

DM43.4 548

I wish to register my objection in the strongest possible terms to the proposal for new housing, (ref. 548), in these areas of Metropolitan Open Land, which is essential for recreational purposes in an already overcrowded place, is unacceptable and the proposed re-designation of the land so that it can be used for high-density urban development will find no local support, but instead, a huge and vocal opposition.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Please see my objections to your proposals as detailed below.

DM43 Ref 541 Land east of Shirley Oaks Road
Ref 542 Land west of Shirley Oaks Road
Ref 548 Land to rear Honeysuckle Gardens

These areas of Metropolitan Open Land are not "incidental open spaces" or "Grassland with a few detached houses" as your report states. These areas were designated by Croydon Council as residents "Amenity Open Spaces" under a section 52 agreement on the 4th December 1985. This was to ensure that the residents were provided with adequate open space following a dispute between the Council and Heron Homes, the developer. These areas were then handed over to the Shirley Oaks Management Limited, a company with the property owners as shareholders.

The designation as MOL should remain. If it is decided de-designation proceeds, the Site should be designated as Local Green Space. Proposed development of the Site in the event that the present designation remains or that re-designation takes place as Local Green Space would not be consistent with national policy under the NPPF and such a proposal would be incompatible. The proposed approach is not appropriate nor would it enable sustainable development for the reasons set out above and those identified in respect to the objection to Policy SP7. The highway network is already at saturation point and in any event any proposed residential development would generate an unacceptable amount of traffic. The site has a high water table with water running off and flooding properties on the Mere End side of the site. Additional planting of trees and shrubs has been introduced to try to compensate. Any development is likely to worsen this situation for properties on that boundary line.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Mr Nick Barnes  
Object: Soundness - Justified  
DM43.4 S48  
Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Road. None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.

Change  
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mrs Margaret Hawkins  
Object: DM43.4 S48  
Ref 548 – Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens  
I am objecting to the proposal for de-designation of this area as Metropolitan open land, with a view to "working with the landowner" to bring development of up to 125 houses forward. It is a vital part of the green chain and wild-life corridor through Shirley. This can clearly be seen by viewing Google satellite photos of the area. This land contains hedgerow and water habitats. A stream runs through it. The land is jointly owned by 500 equal share-holders, which would make "working with the landowner" a complex issue. The council would be unlikely to get the co-operation of all 500 shareholders. Access to this site is situated on a steep bend on a narrow road. It already poses a danger to pedestrians, cars, buses and delivery vehicles, particularly when they meet. There are 3 other such spots on this access road. On 2 of them the associated houses have had their garden walls knocked down at regular intervals over the past 30 years, and there has been at least one fatality. Construction traffic would pose an unacceptable risk to children and pedestrians in the area.

Change  
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Cllr J Cummings  
Object: Soundness - Justified  
DM43.4 S48  
Site 548, Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Tower View, Edgewood View and Primrose Lane.

Change  
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3702/01/008/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms J Fasham</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the Councils proposal to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land of Shirley Oaks Road and Shirley Oaks Village as the local infrastructure could not cope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3713/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms J Stokes</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the proposals to completely change Shirley Oaks Road which is a green lung for that part of the Borough. The amount of car ownership will rise significantly as the bus service is infrequent. The traffic will clog up the Wickham Road even more than now. St. John's school has already plans for more classrooms and the intake will rise in all the local schools. Also pulling down established houses and putting up more flats is detrimental to the character of the area. We had a once in a lifetime chance to improve the look of Croydon, on a human scale. Instead of which we are building hideous tower blocks, while in other parts of the country they are pulling them down. Nobody should have to raise a family in a block 44 stories high. They will eventually become the slums of the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3715/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Jenny Tighe</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Development of these sites will have a negative impact on the local area by changing the character of Shirley, and well as being a loss of green space, wildlife habitat and a vital green corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3723/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs J Middleton</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the site for use for housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change: As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Miss Amanda Smithers

Object

The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 548. My partner is a resident of Betony close Shirley Oaks Village and we definitely do not want the surrounding areas to be built on.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Ms Jennifer Addis

Object

I strongly object to the development proposals by the council for the above areas on Shirley Oaks Village. All the gardens on our houses are tiny so this green land which was designated as 'Amenity Open Land' was supposed to be for the use of the residents. There are enough houses on this area already! This will have a huge detrimental effect on all the residents in the area.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr Tim Duce

Object

Soundness - Justified

I strongly object to any plan to build on Metropolitan Open Land. There are plenty of brown field sites available in Croydon and the MOL should be re-designated as Local Green Space.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr J Patel

Object

Soundness - Justified

I am writing to record my objection to various planning as follows. Your Ref No 128,504,541,542,548 and 938. I don’t think it will be good for the area.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Diane Simpson

Object

Soundness - Justified

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
I am also concerned that you consider there is space for up to 751 houses in the Shirley Oaks Road area. References 128, 504 541 542 548. This would lead to the elimination of green space in that area and therefore I think at least 3 of these areas should be Local Green Spaces if not Metropolitan open land.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
RE: LAND ON EITHER SIDE OF SHIRLEY OAKS ROAD, SHIRLEY OAKS VILLAGE, POPPY LANE; STROUD GREEN PUMPING STATION; COOMBIE FARM, COOMBIE LODGE NURSERIES off Conduit Lane, land west of Shirley Oaks Road, rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens OBJECTION TO DE-DESIGNATION GREEN BELT; SHIRLEY, NEW ADDINGTON, FOREST HILL

We have lived in the Borough of Croydon for 30 years and value its vibrancy and diversity.

As Croydon ratepayers we object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land generally, especially land detailed above, which will change forever Croydon’s character.

We would ask you to encourage policies/development to:

1. Build new housing on brown field sites by all means AND preserve invaluable green space for the benefit of the community of Croydon; 2. Protect green belt land and preserve the green corridors we desperately vital for wildlife and biodiversity; 3. Amend the tall buildings policy and keep the tall building zone where it is suited in the centre of town; 4. Utilise brownfield sites for new low-level housing only where it can be developed alongside new GP surgeries, schools and improved public transport; 5. Traveller sites are not appropriate in the green belt and is a clear breach Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. When travellers camped on Addington Playing Fields in 2012/13 they left rubbish, debris, waste, and deterioration to a local green space. Sadly true of most traveller sites.

"Nowadays people know the price of everything and the value of nothing". Green Belt is vital and precious. Once lost for future generations and will not be replaced by developers.

We understand the need for housing, schools, hospitals and infrastructure. Are the Developers investing these also alongside their building investments?

Please protect our few remaining green spaces on the borough map, by making better use of brown field sites.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 548</td>
<td>We are objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council will not keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. We are also objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure could not cope with the additional traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am writing this email to voice my deep concern about the planned development in the private estate that I have lived in for many years, namely:

- Ref 541, Ref 542, Ref 548, Ref 128 and Ref 504 – all on Shirley Oaks Village private estate.

Firstly, it would have been nice to be informed about any planning ideas in writing rather than see small notices pinned to lamp post around the estate. I would also like to draw your attention that our land was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as ‘Amenity Open Land’ for the residents and for which we pay a quarterly fee for maintenance of the green open land, but more importantly can I bring to your notice that this land was transferred to the Shirley Oaks Management Company, with each property owner as a shareholder in that company. This land is for our use and not for developing a concrete jungle on every single green inch of land in Croydon.

The Shirley Oaks estate has a great community spirit and has become a real sought after location for families to live due to the community nature and the lovely open land that we have, by developing on this land you will be taking away all of the good that has been built up over the years by the many residents we have as well as making the village overcrowded, bringing in more traffic thus resulting in more danger on the main Primrose Lane for people crossing and driving, congestion for parking and so on. I can also bring to your attention that we have already had a couple of fatalities on that main road that runs through the village and this will make it worse for the safety of our kids.

I am sure you have now had many hundreds of emails from residents like myself voicing the same concerns with your planning proposals!

This land belongs to us as residents so I feel its harsh to take this away and start your own developments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/09/2016</td>
<td>3785/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Jenny Greenland</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of the site in Shirley as MOL. If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I enjoy this space every weekend and meet many like-minded people. I also be object to the site being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic as it struggles now. I am happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but I object to building on open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/09/2016</td>
<td>3789/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Paul Slaughter</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/09/2016</td>
<td>3792/01/009/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Simon Bradley</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>To save you looking it up, and to help you identify my specific objections, the five sites mentioned so far and to which I wish to object as being detrimental to the character of the area are: Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croxton Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croxton Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 548).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Soundness -</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/09/2016</td>
<td>3785/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Jenny Greenland</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/09/2016</td>
<td>3789/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Paul Slaughter</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/09/2016</td>
<td>3792/01/009/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Simon Bradley</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second, the Council plans to de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village (page 68, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals). Metropolitan Open Land has the same protection from development as the Green Belt. The Council is proposing to remove this designation so that most of this land can be used for new housing. The draft Local Plan identifies five sites: - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548).

I object to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I also object to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

I object to the use of the Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548 for housing: If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport. I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM43.4 548</td>
<td>Site 548, Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Tower View, Edgewood View and Primrose Lane. As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I write to you with my objections to the proposed Croydon Local Plan, specifically on the points below:
• the land at Poppy Lane is identified as suitable for 51 to 107 homes (pages 445-446, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 128);
• Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, including the conversion of the locally-listed pumping station, is identified as suitable for 26 to 68 homes (pages 451-452, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 504);
• land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House is identified as suitable for 80-215 homes (pages 453-454, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 541);
• land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road is identified as suitable for 88-236 homes (pages 455-456, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 542); and
• land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548).

I object to the decision to designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I also object to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.
Mr Ian Leonard Object DM43.4
548
Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548). I object to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council will not keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I also object to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, thereby disastrously changing the character of the area, additionally, the local road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional traffic.

Mrs & Mrs Linter Object DM43.4
548
I object to land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548). As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr Ross Aitken Object DM43.4
548
I would like to object to these proposals: Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548.

Yasmeen Hanifa Support DM43.4
548
I write to you having received this email from Gavin Barwell MP, the tone of which I find inflammatory and discriminatory towards the Gypsy and Traveller communities, and smacks of "not in my backyard". I write as a resident of Addiscombe who recognises the huge problem of lack of affordable housing to buy and to rent in London promulgated by this Conservative government and the previous coalition government. I fully support Croydon Council's proposals.

02 September 2016 Page 2866 of 4384
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 548</th>
<th>I object to site 548</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms L Pinkney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ms L Sasankan | DM43.4 548 | I am resident at 35 Primrose Lane, Shirley Oaks Village, along with 4 other members of my family. I am writing to express my objection/agreement to the following: 1. de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village 2. The use of the following five sites for housing: Land at Poppy Lane ref 128 Stroud Green Pumping Station, ref 504 land to east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, ref 541 Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, ref 542 Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, ref 548 | Change |
| Lee Kirby-Walker | DM43.4 548 | I am writing to object to: The use of the following five sites for housing • Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128 • Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504 • Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541 • Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 and • Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548 If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated a Local Green Space. | Change |

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Mr M Foster

Object  

I wish to lodge an objection to all five sites where the decision to designate this land as Metropolitan Open space land and to build housing upon them, not only would we be losing vital open space and change the very character of the area, I believe the local road infrastructure would not cope with any more traffic, why must the council continual to try and ruin areas that people like.

At the moment this area as a rural feel to it, nice green spaces and a open aspect which we would loose if these plans were to go ahead. I would ask the council to think very hard before implementing these plans before we have another area that people want to move out of instead of to, these plans will not improve the area quite the reverse, where at the moment people like to live here.

Change  

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Miss Rebecca Thomas

Object  

I email to express my formal concern and objection to the proposal to build additional housing in the green areas of Shirley Oaks Village. I currently reside in Beckenham, 1 Hamilton House, Orchard Way, BR33ER, on the Shirley boarder, and was previously a resident of Shirley for 30 years.

The addition of these houses will not only bring down the areas reputation, spoil views from current properties but also cause additional congestion to an already busy area. We should be looking to preserve our green areas, and Shirley Oaks Village should remain just that, a village! I believe that the Wickham Road has already been flagged as one of the busiest roads in the area, with a fatal road accident occurring both this year and last. Additional housing/congestion will only add to this danger.

This proposal will cause residents of the local area to be driven from their homes unfairly, I am sure that they did not purchase properties to be overlooked and to lose the view of the land that they have been paying to maintain for, in most cases, a number of years.

I am contactable on my home address/phone should wish me to validate my views further.

Change  

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Object DM43.4 548

I am writing to express my objection to the planning proposals in the Shirley Oaks area. The land has been set aside for our use as we have very undersized gardens on the estate and we have also paid to keep those areas in a well-maintained condition. The road around Shirley Oaks only has 2 exits as well, so would make it very congested as there are only 2 options for traffic to leave and enter and there are already a lot of problems at the Wickham Road end as people drive in and out.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

3858/01/006/DM43.4/O

Mr Nicholas Barnes

Object Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 548

Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Road.

None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

3860/01/004/DM43.4/O

Mr M Lockeyear

Object DM43.4 548

I wish to register my objection to these proposals for the following reasons: I purchased my property on the understanding that all the open grassed land surrounding the village was designated by Croydon Council in 1985 as "Amenity Open Land" because of our under-sized gardens and transferred to the Management Company, with each property owner as a shareholder in that company.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
With regard to the 'very scant' notices that have been posted on Shirley Oaks Village in places that are not in visible of all residents, I must object VERY STRONGLY to these plans. (1) The land is owned by the residents with a covenant on it. Our houses are condensed with tiny gardens, the compensation for which is the open ground (owned by all residents) that we are able to use. My understanding is that the original development was curtailed by the then council because of the density of housing/population on Shirley Oaks.

(2) Drainage on Shirley Oaks is very poor. I am given to understand that the water table is very high and indeed during the winter months the open spaces are sodden, holding water which could probably present a flooding problem. It is so bad in some places that the ducks move in!

(3) Could the services (sewerage etc) really support the number of properties proposed. There have already problems from time to time, especially down Shirley Oaks Road. (4) Realistically, whatever type of property would be built, you could expect an average of two cars per dwelling. Shirley Oaks Road/Primrose Lane are extremely hazardous and would not be able to sustain another probably 500/1000 cars. Where would people park. There are enough problems on here already with regard to parking, deliveries etc. Both Shirley Oaks Road at the Wickham Road end and Primrose Road at the Shirley Road end are used as car parks and quite often it takes a bit of delicate manoeuvring to get round, especially if you meet a bus.

(5) Planning permission has been refused for the plot in Poppy Lane (128) a number of times. The area was declared as a nature reserve some time back and I was unaware that this had changed. Part of the reason for the last planning application was the high water table, so how come there has been a change of mind?

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Edwina Morris

Object DM43.4 548

I object to the use of the Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548 for housing:

We think that sites 548, 128, 504, 541 and 548 should be retained as Metropolitan Open Land, but if not they should be designated as Local Green Spaces.

We consider that building housing on these sites will result in the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and will change the character of the area. It will also over-burden the local road infrastructure, which already suffers from heavy congestion during morning and evening periods.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mrs Barbara Cumming

Object DM43.4 548

I object to the planned five sites being used for residential development in Shirley, Croydon: Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional traffic.

Whilst I agree that we desperately need new housing, it should be built on brownfield sites - not our remaining precious green spaces!

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Ms M Bailey

Object DM43.4 548

The Metropolitan Open Land on either side of Shirley Oaks and all around Shirley Oaks Village should not be de-designated, but designated as Local Green space. It is very important that Croydon needs green spaces as these give the feeling of openness and a pleasant environment in which to live. Upwards of approximately 700 hundred odd homes could be built in this area which will lead to possible flooding of areas as rain water will not be able to drain away as easily as it would if it was left as a green belt area. Secondly the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic stemming from these additional homes, and this includes public transport. Thirdly are the NHS facilities in the area able to cope with this large influx?

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Jan Payne

Object

I object to the use of the site for housing.

DM43.4 548

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr & Mrs Asfahani

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 548

Every year we get proposals and consultations for building more homes or structures on Shirley Oaks green land. But must admit the above proposal is the worst and the most ridiculous so far. From what we read, the proposal suggests to build around 750 new homes on what's left of green patches in the village.

The village is already over crowded with Shirley Oaks road and Primrose road looking like a huge PARKING LOT throughout the day. One cannot begin to imagine what it would like with more residents and obviously with at least double the number of cars to that of the number of the new homes proposed.

We bought our property back in 1989, paying above market value at the time, for the sole purpose that the village is quiet and has some green land. Our home was one of the last phases of any buildings to be erected in the village, or so we were promised and confirmed in writing. Since then, a synagogue was built, bus 367 goes through the narrow winding road, every year for the last few years we get proposals to use our green land for one suggestion or another and now this proposal.

We completely oppose this proposal and hope that the council will appreciate that it's not all about the money and just building more houses, but quality of life matters just the same. On one hand the government and councils encourage and push people to plant more trees, grow their veg, recycle etc... Yet on the other hand come up with proposals to use every last green patch to build more structures and homes. Doesn't make any sense.
Cllr M Neal

**Object**

Site 548, Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well-used amenity space. This would totally change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Tower View, Edgewood View and Primrose Lane.

**Change**

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Ms E Rudduck

**Object**

I object to the use of the Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548 for housing:

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

**Change**

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr & Mrs Frederick Banjo

**Object**

As property owners/Residents and shareholders in the company that manages Shirley Oaks Village, we are writing to state our objection to the above mentioned proposal.

The land/s in question is designated as ‘Amenity open Land’ for the use of the property owners and residents of Shirley Oaks Village and must not be built upon.

The proposal to build on these lands will simply destroy the peace & tranquility of the village. The enjoyment of the open land by residents will be lost not to mentioned the increased traffic situation amongst other things.

We strongly object to these proposals to build upon these lands.

**Change**

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3923/01/05/DM43.4/O Ms A Smithers</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 548: The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 548. I object to this as Shirley oaks village and surrounding areas are lovely and people go there for their green space to walk their dogs and have a nice time. This would ruin the whole area and what it currently stands for and I amongst many will be upset if the green areas are built on.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3926/01/05/DM43.4/O Mr &amp; Mrs Peter &amp; Brenda Mullings</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 548: We object to the proposals for this site.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3933/01/06/DM43.4/O Mr &amp; Mrs Thacker</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 548: I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3942/01/06/DM43.4/O Mr Scott Hunter</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 548: I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3943/01/06/DM43.4/O Mr Steve Murray</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 548: I object to the use of the site for housing.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr C Rudduck</td>
<td>I object to the use of the Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548 for housing: If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport. I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr K Rudduck</td>
<td>I object to the use of the Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548 for housing: If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport. I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am a resident of Shirley and strongly object to the current proposals to build on green belt land on the Shirley Oaks and surrounding areas.

There are plenty of brown sites that are unoccupied and could fulfil the purpose of providing new homes. Shirley is already tight for school places. St John’s, in Spring Park Road, is increasing to 2 form entry already with the number of children living locally requiring education. The 367 bus serving the Shirley Oaks Village is infrequent and much more transport will be required. Parking is already a nightmare and with the lack of parking contemplated with the new build supply the problem will only get worse. There will be an incredible build up of traffic on the already congested Wickham Road and other local roads.

I believe this proposed building of traveller's sites and homes will change the whole ethos of Shirley and cause resentment and the lowering of living standards. This is a particular area of standard housing and should not be changed by the building of blocks of houses. Garden land should not be built on and this is an inappropriate development and should not be allowed to go ahead. Metropolitan Open Land has the same protection as the Green Belt and the rules should be followed accordingly.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Having lived on Shirley Oaks for almost 30 years, I strongly feel that any changes to the current planning policies would have serious and negative consequences for the current residents. Not only would properties lose significant value, the estate would also lose its 'village-like' feel that lead us to move there in the first place. We were also told at the time of purchase that Shirley Oaks would always remain as metropolitan open land, and this also heavily influenced our purchase. To add to this, there is also the issue of increased traffic through the estate. There was a fatal accident only a couple of years ago by the bend of Poppy Lane and I feel that with the prospect of even more houses being added to the estate there will be a significantly higher risk of further accidents.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
I object on the grounds of appalling over crowding, your plan would bring at least 2000 more vehicles onto the estate. It is already nearly impossible to get in and out of the estate by car at rush hours. The roads on the estate can barely cope as it is with the bus route. The extra vehicles would include many commercial vans which would be parked over night and weekends causing havoc on the narrow roads of the estate. A single bus route as at present running every 20mins causes problems how do you intend to increase public services more bus routes and more frequent timetables...more chaos! I along with others pay to maintain and the open space as a share holder. Your proposal would seriously devalue our properties and I for one will be seeking serious compensation for this, I trust Croydon has very big capital reserves to meet our legal challenges and compensation. Our gardens are small this is why the land has been designated open land so we have some open space in common with the surrounding houses. Your plans are ill conceived and will effectively destroy Croydon further. There are large areas of open land in Addington which Croydon could use and I presume already own without spending our money attempting to purchase land which will be extremely costly to Croydon in terms of the compensation that you will need to pay out and in the legal fees entailed.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Mr N Oratis

Object DM43.4 548

I object to the decision to de-designate this land as metropolitan open land for the use of residential development for the following reasons. I would first like to begin with reference number 548. This area sits beautifully behind my home, I have a lovely view of the park as do many of my neighbours. I do not want this area to be demolished as I love the character as do visitors and neighbours. This area is used every day and regularly by myself, family members, neighbours and countless visitors wanting to take their dog for a walk or spending time with family and kids. This area has amazing character with huge green, tall trees, a small walk bridge with a lake underneath for people passing by to enjoy. There would also be disturbance and loss of wildlife as there is evidence of badgers in this location also in the above reference numbers. Ref 548, 542, 541, and 128 are owned by Shirley oaks management. 488 residents are shareholders in this company. There was a decision in 1985 for this land to be open for use by the local residents because the gardens of all homes were considered small.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Ms S Ikpa

Object DM43.4 548

The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeyeucke Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
I am writing to object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village, in particular to the use of the following five sites for housing:

(i) land at Poppy Lane reference number 128
(ii) Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504
(iii) land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541
(iv) land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542
(v) land to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548

If the Council cannot keep this land as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should be at least designated as Local Green Spaces.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

I wholly disagree with the plans to develop the land on Shirley Oaks Village. This is metropolitan land and will not be built on.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
I am therefore writing to formally object to:

1. the de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;
2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   - land at Poppy Lane REFERENCE NO. 128;
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane REFERENCE NUMBER 504;
   - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House REFERENCE NUMBER 541;
   - land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road REFERENCE NUMBER 542; and
   - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens REFERENCE NUMBER 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building houses on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built upon. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4007/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr R Horton</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 548</td>
<td>I wish to log my objection to the borough-wide planned changes Croydon Council are proposing to make in their Local Plans for 2016-2036. These proposals are 750 new homes in Shirley Oaks and 35 new homes on the Shrublands Estate. Also the proposed work to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Coombe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Coombe Road.</td>
<td>Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4008/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr R Kiley</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 548</td>
<td>am writing this email to register my objection to the misuse of building on green belt land in Shirley, and elsewhere. All our lives are stressful now and we need these green belt areas to maintain our quality of life. I am objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). If the Council won't keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection. I will also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.</td>
<td>Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4010/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr R Morley-Smith</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 548</td>
<td>Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn't cope with the additional traffic.</td>
<td>Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4022/01/009/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Ewin</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 548</td>
<td>Objection to Croydon Council’s proposal to provide sites for travellers &amp; the building of houses, etc on green land in Shirley &amp; other areas.</td>
<td>Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
am a resident at 35 Primrose Lane, Shirley Oaks Village, along with 4 other members of my family. I am writing to express my objection/disagreement to the following:

Object to the de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and in particular to the use of the following five sites for housing:

- Land at Poppy Lane ref 128
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, ref 504
- Land to east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, ref 541
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, ref 542
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, ref 548

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Ms S Raghun

Object

I am writing to express my objection/disagreement to the following:

2. The use of the following five sites for housing:

- Land at Poppy Lane ref 128
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, ref 504
- Land to east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, ref 541
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, ref 542
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, ref 548

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Ms S Wheeler-Kiley

Object

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mrs S Smithers

Object

The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 548. We don’t want building on the green areas in Shirley oaks people live there because they have choose a quiet place with green areas good for their mental and physical well being, this is a place for others to enjoy as well as residents there is no where else the same as this in Croydon.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Planning Permission Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4040/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs S Smithers</td>
<td>DM43.4 548</td>
<td>Shirley Oaks Village is lovely I go walking round the green areas there and this is such a lovely area. We do not want houses built here and to loose our land that we really like to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4041/01/008/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr s Hilu Abdo</td>
<td>DM43.4 548</td>
<td>Ref: 541, 542, 548, 126 and 504 in Shirley Oaks Village I was shocked to learn about the changes proposed to our grass areas. These changes, if implemented, will change the very nature of our village. It will not only deprive the residents of very essential open green areas, but it will make the whole place very crowded, much more polluted and quite uglier. This would rob us of essential attractions that made us come to this village in the first place. I strongly object to any of these changes and trust that every resident on this estate feels the way I feel. I did not speak to everyone, but the many I spoke with feel as strongly as I do towards this unfair proposal. I have been living in this village with my family since 1989, I would like to see the Croydon Council improve it rather than ruin it. I hope the Council will reconsider its plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am grateful to the Council for consulting on the detailed policies and proposals that will make up the Croydon Local Plan. There is much in the document that I agree with, but some of the proposals would, in my opinion, change the character of parts of Croydon very much for the worse. I hope you will forgive me if I focus on these areas of contention. I am therefore writing to formally object to:

1. the de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;
2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   - land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   - land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
   - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

3. the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:
   - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502;
   - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; and
   - Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 750.

As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

“Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is);

4. Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area’s local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennets Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too;

5. Policy DM2 on development on garden land, which is too subjective and therefore too weak. There should be a much stronger presumption against development on garden land; and

6. Policy DM28, which should allow higher levels of parking in developments of low public transport accessibility. Restricting parking spaces in such areas doesn’t lead to fewer people owning their own car; it just leads to greater competition for existing spaces.
Mr Matt Knight

Object

DM43.4
548

I object to the use of the site for housing.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr S Sasankan

Object

DM43.4
548

I am resident at 35 Primrose Lane, Shirley Oaks Village, along with 4 other members of my family.

I am writing to express my objection/disagreement to the following:

1. De-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village

2. The use of the following five sites for housing:
   - Land at Poppy Lane ref 128
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, ref 504
   - Land to east of Shirley Oaks Roaf and to the rear of Beach House and Ash House, ref 541
   - Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, ref 542
   - Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, ref 548

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mrs Mary Gray

Object

DM43.4
548

I object to the use of the site for housing.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Shirley Lidbury

Object

DM43.4
548

I object to the use of the site for housing.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Mr & Mrs Keith & Susan Hobbs

Object

I object to the use of the site for housing.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr & Mrs Whitehead

Object

Soundness - Justified

As residents whose small rear garden backs onto part of the Shirley Oaks Metropolitan Open Land, we know full well what impact proposals 128, 504, 541, 542 and 548 would have to the area.

There would be an increase in noise from 1) the building work, 2) increased traffic.

There would be a substantial impact on the road system. Wickham Road already gets gridlocked at rush hours and school start/end times. The roads into Shirley Oaks are already too narrow for cars to pass if there are any cars parked, which there are always many of since the majority of driveways are too short to accommodate reasonable size car parking for many.

Shirley Road also has a problem with queuing traffic towards Long Lane which will also be compounded by these proposals.

These developments would increase the drainage issues this area suffers from. The whole area is built on London clay and regularly these areas suffer standing water which has gone through our property in the past. Increasing the density of building in Shirley Oaks will increase this problem too.

The lands around Shirley Oaks remain because of the compact nature of the village, whose properties, as well as our own, have small garden areas and as such these areas are used daily for sports activities, exercise and dog walking.
4065/01/006/DM43.4/O Mr Clive Jarvis
Object DM43.4 548 I object to the use of the site for housing.
Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

4066/01/010/DM43.4/O Dr Chandra Pawa
Object DM43.4 548 the use of land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548 for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area;
Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

4067/01/006/DM43.4/O Mrs Marilyn Loader
Object DM43.4 548 I object to the use of the site for housing.
Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

4068/01/006/DM43.4/O Mr S Soundararajan
Object DM43.4 548 I am writing to object strongly to the de-designation of the following five pieces of land as Metropolitan Open Land and their proposed use as housing.

Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548-the above site is owned by the residents of Shirley Oaks Village through the Shirley Oaks Management Company in which every freeholder has a share. The land in question is. Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548

Your proposal will lead to a huge set of issues for the local residents. I strongly object to the plan and proposal.
Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Given the existing levels of brownfield sites in the area, these should be exhausted before encroaching on areas that would significantly alter the character of the area.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

The planning permissions proposals below I object to ref 548
I have friends who live in Shirley Oaks village and I know them and myself along with many others all object to the proposals to build on the green areas. This grass area is used by many and would totally change the area if built on and we don't want it. Part of the charm of this area is these green areas and it has something that you don't find often in Croydon so please let us keep the green areas as we all object to them being built on.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane - Ref 128
Stroud Green Pumping Stn - Ref 504
land to east of Shirley Oaks Road - Ref 541
land to west of Shirley Oaks Road - Ref 542
land to rear of Honeysuckle Gdns - Ref 548
If the Council will not keep them as MOP - these 5 sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Victoria Moore

DM43.4 548

Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548).

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr Vince Hemment

DM43.4 548

I am therefore writing to formally object to: de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village; the use of the following five sites for housing:

- land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
- land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
- land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
- land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Terrence & Jacqueline Spriggs

Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 548

Objecting to the decision to de-designate this land as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Also be objecting to any of these five sites being used for residential development. Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic.

If the Council won’t keep it as MOL, it should at least designate it as Local Green Space so that it has some protection.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Ms V Cruickshank  
Object  
DM43.4  
548  
I object to the use of the following five sites for housing:  
Land at Poppy Lane: reference number 128; Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane: reference number 504; Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House: reference number 541; Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road: reference number 542; and Land to the rear of 5 – 13 Honeysuckle Gardens: reference number 548. 

Change  
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Cllr S Brew  
Object  
DM43.4  
548  
Site 548, Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Tower View, Edgewood View and Primrosa Lane. 

Change  
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Cllr S Brew  
Object  
DM43.4  
548  
I object to the de-designation of land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village as Metropolitan Open Land, page 68 of the Policies Map. 

Change  
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Councillor M Fisher  
Object  
Soundness - Justified  
DM43.4  
548  
Site 548, Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes. This land should not be de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land as it is a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, providing much loved and well used amenity space. This would total change the character of the area and have a great impact on the local road infrastructure impacting Tower View, Edgewood View and Primrosa Lane. 

Change  
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Mr Christopher Swan

Object

DM43.4

land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548). Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional traffic.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr Edward Swan

Object

DM43.4

I would like to strongly object to the planned five sites being used for residential development in Shirley, Croydon: land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548). Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional traffic.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mrs S Rudduck

Object

DM43.4

I object to the use of the land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548 for housing: If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Developing these sites with the amount of homes suggested would increase the volume of traffic in an area which is already congested in morning and afternoon rush hours and would put increased pressures on local schools and public transport.

I am aware that more affordable houses are needed but please reconsider these plans which will totally change the area in which we have chosen to live and definitely not for the better.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Ms S Rao

Object DM43.4

The use of the land to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens (site ref 548) for housing

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr & Mrs Andrews

Object DM43.4

Soundness - Justified

I am grateful to the Council for consulting on the detailed policies and proposals that will make up the Croydon Local Plan. There is much in the document that I agree with, but some of the proposals would, in my opinion, change the character of parts of Croydon very much for the worse. I hope you will forgive me if I focus on these areas of contention. I am therefore writing to formally object to:

2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   - land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   - land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542, and
   - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

Mr & Mrs Carpenter

Object DM43.4

These proposals to build up to 750 homes on land (assuming it is de-designated) will mean the loss of vital open spaces and will place burdens on local transport, roads, schools and medical facilities which are already under pressure.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 548</th>
<th>The de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land status on Shirley Oak will be vigorously opposed. I can see no reasoned explanation in the planning document for such a course of action nor is there any evidence of the thinking of the Council in the previous plan or 2012 Inspector's Report to explain how MOL status has been revisited with the conclusion that MOL designation be withdrawn. It also seems to have escaped the planning process that Shirley Oaks is governed by a Section 52 Agreement under the 1971 Town and Country Planning Act controlling development of the 'amenity lands' on Shirley Oaks. Further, the land is owned by the 488 Shirley Oaks resident property owners as shareholders of Shirley Oaks Management Ltd that owns the land. There is, therefore, no likelihood of the land ever being sold voluntarily. In summary, this part of the proposed Local Plan is undeliverable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr & Mrs Kennard

We are writing to object to the proposals to:

1. de-designate the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village.
2. the use of the following sites for housing:
   - land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   - land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   - land to the West of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542;
   - land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548;

The Shirley Oaks Village site currently provides a balance of high density housing offset by areas of green space. The proposals for de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land and additional housing on the areas of green space would disrupt that balance and greatly increase the density of housing to an unacceptable level. Access to the Shirley Oaks site is by way of Poppy Lane and Shirley Oaks Road which feed into Shirley Road and Wickham Road respectively. Both Shirley Road and Wickham Road are used heavily throughout the day and subject of long delays particularly at peak times. This has resulted in Poppy Lane and Shirley Oaks Road experiencing heavier traffic flows than they were designed for as commuters cut through between Shirley Road and Wickham Road.

Public transport within the Shirley Oaks site is limited to a small single decker bus due to the road infrastructure and road system. Whilst there are bus services which serve Shirley Road and Wickham Road these are already oversubscribed and subject to delay due to existing traffic congestion.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Mr Trevor Watkins

**Object**

The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128; Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504; land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541; and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and land to the rear of S-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

**Change**

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

---

Carol Holmes

**Object**

I object to both the de-designation and also to the subsequent house-building at the following sites:

- Land at Poppy Lane (reference number 128);
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane (reference number 504);
- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House (reference number 541);
- Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road (reference number 542);
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens (reference number 548).

The very minimum designation for the proposed sites should be as Local Green Spaces, in order to give some protection against over-development.

**Change**

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

---

Mr B Williams

**Object**

I object to the de-designation of the land as Metropolitan Open Land and its proposed use for housing. The open spaces are collectively designated as Metropolitan Open Land and provide several links in the Shirley Green Chain. They help to form the sort of network necessary to ensure the maintenance of the current range and diversity of our flora and fauna. In addition this is a floodplain. There is a sink pond to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens and if this overflows any properties would be flooded. There is also the potential for flooding of future planned properties. The one road through Shirley Oaks Village could not cope with the additional traffic and its exit on to the A232 would cause yet another bottleneck on this already congested road.

**Change**

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
I am writing to object to the following matters in this document:-

2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   a) Ref No. 128— land at Poppy Lane
   b) Ref No. 504— Stroud Green Pumping station
   c) Ref No. 541 — land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Ash House and Beech House
   d) Ref No. 542 — land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road
   e) Ref No. 548— land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens

If the Council do not keep these sites as Metropolitan Open Land, then at least these five sites should be designated as Local Green Spaces.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

I am writing to object to:

2. The use of the following five sites for housing:
   - Land at Poppy Lane, reference number 128
   - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane, reference number 504
   - Land to the east of Shirley Oaks road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House, reference number 541
   - Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road, reference number 542, and
   - Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at a minimum be designated as Local Green spaces.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

This land is owned by Shirley Oaks Management Ltd of which I am a shareholder. There is a section 52 legal agreement in place which requires this site to be transferred to a management company and be held as amenity open space.

The highway network is already at saturation point and in any event any proposed development would generate an unacceptable amount of traffic.

The site has a high water table with water running off and flooding properties on the Mere End side of the site. Any development is likely to worsen this situation.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 548</th>
<th>I object of Policy DM43, reference Site 548 to build new homes on land to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs DB Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 548</td>
<td>I object of Policy DM43, reference Site 548 to build new homes on land to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr &amp; Ms Morgan &amp; Mason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 548</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Mary Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 548</td>
<td>I object to the site for use as housing. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to redesignate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The use of the following five sites for housing:

- Land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128,
- Stroud Green Pumping Station,
- 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504,
- Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and
to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542;
- Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548.

If the council does not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

As this site does not have a willing landowner, it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

I object to Policy DM43, reference Site 548 to/build new homes on land to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens.

As this site does not have a willing landowner, it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

As 541, 542 & 548 would consist of 750 residences, the present utilities, particularly the drains, are likely to be inadequate. I assume that provision will be made for Shirley Oaks Hospital to function during the building and afterwards with the increase in traffic pollution and NHS ambulance access to their base. Healthcare facilities for such an increase in local residents cannot be sustained for the area. If the council will not keep bullet points 1 & 2 as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces.

As this site does not have a willing landowner, it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

I object to the use of the site for housing.

As this site does not have a willing landowner, it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Mr & Mrs Maguire

Object DM43.4 548

I object to the use of the site for housing.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr D Nesterovitch

Object DM43.4 548

The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542, and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr Melvin Howard

Object DM43.4 548

If the Council will not keep the site as MOL, the site should at least be designated as Local Green Space. Building on this site will not only mean the loss of vital green space it will over burden local services and road infrastructure.

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

S Wallace

Object DM43.4 548

I object to land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Poliies & Proposals, reference number 548).

Change

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
4305/01/007/DM43.4/O Mrs Glenna Fullick  
Object  
DM43.4  
548  
I object of Policy DM43, reference Site 548 to build new homes on land to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens  
Change  
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

4308/01/006/DM43.4/O Mrs Kathleen Swan  
Object  
DM43.4  
548  
I would like to strongly object to the planned five sites being used for residential development in Shirley, Croydon; land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens is identified as suitable for 59-125 homes (pages 457-458, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 548). Not only would this entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of the area, the local road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional traffic.  
Change  
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

4309/01/007/DM43.4/O Mrs Rita Evans  
Object  
DM43.4  
548  
The proposal to de-designate Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and use it for five housing sites surely flies in the face of current recommendations to preserve Green Belt equivalent land as a vital amenity and ecological asset?  
Change  
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

4312/01/007/DM43.4/O Doreen Jansen  
Object  
DM43.4  
548  
Objecton to site. Schools in the area are already over-subscribed, so the number of homes proposed will increase the problem  
Change  
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
I wish to object to the detailed proposal in policy DM43 in relation to land at the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens, reference number 548.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mrs J Furmanska

I am writing to object to the following matters in this document:

2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   a) Ref No. 128 — land at Poppy Lane
   b) Ref No. 504 — Stroud Green Pumping station
   c) Ref No. 541 — land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Ash House and Beech House
   d) Ref No. 542 — land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road
   e) Ref No. 548 — land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens
   If the Council do not keep these sites as Metropolitan Open Land, then at least these five sites should be designated as Local Green Spaces.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr P Bhanji

The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 548</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4365/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms Fontaine</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4365/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>The Judge Family</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>We object to Policy DM43, reference Site 548 to build new homes on land to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4366/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms Gemma Sturgeon</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to Policy DM43, reference Site 548 to build new homes on land to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object 3 Proposed Policy DM43 De-designation of Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Road
I object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in the vicinity of Shirley Oaks Road and Shirley Oaks Village. The land should be at least be designated as Local Green Space, for its protection from development.
This open space provides a green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, and should be retained in its present form.
I also object to the following specific proposals for the building of new homes on this site, as detailed in Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan; Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan, Detailed Policies & Proposals:
- Policy DM43, reference 128 to build new homes at Poppy Lane
- Policy DM43, reference 504 to build new homes at Stroud Green Pumping Station (including the conversion of the pumping station which is a locally-listed building)
- Policy DM43, reference 542 to build new homes on land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road
- Policy DM43, reference 548 to build new homes on land to the rear of Honeysuckle Gardens
Not only would these developments entail the loss of the green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, the local road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Also, the already-stretched social and healthcare facilities would be overloaded.
For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Jennifer Carrozzi
Object
DM43.4 548
I am writing to object to the use of the following five sites for housing:
- land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128;
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504;
- land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541;
- land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542; and
- land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548;
If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces;
Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Ms N Nesterovich
Object
DM43.4 548
The use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane site reference number 128, Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane site reference number 504, land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House site reference number 541, and to the west of Shirley Oaks Road site reference number 542, and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas and change the character of this area.
Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mrs Janet Baine
Object
DM43.4 548
I object to the use of the land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens site reference number 548 for housing:
If the Council will not keep these areas as Metropolitan Open Land, they should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. People choose to live on Shirley Oaks because of the peace and quiet. One such friend has had long-term illness but at least she knows she can be quiet there.
Change
As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
I object to the use of the following five sites for housing: land at Poppy Lane reference number 128; Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504; land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541; land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548. If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. The Council should focus on developing other land in the Croydon borough such as unused office blocks, derelict corporate buildings/warehouses which have not been occupied for years instead of attacking the green areas which are enjoyed by the residents in their respective areas. The proposals to build circa 700 houses in such a small area will cause the following detrimental effects to the local residents: depreciation of the value of the houses purchased in the relevant areas, too much strain on the water and sewerage systems in the locality where there is already a high water table. This could result in undue flooding and drainage problems, structural problems in years to come as the land is not fit for such intensive building, increase in traffic on Shirley Road, Wickham Road, Lower Addiscombe and Addiscombe which is already congested. This will unduly increase pollution levels which are already toxic. This will undoubtedly cause an increase in the health problems of the people in the locality such as lung cancer and other respiratory illnesses which will in turn place greater stress on the NHS services, cause more people to take sick days which will result in lower incomes obtained and eventually less tax revenue generated. This will have a knock on effect on the economy which is to say at the very least, bleak, the three green spaces in the Shirley Oaks Village are owned by the 488 Freeholders. Each Freeholder owns one share in the nominee company, Shirley Oaks Management Limited which owns the land on behalf of its shareholders. Building upon this land would seriously undermine the value of the land purchased by the Freeholders and reduce quality of life. If the residents wanted to move, it would prove near impossible because of the resulting lower sale prices of their respective houses imposed by the Council’s building plans. This would appear to be unfair for the Council to impose...
such hardship on the residents. I would urge the council to build upon land in the Croydon borough which is derelict and contains buildings which have not been used for years. These buildings can be knocked down to build the much needed housing for generations to come. These unused or derelict buildings serve no purpose to the local residents and are of no value to the residents. The Council should endeavour to create value where it is needed. This will in turn improve the condition of the abandoned areas. This will also prevent squatting and other unlawful uses of such buildings. I witnessed one example last year where the old post office building next to East Croydon Station was used as a rave containing over 1,000 people. This posed a risk to the safety of the passers by and the increase in crime. The Council’s redevelopment of such spaces could be highly beneficial to the area. The green spaces are however of great importance to the local residents. The residents enjoy these spaces for walking their dogs, recreational and outdoor activities, space for children to play, peace of mind for the resident who works in the city and comes home to a peaceful environment and it provides space for those residents who already have very small back gardens.

I wish to protest vehemently about your plans to destroy Shirley which is a village by building hundred of homes and setting up a Gypsy and Traveller site. You will destroy the Green Belt and increase the traffic in the area thus polluting the environment and the air we breathe. As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
The use of the following five sites for housing:
Land at Poppy Lane (ref number 128)
Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane (ref number 504)
Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beach House and Ash House (ref number 541)
Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road (ref number 542) and land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens (ref number 548)

When the London Borough of Lambeth closed the children’s home, known as Shirley Oaks, Croydon Council determined to keep the building redevelopment of the site broadly in line with the building density that had existed for most of the previous hundred years and subsequent applications by the then developer for increased housing density were rejected. There were a number of reasons for maintaining the original policy amongst which were the need to maintain the established green corridor, retain the character of the area and to maintain the surrounding traffic volumes at a manageable level. The decision to designate the land as Metropolitan Open Land was to ensure that in future further building on the land could not take place thus re-affirming the principles established by the original policy decisions. Nothing has changed in the ensuing years to justify any variation to that policy.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
I am dismayed at the consideration being given to the above, particularly concerning that proposed in the Shirley area. I have been a Shirley resident for almost 30 years and to date have enjoyed what the area does offer both for the community and with regard to open green spaces, which are precious to the health and wellbeing of all ages. Why should future generations be unable to continue to benefit from an outdoor environment as hitherto?

I strongly object to de-designation of the current Metropolitan Open Land and would hope that at least it could be protected as Local Green Space with regard to future development. This is particularly pertinent with regard to the proposals being considered for the Shirley Oaks area. The present road infrastructure through the estate leaves a lot to be desired and any more traffic will be a great cause for concern, to say nothing of the loss of wildlife and spacious living. If we had wanted to live in a highly densely populated area, we would not have chosen the Shirley area to relocate into, rather the centre of the town. The redevelopment of brownfield sites is more acceptable and there must be many of these in the Croydon area to develop without encroaching on valued green spaces.

As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
I wish to formally object to:
1. All the proposed policies relating to the re-designation of land to allow building development at Shirley Oaks Road and land around Shirley Oaks Village.
2. The land at Poppy Lane (reference 128).
3. Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane including the conversion of the locally listed pumping station (reference 504).
4. Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House (reference 541).
5. Land to the West of Shirley Oaks Road (reference 542).

These proposals are NOT appropriate for Croydon to meet its Strategic Objectives. Additionally, the proposals are NOT deliverable or sustainable as:
• Croydon has already announced that it is not necessary to deliberately destroy MOL to reach their housing requirements.
• National and London Plans do NOT require or expect Local Authorities to degrade MOL to generate additional housing.
• The loss of this MOL will entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks through to Ashburton Playing fields, across to South Norwood Park and surrounding areas.
• The above areas are vital to sustain the drainage of surrounding flood areas.
• The above mentioned areas are referred to as the "lungs of Croydon" as they sustain carbon dioxide capture (photosynthesis), oxygen release (photosynthesis), and biodiversity. Local wildlife includes badgers and bats.
• Green areas increase the character, desirability and amenity of residential areas.
• Green areas have a strong positive impact of the character of surrounding residential areas.
• The proposed increase in housing will put an additional burden on public transport, roadways and street parking and other services. The additional volume of traffic will create additional road hazards.

As this site does not have a willing landowner, it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
Mr John Carley

Object Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 548

I object to the de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village; reference Numbers 128, 504, 541, 542 and 548. This is currently Green Space and provides vital green recreational area and buffer between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding area.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mr Steve Westray

Object DM43.4 548

The de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village and either side of Shirley Oaks Road. At present I understand that Metropolitan Open Land has the same protection as the Green Belt and I believe that it is vitally important to retain the controls around our green spaces in Shirley. If any additional homes were to be considered for this area then they should be restricted in number and carefully planned in order to retain the character of this area. The idea of building up to 750 new homes is totally out of keeping with this objective and would be considerable strain on local infrastructure and resources. New housing on this scale would lead to a significant increase in traffic along the Wickham Road which is already extremely busy not only servicing the residents of Shirley but as an important thoroughfare into Croydon.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.

Mrs Ann Sebire

Object DM43.4 548

I am writing to object to:
2. The use of the following five sites for housing:
a) Land at Poppy Lane reference number 128)  
b) Stroud Green Pumping Station reference Number 504  
c) Land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541  
d) Land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542 and  
e) Land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference numbers 543

I just hope that there has been enough consideration about the fact that Shirley is built on springs and Heron Homes and Wren both had problems with flooding the area down at Woodmere Avenue.

Change As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7324/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs Olive Garton</td>
<td>Use of formerly open land for housing (references 128, 504, 541, 542 and 548): Again, this open land should not be lost. Furthermore, there is no infrastructure in place to support the huge increase in population density that such development would represent. Development of the site of the former pumping station (reference 504): It was established at the time the Shirley Oaks village was built that this land could not be built on, as there is an Artesian well on the land and any development would risk polluting the water source. Furthermore, a ‘travellers’ site would be inappropriate on this site.</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8822/01/008/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mrs M Davies</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the proposed use of: - the land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road (541) - The land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road (542) - The land at Poppy Lane, Shirley Road (128) - Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane (504) - Land to the rear of honeysuckle gardens (548) - Open space land at shrublands estate (938)</td>
<td>As this site does not have a willing landowner it is unlikely that it would be developed. It has been reconsidered against the criteria for designation as Local Green Space and found to meet the criteria so it will be designated as Local Green Space, protecting the site from inappropriate development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1180/01/011/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs K Davenport</td>
<td>I am horrified at the proposals regarding Shirley. There may be a need for more housing but there are alternatives and it is up to the Council to find these rather than making it easier and more profitable for builders which is what is now happening.</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713/02/007/DM43.4/C</td>
<td>Alison Connor</td>
<td>I am happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but strongly object to building on precious open space.</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782/01/08</td>
<td>Angus &amp; Olivia Bloom</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM43.4 938 As a resident of Shirley Oaks I am writing to object to the proposals for housing development on the estate and surroundings. Having lived in Shirley all of my life I would be deeply disappointed to see it change unrecognisably. I envisage the property on Shirley Oaks Road will either be demolished or surrounded by high density housing. Either eventuality will be highly detrimental. I have viewed the Detail Policies and Proposals on Croydon Councils website and object the following plans, references - Ref 128 Ref 504 Ref 541 Ref 542 Ref 548 Ref 938 Ref 502 Ref 681 Object to Site 938 Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868/01/06</td>
<td>Danusia Spink</td>
<td>DM43.4 938</td>
<td>I object to the building of any homes on communal open spaces and loss of amenity on the Shrublands Estate. Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904/01/06</td>
<td>Emma Smith</td>
<td>DM43.4 938</td>
<td>I object to the use of open spaces on the shrublands estate for housing reference number 938 Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913/01/07</td>
<td>Andrea Swaby</td>
<td>DM43.4 938</td>
<td>I hereby would like to register my serious OBJECTION to the council’s proposal to build 750 new homes in Shirley-OAK road and 35 new homes on shrublands estate to create gypsy traveller sites. As I live on Devonshire I also have serious object to allow 4 storeys in this area Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918/01/18</td>
<td>Mr Gareth Champion</td>
<td>DM43.4 938</td>
<td>Happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much needed homes, but will be obecting to building on precious open space. Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993/01/06</td>
<td>Graham &amp; Kate Marsden</td>
<td>DM43.4 938</td>
<td>We object to building on the precious open space elements of this proposal. We do not object to the redevelopment of the used garages. Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposal to build new houses on the Shrublands Estate does not fall within the Strategic Objectives because:

Objective 2: This development will not Foster an environment where existing enterprise can prosper, but will reduce enterprise.

Objective 4: This development will not reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation. It will not reduce unemployment, improve skills and education and improve environmental conditions, the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Objective 5: This development is not high quality and will not enhance the borough’s natural environment but will reduce the natural environment by turning a green area into housing.

Objective 7: This development will reduce the area as a safe, healthy and cohesive community but making the area overcrowded with residential property.

Objective 10: This development will reduce the quality and accessibility of green spaces and nature.

If this development is undertaken it will not deliver the strategic objective.

This development will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The development will change the outlook and community within the South Croydon area and future generation will suffer because of this.

This proposed development of new housing in Shrublands Estate is not within keeping of the current development within this area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with housing in the area.

Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area. This development would overwhelm this green area.

Building a traveler’s site will increase noise levels and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area.

Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

This development would diminish the area of green fields and recreational
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2128/02/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>21/2/2016</td>
<td>Cllr Steve O’Connell AM</td>
<td>Object DM43.4 938 I object to the open spaces on the Shrublands Estate by building. The open spaces on the Shrublands should not be allocated.</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2147/01/008/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>21/4/2016</td>
<td>Patrick Thomas</td>
<td>Object DM43.4 938 I am writing at this time to record my objection to the use of open space at the Shrublands Estate for housing site. 938.</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2302/01/011/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>23/02/2016</td>
<td>Brenda Stratford</td>
<td>Object DM43.4 938 Use of open spaces on Shrublands. Ref 938</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2429/02/009/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>24/2/2016</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs E Abdul-Nabi</td>
<td>Object DM43.4 938 Soundness - Justified Object to the use of open spaces on Shrublands estate for housing.</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2450/02/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>24/5/2016</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Jeffrey</td>
<td>Object DM43.4 938 I am happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but I will be objecting to building on precious open space.</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2558/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>25/5/2016</td>
<td>Miss Margaret A Williams</td>
<td>Object DM43.4 938 I wish to register my objection to the proposed plans for the housing development on the green areas around the Shirley Oaks Estate.</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2564/01/008/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>25/6/2016</td>
<td>Mrs Shirley M Kell</td>
<td>Object DM43.4 938 I am writing to object to Plans for Residential development Ref No.938 Garages and open spaces on the Shrublands Estate identified as suitable for 35 homes I object to the building of homes on the Open Space Area of the proposal I have no objection to the redevelopment of the garages.</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2582/01/005/DM43.4/O Ms Ellie London
Object DM43.4 938
I object to the use of open spaces on the Shrublands estate for housing reference no. 938.

Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

2618/01/009/DM43.4/O Miss P Jones
Object DM43.4 938
Having lived in Shirley for over 50 years I strongly object to Croydon Council plans to de-designate the Metropolitan open land so that most of this land can be used for new housing. At the moment it has the same Protection as Green Belt.

Firstly, this would entail the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding area, changing the character of the area more importantly the road infrastructure couldn’t cope with the additional traffic. Try getting out to the Wickham Road from Orchard Avenue in rush hour.

Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

2657/01/005/DM43.4/O Rebecca Pullinger CPRE London
Object Soundness - Effective DM43.4 938
A large number of the sites allocated for development through Detailed Policies and Proposals may result in the loss of green space. This appears to run counter to the Borough’s Strategic Objective 10 (The need to utilise brownfield areas first) and could be replaced with a goal to promote good quality high density developments that protect Croydon’s green spaces. Even undesignated green spaces provide important ecosystem services to Croydon’s growing population.

The Council should provide a map of the site allocation to ensure that it is clear which area is proposed for redevelopment. We object to any proposed development of open spaces in the Estate; any proposals must ensure that the open spaces are protected and enhanced. This should be reflected in this document to guide future planning applications.

Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

2665/01/008/DM43.4/O Ms S Mawaziny
Object DM43.4 938
I object to this site.

Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Kellas

Object

DM43.4
938

I would say to the Council Croydon is full and kindly leave our precious Shirley open spaces and attractive streets alone, we don’t need an odd assortment of blocks of flats amongst the semi-detached and small detached properties here, or in similar Croydon suburbs - it would be an architectural disaster along the lines of the 1950s concrete jungle development of the centre of Croydon. And we don’t have the infrastructure to cope with more people, or the roads to cope with the traffic we already have.

Change

This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will not be included in the Local Plan.

Mr & Mrs Iles

Object

DM43.4
938

Whilst we can see the sense of removing unused garages on the Shrublands Estate and building new housing is fair enough but it is unthinkable that open spaces on or about the site should suffer the same fate. Traffic on Bridle Road is already heavy, there have been numerous accidents due to speeding drivers from the Estate. Why add more problems to an existing one. More inhabitants means more cars, more people on an already crowded public transport. What little green space there is around Shrublands should be protected not built on thus making the area worse than it already is.

Change

This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will not be included in the Local Plan.

Mr Beresford Walker

Object

DM43.4
938

I am sympathetic to the building of homes on the under-used garages on the Shrublands Estate as detailed in Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan, Detailed Policies & Proposals: reference number 938. However, I object to the building of any homes on communal open spaces and loss of amenity on the Shrublands Estate.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2700/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Thomas</td>
<td>The use of open spaces on the Shrublands estate for housing, I object to. The estate is a pleasant area and the spaces provided make safe areas for children on the estate to play.</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2706/01/006/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Panagakis</td>
<td>Object to the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing (ref: 938)</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2735/01/003/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Eric Green</td>
<td>In such a densely built housing estate as Shrublands, these small sites would be better used enhancing and providing further facilities for the existing residents.</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2737/01/004/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>C Banks</td>
<td>We are writing to object to the use of open spaces on the shrublands estate for housing, reference number 938.</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2791/05/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Peter Staveley</td>
<td>I am happy for you to build on under-used garages but the open space within the Shrublands Estate must be designated as green land and protected. 2.3 Do you think the preferred approach enables sustainable development? Sustainable development is defined as being development that meets the needs of the present without compromising on the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Yes, but only on land current used for underused garages, not on the open land. Future generations will need that open space.</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/01/001</td>
<td>DM43.4/C</td>
<td>Cllr Richard Chatterjee</td>
<td><strong>Comment</strong> Soundness - Effective DM43.4 938 Shrublands estate and the adjacent land to the east, south and west requires protection from further building other than housing on some redundant garages, for the benefit of local residents, especially younger children, as the density of occupation is high; the views from the existing upper storeys such as 170-224 (The Ship) towards central London should be recognised and protected. Change To be designated as a Local Designated View in the Local Plan the viewpoint needs to be in a publically accessible location in a major public area or located in an area or routes identified in Figure 5.1 of the Croydon Local Plan Strategic Policies for public realm improvement. The Local Designated View should be a unique view or is of a key landmark (note we mean a Local Designated Landmark). The view must be of substantial parts of the borough. The site has not been brought forward as a site by a landowner(s). Furthermore no definitive site has been identified and therefore the site has been removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/01/007</td>
<td>DM43.4/C</td>
<td>Mr Roy Saunders</td>
<td>Object to building on precious open space at Shrublands although not the underused garages Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/01/004</td>
<td>DM43.4/S</td>
<td>Mrs Hellen McMillan</td>
<td>Support DM43.4 938 There are brownfield sites such as the proposed replacement of underused garages in the Shrublands area; it would be perfectly acceptable for housing. Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/02/007</td>
<td>DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms Debbie Butler</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 938 I object to the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing reference number 938. Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/01/003</td>
<td>DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr John Newman</td>
<td>Object DM43.4 938 I object to the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing - site ref. 938. Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object DM43.4 938

The proposal to build new houses on the Shrublands Estate does not fall within the Strategic Objectives because:-

Objective 2: This development will not Foster an environment where existing enterprise can prosper, but will reduce enterprise

Objective 4: This development will not reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation. It will not reduce unemployment, improve skills and education and improve environmental conditions, the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Objective 5: This development is not high quality and will not enhance the borough’s natural environment but will reduce the natural environment by turning a green area into housing

Objective 7: This development will reduce the area as a safe, healthy and cohesive community but making the area overcrowded with residential property

Objective 10: This development will reduce the quality and accessibility of green space and nature.

This proposed development of new housing in Shrublands Estate is not within keeping of the current development within this area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with housing in the area. Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area and is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Building a travellers site will increase noise levels and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area.

Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. This development would diminish the area of green fields and recreational land within the area.

This development will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The development will change the outlook and community within the South Croydon area and future generations will suffer because of this.

Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

Object DM43.4 938

I understand that the Council plan to build on open land in the Shrublands Estate (reference number 938). The Council should not be building on precious open space. As stated above, open, green land is essential to maintain a pleasant living area, and to maintain the character of the area.

Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.
Object | DM43.4 | 938 | the Council plans to build on under-used garages and open spaces on the Shrublands Estate. These sites are identified as suitable for 35 homes (pages 459-460, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 938).

I am happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but I will be objecting to building on precious open space. | Change | This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

Object | DM43.4 | 938 | 3 REF: 938 (Shrublands)
I am happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but strongly object to building on precious open space. | Change | This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

Object | Soundness - Justified | DM43.4 | 938 | Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Road.

None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all. | Change | This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

Object | DM43.4 | 938 | I object to all the proposals set out for new housing and travellers sites in Shirley. I feel it will ruin the area by taking up all the open spaces. | Change | This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

Object | DM43.4 | 938 | Second, the Council plans to build on under-used garages and open spaces on the Shrublands Estate. These sites are identified as suitable for 35 homes. I do not know how many under-used garages there are in Shrublands but I can’t imagine that area can cope with any additional housing. Its bursting at the seams as it is, but I am especially objecting to building on precious open spaces. Unlike New Addington that has vast open spaces (that should remain I’d just like to point out!) Shrublands hardly has any, so to propose to build on those is an outrage. | Change | This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

Object | DM43.4 | 938 | The open spaces on Shrublands Estate (no objection to building on the sites of garages) | Change | This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.
| 3102/02/008/DM43.4/O Mr Richard Horton | Object DM43.4 938 | I wish to log my objection to the borough-wide planned changes Croydon Council are proposing to make in their Local Plans for 2016-2036. These proposals are 750 new homes in Shirley Oaks and 35 new homes on the Shrublands Estate. Also the proposed work to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Coombe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Coombe Road. | Change | This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan. |
The draft identifies two areas of Shirley as locations where ‘Medium-rise blocks with associated grounds’, ‘Large buildings with spacing’ and ‘Large buildings with strong frontages will be gradually introduced’ (page 132). Shirley Road Shopping Parade and the area around Shirley Library are identified as areas where the Council wants to see “focussed intensification associated with gradual change of area’s local character”, under Policy DM31.4 (page 129). This includes the Wickham Road, Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, Hartland Way, Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way (page 166).

In practice, this means that existing family dwellings, mainly semi-detached buildings, will give way to medium-rise blocks in these particular streets. My main objections are:

- It will depress house prices throughout those streets and the surrounding streets. This will in turn result in property developers buying up many of the existing family homes and making a profit by building low-quality apartment blocks along narrow side-streets. Those roads will become crowded and overpopulated.
- Insufficient local infrastructure to cope with the increased population. Longer term, this will completely change the character of Shirley. Of course, this is the intention. However, it will be a change for the worse, not the better. Many of the current residents - some, like myself, brought up on a council estate - have worked hard for many years in order to improve their quality of life and provide a better environment for their children. We will desert the town as it ceases to be the relatively quiet, aspirational location we moved to and transforms into a busier, overcrowded and underfunded suburb.

Conclusion

The proposals I have highlighted can only be viewed as negative. If adopted, they will increase the local population - and the density of that population - without providing any supporting infrastructure. The new residents from the planned apartment blocks and traveller sites will need additional public services such as schools, medical services and shops. Older residents will give way to young families who require greater social support, yet no additional resources are identified to help manage the changing demographic. Traffic congestion along already busy roads will increase, as will pollution and accident black-spots. The few
remaining green spaces will disappear. Overall, the proposals signal a reduction in the quality of life for both the existing residents and the newcomer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3141/01/001/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr David Thorpe</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I wish to object to the new plans and proposals references numbered - 128, 502, 504, 541, 542, 548, 661 and 938.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3161/01/008/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Jim Cowan</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I have read Gavin Barwell’s assessment of policies and proposals in the Croydon Local Plan and totally agree that if implemented would destroy the character of Shirley. The infrastructure in Shirley is already stretched to the limit and can not withstand any further burdens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3193/01/008/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Stan Minter</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4</td>
<td>I have major concerns over the planned development of the Shirley Area. This is currently one of the nicest areas of Croydon and you plan to swamp it with a number of housing developments and some travellers sites. This will be very detrimental to the whole area. I understand that nationally we need to have more accommodation for families. We need to achieve this with out destroying the whole fabric of our society. This scale of development will transform the whole area into a old fashioned “Estate”. There are not sufficient services in the wider area to support such an influx of families. The road infrastructure already struggles at time and these developments will make the whole situation much worse.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3193/02/008/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Stan Minter</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 938</td>
<td>I have major concerns over the planned development of the Shirley Area. This is currently one of the nicest areas of Croydon and you plan to swamp it with a number of housing developments and some travellers sites. This will be very detrimental to the whole area. I understand that nationally we need to have more accommodation for families. We need to achieve this with ought destroying the whole fabric of our society. This scale of development will transform the whole area into a old fashioned “Estate”. There are not sufficient services in the wider area to support such an influx of families. The road infrastructure already struggles at time and these developments will make the whole situation much worse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3235/01/008/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Mr Peter Kenny</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 938</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing reference number 938.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3323/01/009/DM43.4/C</td>
<td>Daila Bradley</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM43.4 938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3354/01/008/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Dr Bob Wenn</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 938</td>
<td>I object to the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3358/01/018/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Joy Harris</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM43.4 938</td>
<td>Happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much needed homes, but will be obecting to building on precious open space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change: This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.
Second, the Council plans to build on under-used garages and open spaces on the Shrublands Estate. These sites are identified as suitable for 35 homes (pages 459-460, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 938).

I am happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but I will be objecting to building on precious open space.

On the Shrublands estate (pages 459-460), built so that people needing less expensive housing could enjoy green space, there needs to be deep thought given to the wisdom of any development. The proposed use of disused or under used garage blocks may be acceptable. Will the residents will be properly consulted?

Happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but will be objecting to building on precious open space.

Happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but will be objecting to building on precious open space.

I wish to log my objection to the borough-wide planned changes Croydon Council are proposing to make in their Local Plans for 2016-2036. These proposals are 750 new homes in Shirley Oaks and 35 new homes on the Shrublands Estate. Also the proposed work to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Combe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Coombe Road.

I am writing to object to: 3. The use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing (ref 938).
I am writing to object to the use of the green spaces surrounding Shrubland Estate for housing. (reference number 938)

This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.
The proposal to build new houses on the Shrublands Estate does not fall within the Strategic Objectives because:-

Objective 2: This development will not Foster an environment where existing enterprise can prosper, but will reduce enterprise.

Objective 4: This development will not reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation. It will not reduce unemployment, improve skills and education and improve environmental conditions, the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Objective 5: This development is not high quality and will not enhance the borough’s natural environment but will reduce the natural environment by turning a green area into housing.

Objective 7: This development will reduce the area as a safe, healthy and cohesive community but making the area overcrowded with residential property.

Objective 10: This development will reduce the quality and accessibility of green space and nature. This development will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The development will change the outlook and community within the South Croydon area and future generation will suffer because of this. This proposed development of new housing in Shrublands Estate is not within keeping of the current development within this area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with housing in the area. Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area and is not in keeping with the surrounding area. Building a travellers site will increase noise levels and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area. Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. This development would diminish the area of green fields and recreational land within the area.

This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.
3503/01/009/DM43.4/O Mr Gary Kenney

Object DM43.4 938

I am writing to show that I object to a number of your plans around the Shirley area. I contest that you need to build on our green sites and bring in new ‘traveler’ sites into Shirley.

On top of this I cannot understand the need to bring ‘medium’ high rise buildings in and around Shirley, including Devonshire way and the new proposals around Harland way.

Please can you let me know if my objection has been noted and how I can make it more official?

Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

---

3510/01/009/DM43.4/O Katrina Neal

Object DM43.4 938

As a long term resident of Shirley/West Wickham and one who has seen many changes over the years, I am strongly objecting to the following use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate (where I live) ref 938.

Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

---

3510/01/008/DM43.4/O Katrina Neal

Object DM43.4 938

As a long term resident of Shirley/West Wickham and one who has seen many changes over the years, I am strongly objecting to the following use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate (where I live) ref 938.

Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

---

3511/01/009/DM43.4/O Jenny Hayden

Object DM43.4 938

Ref no : 938...

I believe that building new homes , in Shrublands, on the areas currently occupied by under used garages , could be a good idea. BUT to build on green spaces , I would certainly object to.

Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

---

3547/01/009/DM43.4/O Mr I Fuell

Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 938

Object to The use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing: reference number 938.

The loss of more open spaces for yet more housing will create even greater pressures and tensions within the settled community and surrounding areas, while also placing greater strain on existing infrastructure and local services.

Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

---

3591/01/006/DM43.4/O Mr Nick Barnes

Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 938

Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Raod.

None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.

Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.
3704/01/003/DM43.4/C Mrs J Horton  
DM43.4  
938  
I wish to log my objection to the borough wide planned changes Croydon Council are proposing to make in their Local Plans for 2016-2036. These proposals are 750 new homes in Shirley Oaks and 35 new homes on the Shrublands Estate. Also the proposed work to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Coombe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Coombe Road.  
Change  
This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

3737/01/006/DM43.4/O Mr J Patel  
Object  
DM43.4  
938  
I am writing to record my objection to various planning as follows. Your Ref No 128,504,541,542,548 and 938. I don’t think it will be good for the area.  
Change  
This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

3769/01/013/DM43.4/O Mr K George  
Object  
DM43.4  
938  
I further object to the use of green space on Shrublands for housing. Reference 938.  
Change  
This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

3775/01/007/DM43.4/O Mr & Mrs Barnes  
Object  
DM43.4  
938  
The Council plans to build on underused garages and open spaces on the Shrublands Estate. These sites are identified as suitable for 35 homes (pages 459-460, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 938).  
Change  
This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

3785/01/008/DM43.4/O Jenny Greenland  
Object  
DM43.4  
938  
I am happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but I object to building on open space.  
Change  
This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

3789/01/018/DM43.4/O Mr Paul Slaughter  
Object  
DM43.4  
938  
Happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much needed homes, but will be objected to building on precious open space.  
Change  
This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

3792/01/010/DM43.4/O Mr Simon Bradley  
Object  
DM43.4  
938  
By the way, the development of additional housing on underused and poorly maintained garage blocks in Shrublands is exactly what should be happening – leave green spaces alone and simply redevelop existing sites for better use.  
Change  
This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.
Mr Stephen Barnes
Object
DM43.4
938
Third, the Council plans to build on under-used garages and open spaces on the Shrublands Estate. These sites are identified as suitable for 35 homes (pages 459-460, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 938). I am happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but I object to building on precious open space.
Change
This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

Mr Ian Leonard
Object
DM43.4
938
The Council plans to build on under-used garages and open spaces on the Shrublands Estate. These sites are identified as suitable for thirty-five homes (pages 459-460, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 938). I am happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but I object to building on the borough's precious open spaces.
Change
This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

Mrs & Mrs Linter
Object
DM43.4
938
Second, the Council plans to build on under-used garages and open spaces on the Shrublands Estate. These sites are identified as suitable for 35 homes (pages 459-460, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 938). I am happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but I object to building on the borough's precious open spaces.
Change
This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

Mr Nicholas Barnes
Object
DM43.4
938
Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Road.

None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.
Change
This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

Edwina Morris
Object
DM43.4
938
I object to the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing (reference number 938).
Change
This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3893/01/015/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>01/01/5</td>
<td>Jan Payne</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the use of open space on the Shrublands Estate for housing reference no.938</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3904/01/006/DM43.4/S</td>
<td>01/00/6</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Golbourn</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>I am happy for the Croydon Council to build on the under-used garages on the Shrublands Estate BUT I object to building on any of the open spaces on the Shrublands Estate (reference number 938).</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3904/01/005/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>01/00/5</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Golbourn</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I am happy for the Croydon Council to build on the under-used garages on the Shrublands Estate BUT I object to building on any of the open spaces on the Shrublands Estate (reference number 938).</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3938/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>01/002</td>
<td>Kuljit Kaur</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>The use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3978/01/012/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>01/012</td>
<td>Ms S Ikpa</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing site reference number 938</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3983/01/002/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>01/002</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Walsh</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>We also understand that you wish to develop homes on green field sites in the area. One has to question why you cannot use the available brown field areas? The Shrublands area especially should be allowed to maintain their open spaces.</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3992/01/012/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>01/012</td>
<td>Patricia Wood</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified Finally I object to the use of open space on the Shrublands Estate for housing reference number 938</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4002/01/007/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>01/007</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Turner</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>We are writing to object to the following sites for housing and traveller sites. (938)</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4007/01/008/DM43.4/O Mr R Horton Object I wish to log my objection to the borough-wide planned changes Croydon Council are proposing to make in their Local Plans for 2016-2036. These proposals are 750 new homes in Shirley Oaks and 35 new homes on the Shrublands Estate. Also the proposed work to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Coombe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Coombe Road.

DM43.4
938

Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

4051/01/012/DM43.4/O Mr Matt Knight Object object to the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing

DM43.4
938

Object to the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing

Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

4066/01/011/DM43.4/O Dr Chandra Pawa Object I object to the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing site reference number 938

DM43.4
938

I object to the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing site reference number 938

Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

4071/01/005/DM43.4/O Mr & Mrs Tross Object Given the existing levels of brownfield sites in the area, these should be exhausted before encroaching on areas that would significantly alter the character of the area.

DM43.4
938

Given the existing levels of brownfield sites in the area, these should be exhausted before encroaching on areas that would significantly alter the character of the area.

Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

4075/01/011/DM43.4/O Kaljit Gata-Aura Object Object to the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing - Ref 938

DM43.4
938

Object to the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing - Ref 938

Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

4079/01/012/DM43.4/O Melissa Chu Object the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing site reference number 938

DM43.4
938

the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing site reference number 938

Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

4083/01/015/DM43.4/O Mr Reuben Gata-Aura Object object to The use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing - Ref 938

DM43.4
938

object to The use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing - Ref 938

Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.
Ms V Cruickshank

Object

DM43.4 938

I object to the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing: reference number 938.

The loss of more open spaces for yet more housing will create even greater pressures and tensions within the settled community and surrounding areas, while also placing greater strain on existing infrastructure and local services.

Cllr S Brew

Object

DM43.4 938

I object to the de-designation of land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village as Metropolitan Open Land, page 68 of the Policies Map.

Ms S Rao

Object

DM43.4 938

The use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate (site ref 938) for housing.

Mr & Mrs Carpenter

Object

DM43.4 938

Again open space should be retained. We have no objection to the use of the sites of redundant garages.

Mr & Mrs Kennard

Object

DM43.4 938

I am writing to show that I object to a number of your plans around the Shirley area. I contest that you need to build on our green sites and bring in new 'traveler' sites into Shirley.

On top of this I cannot understand the need to bring 'medium' high rise buildings in and around Shirley including Devonshire way and the new proposals around Hartland way.

Please can you let me know if my objection has been noted and how I can make it more official?

Mr Trevor Watkins

Object

DM43.4 938

the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing site reference number 938.

Carol Holmes

Object

DM43.4 938

Shrublands Estate development (reference number 938) Open spaces on this estate should not be used for building.
4197/01/002/DM43.4/O Mr E McNulty
Object DM43.4 938
As a Shrublands resident of over 50 years, I strongly object to plans to use the estate's open spaces for housing. There are plenty of brownfield sites for new developments before resorting to the type of infilling which would change the character of our estate forever, leading to environmental degradation and a worsening of residents' quality of life.
Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

4200/01/007/DM43.4/O Mr G Furmanski
Object Soundness - Justified DM43.4 938
I object to Ret No. 938 — the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing land
Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

4209/01/008/DM43.4/O Mr & Mrs King
Object Proposed Policy Development & Under-used Garages and Open Spaces on Shrublands Estate. Policy DM43, reference 938
I am sympathetic to the building of homes on the under-used garages on the Shrublands Estate as detailed In Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan, Detailed Policies & Proposals: reference number 938. However, I object to the building of any homes on communal open spaces and loss of amenity on the Shrublands Estate.
For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out In Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.
Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

4218/01/009/DM43.4/O Mr & Ms Morgan & Mason
Object DM43.4 938
I object to the use of open space on the Shrublands Estate for housing.
Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.
4228/01/012/DM43.4/O Sheila Newman  
Object DM43.4  
938  
the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing site reference number 938

Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

4232/01/008/DM43.4/O Mr & Mrs Farrow  
Object DM43.4  
938  
Proposed Policy Development & Under-used Garages and Open Spaces on Shrublands Estate. Policy DM43, reference 938

I am sympathetic to the building of homes on the under-used garages on the Shrublands Estate as detailed In Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan, Detailed Policies & Proposals: reference number 938. However, I object to the building of any homes on communal open spaces and loss of amenity on the Shrublands Estate.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out In Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

4238/01/002/DM43.4/O Miss b Hall  
Object DM43.4  
938  
the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing reference number 938. There are limited open spaces on an estate of this size & to remove any is detrimental to the local community. Previously built areas are acceptable to build on again.

Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

4268/01/012/DM43.4/O Mr D Nesterovitch  
Object DM43.4  
938  
the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing site reference number 938

Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

4277/01/002/DM43.4/O Mr H Bhanji  
Object DM43.4  
938  
Object to the use of open spaces on Shrublands Estate for housing - site 938.

Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.
Mr Melvin Howard

Object DM43.4 938

If some of the garages are underused then they could be replaced by much needed homes but I object to building on precious open space in an already much built up area.

Change

This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

S Wallace

Object DM43.4 938

Second, the Council plans to build on under-used garages and open spaces on the Shrublands Estate. These sites are identified as suitable for 35 homes (pages 459-460, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 938).

Change

This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

Mrs Glenna Fullick

Object DM43.4 938

Proposed Policy Development & Under-used Garages and Open Spaces on Shrublands Estate. Policy DM43, reference 938

I am sympathetic to the building of homes on the under-used garages on the Shrublands Estate as detailed In Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan, Detailed Policies & Proposals: reference number 938. However, I object to the building of any homes on communal open spaces and loss of amenity on the Shrublands Estate.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

Change

This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

Doreen Jansen

Object DM43.4 938

the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing reference number 938; building on brownfield i.e. the under-used garages is acceptable, but taking away open areas on the estate is not as density affects human behaviour & there are e.g. many young people there.

Change

This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.
Mrs J Furmanska
Object DM43.4 938
I object to Ret No. 938 — the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing land
Change
This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will not be included in the Local Plan.

Mr P Bhanji
Object DM43.4 938
the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing site reference number 938
Change
This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

Ms B Fontaine
Object DM43.4 938
the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing site reference number 938
Change
This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

The Judge Family
Object DM43.4 938
Proposed Policy Development & Under-used Garages and Open Spaces on Shrublands Estate. Policy DM43, reference 938
We are sympathetic to the building of homes on the under-used garages on the Shrublands Estate as detailed on Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Part II and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals: reference number 938. However, I object to the building of any homes on communal open spaces and loss of amenity on the Shrublands Estate.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

Change
This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.
Ms Gemma Sturgeon

Object

DM43.4

938

Proposed Policy Development & Under-used Garages and Open Spaces on Shrublands Estate. Policy DM43, reference 938

I am sympathetic to the building of homes on the under-used garages on the Shrublands Estate as detailed In Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan, Detailed Policies & Proposals: reference number 938.

However, I object to the building of any homes on communal open spaces and loss of amenity on the Shrublands Estate.

For the reasons given above:

1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability to meet the needs of future generations.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

Mrs Jennifer Farina

Object

DM43.4

938

4 Proposed Policy DM43 Development of Under-used Garages and Open Spaces on Shrublands Estate

I agree to the building of homes on the under-used garages on the Shrublands Estate as detailed in Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan, Detailed Policies & Proposals: reference number 938.

However, I object to the building of any homes on open spaces on the Shrublands Estate.

For the reasons given above:

1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet the Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM43.4 938</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4378/01/013/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Jennifer Carrozzo</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing, site reference number 938.</td>
<td>Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4384/01/012/DM43.4/O</td>
<td>Ms N Nesterovich</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing site reference number 938</td>
<td>Change This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object  DM43.4

the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate for housing reference number 938. The Council should focus on developing other land in the Croydon borough such as unused office blocks, derelict corporate buildings/factories/warehouses which have not been occupied for years instead of attacking the green areas which are enjoyed by the residents in their respective areas. The proposals to build circa 700 houses in such a small area will cause the following detrimental effects to the local residents: depreciation of the value of the houses purchased in the relevant areas, too much strain on the water and sewerage systems in the locality where there is already a high water table. This could result in undue flooding and drainage problems, structural problems in years to come as the land is not fit for such intensive building, increase in traffic on Shirley Road, Wickham Road, Lower Addiscombe and Addiscombe which is already congested. This will unduly increase pollution levels which are already toxic. This will undoubtedly cause an increase in the health problems of the people in the locality such as lung cancer and other respiratory illnesses which will in turn place greater stress on the NHS services, cause more people to take sick days which will result in lower incomes obtained and eventually less tax revenue generated. This will have a knock on effect on the economy which is to say at the very least, bleak, the three green spaces in the Shirley Oaks Village are owned by the 488 Freeholders. Each Freeholder owns one share in the nominee company, Shirley Oaks Management Limited which owns the land on behalf of its shareholders. Building upon this land would seriously undermine the value of the land purchased by the Freeholders and reduce quality of life. If the residents wanted to move, it would prove near impossible because of the resulting lower sale prices of their respective houses imposed by the Council’s building plans. This would appear to be unfair for the Council to impose such hardship on the residents. I would urge the council to build upon land in the Croydon borough which is derelict and contains buildings which have not been used for years. These buildings can be knocked down to build the much needed housing for generations to come. These unused or derelict buildings serve no purpose to the local residents and are of no value to the residents. The Council should endeavour to create value where it is needed. This will in turn...
improve the condition of the abandoned areas. This will also prevent squatting and other unlawful uses of such buildings. I witnessed one example last year where the old post office building next to East Croydon Station was used as a rave containing over 1,000 people. This posed a risk to the safety of the passers by and the increase in crime. The Council's redevelopment of such spaces could be highly beneficial to the area. The green spaces are however of great importance to the local residents. The residents enjoy these spaces for walking their dogs, recreational and outdoor activities, space for children to play, piece of mind for the resident who works in the city and comes home to a peaceful environment and it provides space for those residents who already have very small back gardens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM43.4 938</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marie Hillman

I have lived on Shrublands for 54 and a half years. It is known for its fresh and open green areas. It is a small estate and to take that away and build on it is would be a travesty. There is nothing here for us anyway, so take the ball court and the prettiness away from us would be awful for young and old. We don't wish to feel catastrophic and feel we have no say where we lived. A very crafty unlaizing, disrespectful move on your part for not informing the residents in good time to get our objections in! The main park was removed a year ago and replaced with a smaller one in Fir Tree Gardens which is in inadequate for the amount of children up here. Our shops aren't much to speak of either and very depressing for us as there is nothing to do up here. Why don't you try to improve where we lived, instead of taking more away from us by ruining it even further? New Addington is the biggest estate in Europe with far more amenities than Shrublands- go build there!

Dr I Jayamanne

I wish to protest vehemently about your plans to destroy Shirley which is a village by building hundred of homes and setting up a Gypsy and Traveller site. You will destroy the Green Belt and increase the traffic in the area thus polluting the environment and the air we breathe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soundness - Justified DM43.4 938</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ann & Alan Gibbs

The proposal to build houses on vital open space on the estate is unacceptable and would be detrimental to the residents of the estate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM43.4 938</td>
<td>This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will may come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Ian Fraser

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM43.4 938

I also object to the use of open spaces on the Shrublands Estate (reference 938). The whole character of the Shrublands estate is determined by its openness. The Shrublands Estate has little else to justify its current design! Any loss of land to housing development will expotentially degrade this estates character.

Change

This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

P L Johnson

Object: DM43.4 938

I wish to object to the use of the following sites for housing: The use of open spaces on the shrublands estate (ref no 938) The shrublands estate lacks adequate road access and already traffic from and to it causes serious congestion in Oak Ave and other roads.

Change

This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.

Mrs M Davies

Object: DM43.4 938

I am writing to object to the proposed use of:
- the land to the east of Shirely Oaks Road (541)
- The land to the west of shirely Oaks Road (542)
- The land at Poppy Lane, Shirley Road (128)
- Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane (504)
- Land to the rear of honeysuckle gardens (548)
- Open space land at shrublands estate (938)

Change

This site comprised a collection of sites rather than one individual site. It will come forward through the Council New Build Programme but will not be included in the Local Plan.
The proposal to build new houses in Shirley Oaks Hospital, Poppy Lane does not fall within the Strategic Objectives because:

Objective 2: This development will not foster an environment where existing enterprise can prosper, but will reduce enterprise.

Objective 4: This development will not reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation. It will not reduce unemployment, improve skills and education and improve environmental conditions, the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Objective 5: This development is not high quality and will not enhance the borough’s natural environment but will reduce the natural environment by turning a green area into housing.

Objective 7: This development will reduce the area as a safe, healthy and cohesive community but making the area overcrowded with residential property.

Objective 10: This development will reduce the quality and accessibility of green spaces and nature.

If this development is undertaken it will not deliver the strategic objective. This development will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The development will change the outlook and community within the South Croydon area and future generations will suffer because of this.

This proposed development of new housing in Shirley Oaks Hospital is not within keeping of the current development within this area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with housing in the area.

Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area and is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Building a travelers site will increase noise levels and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area.

Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

This development would diminish the area of green fields and recreational land within the area.

Site A546 was an alternative site and had not come forward for development. It is designated in the Local Plan as a site that would be difficult (in terms of character) to integrate with the built-up area of the borough and has not been allocated for development on that basis.

In the light of this comment it will be designated as Local Green Space along with the allotments and Peabody Close playing field.
I am writing to you in my capacity as secretary of the Addiscombe Woodside and Shirley Leisure Gardens Ltd, with the full endorsement of the Executive Committee. AWSLF is an allotment society comprising in excess of 400 plots, adjacent to Stoud Green Pumping Station and bounded by Primrose Lane, Poppy Lane and Glenthorne Avenue.

I am writing to object to two issues detailed in the above document which are relevant to our land.

Land opposite Shirley Oaks Hospital, Poppy Lane. Policy DM43 Shirley Ref A546
- The land detailed in the map on page 444 is the freehold property of the shareholders of the AWSLF Ltd. On these grounds alone we object to its development.
- In addition to this, in recent years this land has been turned into a nature reserve, now home to numerous flora and fauna including, we understand protected species. This is a vital asset of the Society, much used by its members and visitors and previously prone to flooding before being properly managed.

This site was allocated as an alternative site. It is not considered appropriate to carry this site through to the next stage of the Local Plan and so is therefore removed.

In the light of this comment it will be designated as Local Green Space along with the allotments and Peabody Close playing field.
The proposal to build new houses in Shirley Oaks Hospital, Poppy Lane does not fall within the Strategic Objectives because:

Objective 2: This development will not Foster an environment where existing enterprise can prosper, but will reduce enterprise.

Objective 4: This development will not reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation. It will not reduce unemployment, improve skills and education and improve environmental conditions, the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Objective 5: This development is not high quality and will not enhance the borough’s natural environment but will reduce the natural environment by turning a green area into housing.

Objective 7: This development will reduce the area as a safe, healthy and cohesive community but making the area overcrowded with residential property.

Objective 10: This development will reduce the quality and accessibility of green space and nature. This proposed development of new housing in Shirley Oaks Hospital is not within keeping of the current development within this area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with housing in the area.

Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area and is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Building a travelers site will increase noise levels and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area.

Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. This development would diminish the area of green fields and recreational land within the area.

As set out in the Croydon Local Plan: Changes to the Policies Map document, the reason that the site is not a preferred option is because the site would be difficult to integrate with the built up area of the borough. The site has not come forward as part of the consultation process and will therefore not be carried forward into the proposed submission stage of the plan.

In the light of this comment it will be designated as Local Green Space along with the allotments and Peabody Close playing field.
The proposal to build new houses in Shirley Oaks Hospital, Poppy Lane does not fall within the Strategic Objectives because:

Objective 2: This development will not foster an environment where existing enterprise can prosper, but will reduce enterprise.

Objective 4: This development will not reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation. It will not reduce unemployment, improve skills and education and improve environmental conditions, the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Objective 5: This development is not high quality and will not enhance the borough’s natural environment but will reduce the natural environment by turning a green area into housing.

Objective 7: This development will reduce the area as a safe, healthy and cohesive community but making the area overcrowded with residential property.

Objective 10: This development will reduce the quality and accessibility of green space and nature. This development will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The development will change the outlook and community within the South Croydon area and future generation will suffer because of this. This proposed development of new housing in Shirley Oaks Hospital is not within keeping of the current development within this area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with housing in the area.

Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area and is not in keeping with the surrounding area. Building a travellers site will increase noise levels and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area. Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. This development would diminish the area of green fields and recreational land within the area.

In the light of this comment it will be designated as Local Green Space along with the allotments and Peabody Close playing field.
Object Soundness - Justified DM44.2
I strongly object to your policies.

Local shopping parades are empty due to draconian parking charges. Whitgift and Centrale are empty. Office blocks empty.

DM2 DM40 DM40.4 DM41.3 DM44.2 DM28 DM3 DM31.4

No change The Local Plan is required to allocate sites for development so it is not possible to remove this policy.

Object DM44.2
We object to this policy

No change The sites identified are required to meet the demand and to serve the needs of the borough.

Object DM44.2
I would like to object.

No change No change can be made as a result of this comment as it is not detailed enough as to what is being objected to.

Object DM44.2
I would like to register my anxieties as regards some of the proposals in the draft "local plan". They are 44.2

No change No change can be made as a result of this comment because it is not clear as to what is being objected to.

Councillor Luke Clancy
London Borough of Croydon

Comment Soundness - Effective DM44.2 345
Site 345, Normanton Park Hotel, 34-36 Normanton Road. The rear of the site should be considered for possible expansion of St. Peter's School, as it adjoins the school play areas.

The rear of the site should be considered for possible expansion of St. Peter's School as it adjoins the school play areas.

Change The proposed allocation will be amended to include the potential expansion of the school if it is required for school expansion at the point of any application being made.

Councillor Dudley Mead
London Borough of Croydon

Comment DM44.2 345
Site 345, Normanton Park Hotel, 34-36 Normanton Road. The rear of the site should be considered for possible expansion of St. Peter's School, as it adjoins the school play areas.

The rear of the site should be considered for possible expansion of St. Peter's School as it adjoins the school play areas.

Change The proposed allocation will be amended to include the potential expansion of the school if it is required for school expansion at the point of any application being made.

Councillor Jason Perry
London Borough of Croydon

Comment Soundness - Effective DM44.2 345
Site 345, Normanton Park Hotel, 34-36 Normanton Road. The rear of the site should be considered for possible expansion of St. Peter's School, as it adjoins the school play areas.

The rear of the site should be considered for possible expansion of St. Peter's School as it adjoins the school play areas.

Change The proposed allocation will be amended to include the potential expansion of the school if it is required for school expansion at the point of any application being made.

Councillor Mario Creatura
London Borough of Croydon

Comment Soundness - Effective DM44.2 345
Site 345, Normanton Park Hotel, 34-36 Normanton Road. The rear of the site should be considered for possible expansion of St. Peter's School, as it adjoins the school play areas.

The rear of the site should be considered for possible expansion of St. Peter's School as it adjoins the school play areas.

Change The proposed allocation will be amended to include the potential expansion of the school if it is required for school expansion at the point of any application being made.
The rear of the site should be considered for possible expansion of St. Peter’s School, as it adjoins the school play areas.

The site should be allocated for an expansion to the adjacent primary school.

The proposed allocation will be amended to include the potential expansion of the school if it is required for school expansion at the point of any application being made.

Site 345, Normanton Park Hotel, 34-36 Normanton Road. The rear of the site should be considered for possible expansion of St. Peter’s School, as it adjoins the school play areas.

The rear of the site should be considered for possible expansion of St. Peter’s School, as it adjoins the school play areas.

The proposed allocation will be amended to include the potential expansion of the school if it is required for school expansion at the point of any application being made.

Normanton Park Hotel, 34-36 Normanton Road. The rear of the site should be considered for possible expansion of St. Peter’s School, as it adjoins the school play areas.

The proposed allocation will be amended to include the potential expansion of the school if it is required for school expansion at the point of any application being made.

A large number of the sites allocated for development through Detailed Policies and Proposals may result in the loss of green space. This appears to run counter to the Borough’s Strategic Objective 10 (The need to utilise brownfield areas first) and could be replaced with a goal to promote good quality high density developments which protect Croydon’s green spaces. Even undesignated green spaces provide important ecosystem services to Croydon’s growing population.

We are concerned about the potential loss of green space through this site allocation.

The Council should provide additional text in these policies to encourage developers to propose good quality, high density developments which promote the protection and enhancement of green space.

The proposed allocation will be amended to include the potential expansion of the school if it is required for school expansion at the point of any application being made.

Site 345, Normanton Park Hotel, 34-36 Normanton Road. The rear of the site should be considered for possible expansion of St. Peter’s School, as it adjoins the school play areas.

The rear of the site should be considered for possible expansion of St. Peter’s School, as it adjoins the school play areas.

The proposed allocation will be amended to include the potential expansion of the school if it is required for school expansion at the point of any application being made.
I would suggest that some of the land is devoted to extending the playing fields of the school next to the property which has itself doubled its intake of children in recent years and probably needs more space. I would also suggest that fewer houses are built, with space for more cars to park away from Normanton Road. The traffic flow on Normanton Rd is really awful now, mainly because most of the road-space is taken up by parked cars. Visitors to, and residents in, the many relatively new flats tend to park on the street because parking area within the apartment complexes is inadequate.

The proposed allocation will be amended to include the potential expansion of the school if it is required for school expansion at the point of any application being made.

Site 345, Normanton Park Hotel, 34-36 Normanton Road. The rear of the site should be considered for possible expansion of St. Peter's School, as it adjoins the school play areas.

The proposed allocation will be amended to include the potential expansion of the school if it is required for school expansion at the point of any application being made.

The proposed allocation will be amended to include the potential expansion of the school if it is required for school expansion at the point of any application being made.

The proposed allocation will be amended to include the potential expansion of the school if it is required for school expansion at the point of any application being made.

The proposed allocation will be amended to include the potential expansion of the school if it is required for school expansion at the point of any application being made.

I wish to add my objections made on this document by our local M.P. Chris Philp.

The proposed allocation will be amended to include the potential expansion of the school if it is required for school expansion at the point of any application being made.

I would like to voice my objection to the following plan DM 44.2

The proposed allocation will be amended to include the potential expansion of the school if it is required for school expansion at the point of any application being made.
Site 345, Normanton Park Hotel, 34-36 Normanton Road. The rear of the site should be considered for possible expansion of St. Peter's School, as it adjoins the school play areas.

The rear of the site should be considered for possible expansion of St. Peter's School, as it adjoins the school play areas.

The proposed allocation will be amended to include the potential expansion of the school if it is required for school expansion at the point of any application being made.

Site 345, Normanton Park Hotel, 34-36 Normanton Road. The rear of the site should be considered for possible expansion of St. Peter's School, as it adjoins the school play areas.

The proposed allocation will be amended to include the potential expansion of the school if it is required for school expansion at the point of any application being made.

Site 345, Normanton Park Hotel, 34-36 Normanton Road. The rear of the site should be considered for possible expansion of St. Peter's School, as it adjoins the school play areas;

The proposed allocation will be amended to include the potential expansion of the school if it is required for school expansion at the point of any application being made.

We are strongly against the planning ideas you have over green spaces. Please add these six against to planning ideas with references below DM40.1 DM2 40.4 DM44.2 DM28 DM31.4

The proposed allocation will be amended to include the potential expansion of the school if it is required for school expansion at the point of any application being made.

Site 345, Normanton Park Hotel, 34-36 Normanton Road. The rear of the site should be considered for possible expansion of St. Peter's School, as it adjoins the school play areas;

The proposed allocation will be amended to include the potential expansion of the school if it is required for school expansion at the point of any application being made.

I would like to voice my objection to the following plan DM44.2

The objection has not been substantiated in planning terms and therefore cannot be considered as part of the Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Smith

Object DM44.2

We are strongly against the planning ideas you have over green spaces. Please add these six against to planning ideas with references below.

DM40.1
DM2
40.4
DM44.2
DM28
DM31.4

No change

The objection has not been substantiated in planning terms and therefore cannot be considered as part of the Local Plan.

Riddlesdown Residents Association

Object DM44.2

This is a greenbelt site, and it is not appropriate to build a traveller’s site on. Policy E of "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites", published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. We note of proposals also for travellers sites at Coombe Farm, off Oaks Road and Pear Tree Farm, Featherbed Lane. All three sites in our opinion would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. No travellers’ sites should be considered or allowed on any green belt land.

This site should not be allocated as a Gypsy and Traveller site.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr Bob Sleeman

Call for a review including increased weighting for needs for transport, education and health facilities for all sites suitable for 15 + pitches with site area greater than 4.0.

Coombe Lodge Nursery (Central Nursery), Conduit Lane, Coombe Road, South Croydon, CR0 5RQ

As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr Bob Sleeman

Object DM44.2

As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is);

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Hidden in the depths of the documents without any detailed maps and no backing documentation are plans to allocate Traveller sites:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref no</th>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Proposed use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>755</td>
<td>Pear Tree Farm &amp; Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane</td>
<td>Gypsy and traveller site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>Coombe Farm, Oaks Road</td>
<td>Gypsy and traveller site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>661</td>
<td>Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane</td>
<td>Gypsy and traveller site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no reference to any national mechanism for rating such sites, so has Croydon invented a scoring regime without any accreditation? There should be a review including increased weighting for needs for transport, education and health facilities for all sites suitable for 15+ pitches with site area greater than 4.0 ha.

Number | ID | Site Area | Nos of pitches at 500 m² each |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kent Gateway Lane, Featherbed Lane, Selsdon, CR0 5AR</td>
<td>13.7 15+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536</td>
<td>Land of former Croydon Airport runway, south of Imperial Way, Purley Way, Waddon, CR0 4RR</td>
<td>4.5 15+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>Land south of Threehalfpenny Woods, Kent Gate Way, Bridle Way, Addington, CR0 5AH</td>
<td>39.0 15+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>Land adjoining Kent Gateway East of Addington Village Roundabout, Kent Gateway Lodge Lane, Addington CR0 5AR</td>
<td>25.1 15+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638</td>
<td>Land west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, Elmside, Addington CR00QA</td>
<td>7.4 15+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>Land south of Heathfield, Reaco Drive, Selsdon, CR0 5RS</td>
<td>4.9 15+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>661</td>
<td>Coombe Lodge Nursery (Central Nursery), Conduit Lane, Coombe Road, South Croydon, CR0 5RQ</td>
<td>4.2 15+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Addiscombe Residents Association

Object: Croydon has very few green places that are actually loved and residents are proud of so they need to be left as they are or enhanced. The proposal to place travellers site is not acceptable. These sites are stated by the Council to be in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". Also these sites are far from schools and shops therefore not suitable for the proposed change of use. The site should not be allocated as gypsy and traveller site.

Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

---

Mrs Hilary Chelminski
Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM44.2 661

3. the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:

- Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502;
- Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; and
- Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 755;

As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

"Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development".

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is);

Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
We note the council comment “should not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the biodiversity of the borough. In spite of this we feel that the 3 sites that are being offered will have a biodiversity impact. I have received many comments on the wrong choice of sites, but do understand that the choice is limited. Any chance of a review?

Object

DM44.2

661

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

I am emailing to formally object to your worrying proposals to build 3 gypsy traveller sites in Croydon on Green Belt sites, and your proposals to build housing on some of our precious green spaces and back gardens. We have to protect our green belt at all costs, and we feel that as residents that we are under constant attack having to protect land which is sacrosanct. You can’t just keep changing the goal posts to suit your purposes. I have lived in the area all my life and have never been so alarmed about council proposals. It is hugely stressful for residents, who use and appreciate the green spaces, to be threatened with your proposals. I fully support and agree with the objections raised by my MP Gavin Barwell, and ask you to reconsider your plans to prevent irreversible damage to Croydon and its green spaces.

Object

DM44.2

661

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

When Gypsies and Travellers set up an unauthorised encampment near to Coomba Lane tramstop the Council had to clear up 85 pieces of used toilet paper with faeces on it that were blowing around into people’s gardens. It was a health hazard.

A Gypsy and Traveller site will also ruin the countryside. Green space is exactly that. Leave it alone.

Therefore I object to a Gypsy and Traveller site at Coomba Lodge Nurseries.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0362/01/002/DM44.2/O Mr R Jarvis</td>
<td>Complete total eternal objection. Green space is exactly that. Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge have the peaceful rural names that they do. Existing residents have the right to the peaceful enjoyment of their land and everyone can at different times enjoy the countryside and low density this is only healthy both physically and mentally. It is vital to preserve these unbuilt areas which are the nearest lungs we can escape to. Government Green belt Policy E has deemed any development inappropriate and Croydon Council must obey as the most important vote of the electorate was for the Conservative Government.</td>
<td>Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0362/01/004/DM44.2/O Mr R Jarvis</td>
<td>Complete total eternal objection. Green space is exactly that. Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge have the peaceful rural names that they do. Existing residents have the right to the peaceful enjoyment of their land and everyone can at different times enjoy the countryside and low density this is only healthy both physically and mentally. It is vital to preserve these unbuilt areas which are the nearest lungs we can escape to. Government Green belt Policy E has deemed any development inappropriate and Croydon Council must obey as the most important vote of the electorate was for the Conservative Government.</td>
<td>Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposals in General:
Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land ensure that areas close to high density building, and in particular house, were maintained such that people who lived and worked nearby could benefit from open green space to exercise, relax and maintain a balanced lifestyle. By de-designating the space, not only is a very valuable facility being removed, but the population density that need to benefit from the space is being increase. The proposals fail to identify what alternative facilities of equivalent benefit would be made available and how many people will be affected by the loss of these facilities.

Proposal Ref 661: I specifically object to this proposal as they are contraty to Policy E of the Planning Policy for Travellers Sites “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. If the land is misguidedly de-designated it makes no difference in that the site has not changed, nor have the environment or the reason for it being designated in the first instance. Hence the reasoning for deeming it inappropriate for travellers still stands.

Notwithstanding the reasons for maintaining the current use of the areas in question, the occupation of these areas raises significant security issues for both travellers or any other new inhabitants, and those enjoying the adjacent areas. Access to both Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries have very poor sight lines onto Oaks Road and Coombe Road presenting a traffic hazard to both pedestrians and goods vehicles turning in and out.

The lack of local transport infrastructure in the area and the lack of pedestrian pavements and other walkways would result in a significant increase in vehicle movement.

Notwithstanding the reasons for maintaining the current use of the areas in question, the occupation of these areas raises significant security issues for both travellers or any other new inhabitants.
Object Gypsy/traveler sites: OBJECT
Croydon has very few green places that are actually loved and residents are proud of so they need to be left as they are or enhanced. The proposal to place travelers site is not acceptable. Also, these sites are far from schools and shops therefore not suitable.
Reference 502: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road — within Lloyds Park
Reference 661: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane — with Coombe Tea Room
Reference 755: Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane;
These sites are stated by the Council to be in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object Gypsy/traveler sites: OBJECT
Croydon has very few green places that are actually loved and residents are proud of so they need to be left as they are or enhanced. The proposal to place travelers site is not acceptable. Also, these sites are far from schools and shops therefore not suitable.
Reference 502: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road — within Lloyds Park
Reference 661: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane — with Coombe Tea Room
Reference 755: Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane;
These sites are stated by the Council to be in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Whilst we welcome the approach to meeting these two Vision elements:

A Sustainable City: A place that sets the pace amongst London boroughs on promoting environmental sustainability and where the natural environment forms the arteries and veins of the city

A Caring City: A place noted for its safety, openness and community spirit where all people are welcome to live and work and where individuals and communities feel empowered to deliver solutions for themselves

London Wildlife Trust is concerned at the assessment undertaken to identify potential new travellers’ sites (Assessment and Selection of sites for Gypsy and Travellers, Evidence for the Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (P&A Options), August 2015). It sets out criteria and scoring for the assessment of sites in Table 1.

For Green Belt/MOL:
- No built form -10
- Built form -5
- Not GB/MOL +10

There is no +5 score amber or green. Yet for the GB/MOL scoring of each site in Table 5, a score in amber of +5 is sometimes used. This is incorrect as it overscores sites by 10 points (i.e. +5 when it should be -5). Therefore the accumulated site

For this site Green Belt/Metropolitan Open Land should be listed as a policy designation prohibiting further exploration of options.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I strongly object to the proposed Traveller Site at Coombe Lodge Nurseries. My objections mirror those of Mr Khimji who is also a CR2 resident. I would like to reinforce the exact objections that he has also raised as outline below:

1. Croydon residents have had to endure innumerable hardship as we have been treated – both in practice and reputation – as one of the ‘poor’ London Boroughs, following riots on the trams and the fires in 2011, as well as an illegal rave last year and bad press with the assault of an old lady on a Croydon bus this month. The lodging of this site here will do nothing but increase that reputation at a time when massive amount of investments are due to pour in for the Westfield Regeneration project. It will also serve to put off potential purchasers of property and reduce house prices in what is currently a well-to-do area, with no justification.

2. Rather than serving the travelling community, this site should be used to build new houses and flats to serve the existing, Croydon community, which could also be no doubt sold for profit in what is a ‘win-win’ for all concerned.

3. There is no reason to appease the travelling community when the number of beneficiaries would be largely outweighed by the number of existing Residents that would be adversely affected by the scheme.

4. There will inevitably be a ‘spillover’ effect to the site, which the Council (and by definition, local tax payers) will have to foot the bill for, and there appears to be no justification for Croydon residents paying for the upkeep of the site – what contributions will we expect to receive in return?

I look forward to receiving feedback on the concerns that I have raised, above.
Object DM44.2

I am writing to you today in regards to the proposed Traveller site at Coombe Lodge Nurseries.

I have certain objections to the proposed use of the land, namely:

1. I believe that the proposed site would be against the very essence of the existing Croydon plan to improve the borough, and that the knock-on effects of this will be an adverse impact on the desirability and gentrification of Croydon. I believe this site would undo all the good work the Council have so far achieved and have planned for the coming years.

2. Considering the lack of affordable housing for existing Croydon Residents, this land would be put to better use to build the required housing that is desperately needed for those who have chosen to live within the borough, and who ultimately want to contribute to the community. Any such project will have an undeniably higher value for the Council and for the borough.

3. I find it unfair that Travellers' requirements are put above the needs of existing Croydon residents, when there is no evidence of any community contribution - both economically and in social terms.

4. I am unsure as to the reasoning behind this proposal. What are the economic benefits of the proposal, and how will this serve to improve the Borough of Croydon? Has a cost/benefit analysis been performed?

5. I am concerned at the apparent lack of controls around the encampment proposed, mainly in regards to safety and population limits. What are the criteria for being able to pitch on this site? Will numbers be restricted relating to the space of the site? What infrastructure services will be provided, at what costs, and ultimately who will pay for this? As a taxpaying resident of Croydon, it is unfair for me to be funding these costs when I have similar costs which I pay for myself.

Thank you for taking the time to consider these objections.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/08/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>A Eady</td>
<td>Coombe lodge nurseries conduit lane</td>
<td>Please note our objection to this area becoming a travellers site as we have had experience of gypsies in the area causing severe rubbish problems due to not recycling and not caring for the environment as well as increasing the crime rates in the due to Police proven burglaries. Their Children were entered into local schools which current locals could not get in to and then they also became very disruptive in the classroom. We have been Croydon residents all our lives and have always paid our council tax to achieve a better place to live. Please reject this proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/08/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>A P Goodall</td>
<td>The Policies laid out by the Mayor London- London Assembly website, without a doubt, states that the Mayor’s office really supports the safety of Metropolitan Open Land and claims that “the strongest protection should be given to London's MOL and inappropriate development refused”. I therefore vigorously object to any interference to MOL and in particular if the neighbourhood is simply going to be used differently with little or no consultation with the local residents and businesses. The site should not be used for a Gypsy and Traveller site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/09/02/008/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Alison Connor</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>The Council are proposing in total 45 permanent pitches. Both sites are some distance from public services. They should consider instead the expanding the existing site off the Purley Way. More importantly the Council are in breach of policy E Planning Policy for Traveller Sites published by the Government in August which clearly states: &quot;Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development&quot;. The Council have acknowledged both sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I am writing to object to:

1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:
   - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661;
   - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502;

as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. The additional traffic at the junctions of Coombe Road and Oaks Road and Conduit Lane that this proposal will generate. These junctions are already dangerous for vehicles and this area has the potential with this proposal to become a major accident black spot without significant very costly improvements to the local road network.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I have been a resident and homeowner in South Croydon for over 40 years. I was attracted to the area because of the green belt within its boundaries as well as very good railway connections to Central London. I am dismayed to learn that Croydon Council have identified three locations where they propose to set up permanent Gypsy and Traveller sites. I am particularly concerned with the proposed sites on Conduit Lane and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road. Both these are on green belt and in an area of natural beauty that I would have thought our elected council would go out of its way to preserve. How can this be when The Department for Communities and Local Government's Planning policy for traveller sites dated August 2015 states under Policy E: Local Government's Planning policy for traveller sites dated August 2015, paragraph 16 that “Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. Subject to the best interests of the child, personal circumstances and unmet need are unlikely to clearly outweigh harm to the Green Belt and any other harm so as to establish very special circumstances”?

What are the very special circumstances that make your proposals “appropriate”? How can you go against current Government Policy so blatantly when surely in Croydon, with its many industrial estates, brownfield sites and urban sprawl, there are far more suitable sites for such developments. The Government policy/guideline is to have new sites near to existing developments. Clearly this would not be the case with this recommendation.

These proposals are clearly harmful for the Green Belt and would have a negative impact on the environment and wildlife in Coombe Wood, Shirley Hills and Lloyd Park. It would create a precedent for further erosion of our valuable local amenity. Coombe Road and Coombe Lane are already very busy roads and one of the main arteries into the town centre. The additional traffic emanating from these two sites, without significant road improvements, would exacerbate the traffic congestion, not to mention the additional pressure on the already stretched local services such as schooling and general health centres, schools and other local amenities. The traveller community favour smaller sites to avoid risk of inter-family tensions. These sites go against this.

change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

The travellers sites sites 661 and 502 will have a negative impact on the environment and wildlife, and impact on traffic congestion, add to an already dangerous junction of Coombe Road and Oaks Road and Conduit Lane. Road improvements would be needed. Will add pressure on local schools and general practitioners. The two sites will not meet the needs of the Traveller community not within walking distance of shops, health centres, schools and other local amenities. The traveller community favour smaller sites to avoid risk of inter-family tensions. These sites go against this.
practitioners. The access roads to these proposed sites are clearly unsuitable for the larger vehicles that this community use as part of their livelihood and way of life. The junctions at Coombe Road, Oaks Road and Conduit Lane are already dangerous for vehicles and this area has the potential with this proposal to become a major accident black spot without significant very costly improvements to the local road network.

In summary not only do I feel that these proposed sites are very unsuitable for the area but also they would not meet the needs of the traveller community. Neither of the proposed sites are within walking distance of shops, health centres, schools and other local amenities which I believe is their preference. The Traveller Community favour smaller sites as there is less likelihood of inter-family tensions. These plans clearly go against this.

I would urge you to give more thought to and reconsider this planning application as it is my strong opinion that it neither suits the Traveller Community nor the local residents.
This is Green Belt land which is inappropriate for traveller sites. Our community does not wish to lose any of its green belt land. We don't want the start of development in green belt leading to a precedent and subsequent further loss. Also there would be a negative effect on the environment, wildlife etc to lose any green belt land. The site does not meet anyone's needs. It would be detrimental to one local community. Also, it doesn't meet the needs requested by gypsy and traveller communities. They prefer smaller family sites. They require good access to roads, especially for their large vehicles. They do not request public transport, which was stated as a benefit, but it is not relevant to these communities. There are not any shops or amenities near by. These community groups request that too. On every level these sites do not fit traveller needs and they would create a negative impact on the local community's needs. This site is unsuitable to develop. There are not adequate roads, schools, shops, health facilities etc to cope with such development. The cost to put this infrastructure in place is huge. I think that overwhelming costs would outweigh any benefits. The site has local, environmental, conservation, historical and natural significance. It is too important to lose. I think that the area doesn't suit the needs of any travellers. As stated there is no infrastructure to cope with these numbers. Our local area would be compromised. It is most likely there will be an adverse reaction on local businesses. The areas (e.g. Coombe Woods, Coombe Lodge Nurseries) would be negatively impacted by the plans.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I have lived at my address for nearly 30 years and am writing to object to the use of land at Coombe Lodge Nurseries, off Conduit Lane, (site reference 661) on the following grounds:

The site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

The site is located within the Green Belt considered to be inappropriate for development as 'Traveler sites', Planning Policy for Traveler Sites, DCLG, August 2015.

Selection of the site should have a bias towards 'brownfield or industrial land' not Green Belt.

Insufficient local infrastructure to accommodate the plans.

Lack of necessary amenities in the vicinity.

Imbalance across the Croydon Borough with two proposed sites [sic. Sites 661 and 562] being in South Croydon in close proximity to each other.

It would be detrimental to the rights of adjoining owners.

Could I respectfully suggest that alternative sites such as Pear Tree Farm, Featherbed Lane or that at Lathams Way, off Beddington Farm Road, would be much less detrimental to the environment.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Object to use of site 661 for gypsy and travellers as not the most appropriate to help Croydon meet Strategic Objectives as in Green Belt. Not in line with Government planning policy on the Green Belt.

Detail:
• Government planning policy with regards to traveller sites wants to ensure that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development.
• The proposal to create a permanent traveller site on land designated as Green Belt land is contrary to Policy E of the Planning Policy: “Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances.” There are no very special circumstances.
• The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the “very special circumstances” justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt.
• The local character description is clearly at odds with the proposal.
• The justification acknowledges the Green Belt issue, though insufficiently, but relies on the fact that there are existing structures. These are not in fact substantial — being glasshouses — and could be said to be at least environmentally consistent with the Green Belt. But there is no very special circumstance justification proposed as required by Planning Policies.
• Approving the proposal would set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to be subject to similar development. It is not in the community’s interests to allow the erosion of the green spaces surrounding the community and we object to the impact this site could have on the environment and wildlife. In the light of these issues, it is not appropriate simply to weight Green Belt as one of many factors to be considered, but rather it presents an overarching policy objection that cannot be over-ridden in the way proposed. The decision making process is contrary to Government guidance.

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I wish to place on record my objection to the above proposal with is contrary to Government policy (Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites) which state “Traveller Sites (temporary or Permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development” I assume that you are aware of Government Policy. Croydon Council tell me that money is tight and they are cancelling the Green Waste collection, I am therefore at a loss to understand why you are wasting time and money considering this proposal in an area that is not near any schools or shops.

My wife and I wish to object strongly to the proposal for two traveller sites in our local area. As a couple keen on wildlife, we moved to Melville Avenue mainly for its green location and quick access to unspoilt lanes and open areas in what we were led to believe were green belt. Now these are under threat.

We have had a fair bit of experience with travellers in the local area in the past, encamped on the Coombe Lodge Playing Fields, in Lloyd Park and on Addington Hills and in all cases have been dismayed by their lack of conscience. They have taken down fences and burnt them as bonfires, destroyed turf on pitches, disturbed our neighbours’ beehives, and left considerable amounts of rubbish scattered behind, making no effort even to tidy it into one spot. You will see why then we are less than enthusiastic about the proposals.

Both Conduit Lane and Oaks Lane are tranquil places, very good for wildlife which we enjoy watching. There are few such places within easy access of Croydon and we feel very strongly they should be

am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b;
Barbara Wilkins

I would like to register my opposition to allowing gypsy sites on Coombe Lodge Nurseries. Croydon is a densely populated and built up area. To allow gypsy sites on these two areas of precious Green Belt is totally inappropriate and I understand contrary to Government planning policy.

Amanda Stretton

As a resident of Shirley residing very near Lloyd Park we are writing to object to:

1. The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:
   - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661
   - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502

   as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

   As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

   “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

   The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

D Northcote

Please note that my family and I are absolutely against a site being set up. We had trouble with ‘travellers’ very recently and are very aware of the trouble they cause.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
1782/01/003/DM44.2/O Angus & Olivia Bloom

Object Soundness - Justified DM44.2 661

As a resident of Shirley Oaks I am writing to object the proposals for housing development on the estate and surroundings. Having lived in Shirley all of my life I would be deeply disappointed to see it change unrecognisably. I envisage the property on Shirley Oaks Road will either be demolished or surrounded by high density housing. Either eventuality will be highly detrimental.

I have viewed the Detail Policies and Proposals on Croydon Councils website and object the following plans, references - Ref 128 Ref 504 Ref 541 Ref 542 Ref 548 Ref 938 Ref 502 Ref 661

Objection to Site 661

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

1788/01/006/DM44.2/O Alice Desira

Object Soundness - Justified DM44.2 661

Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 (p179). I totally object to the council plans to create a Gypsy/Traveller site here. This is a greenbelt site and Policy E of "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites", published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". This is quite a beautiful part of Croydon and having this site here would just ruin the area. I have regular experience of travellers where I work on Imperial Way in Croydon and the rubbish that is left by the travellers is disgusting. I can just see Lloyd Park being used as a dumping ground by travellers and the whole area looking unsightly. Please, please do not allow this policy to go through.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

1793/01/001/DM44.2/O Amit Patel

Object Soundness - Justified DM44.2 661

The council plans to create a Gypsy/Traveller site here. This is a greenbelt site, and it's not appropriate to put a traveller site here. Policy E of "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites", published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development".

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Andrea Telman, Object DM44.2 661

I totally disagree to the following planning applications which would spoil the character of our local environment and threaten our green belt. I choose to live in an area that is peaceful and quiet and resent the changes that are being forced upon me. In the spirit of true democracy I wish to make clear my objection to the following developments - Policy DM40.1 (p165), Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p168), Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 308 (p171), Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 (p179), Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179), Policy DM35, Table 11.8, Site 945 (p146), and Policy DM31.4 (p126).

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Bernard Nelligan, Object DM44.2 661

I understand the draft local plan is out for consultation and feedback is requested. Regarding the consultation my comments are as follows:

Policy DM44.2: There should be no development on Greenbelt sites - no erosion or exception to this principle. A proposed Traveller site on Conduit Lane would be on greenbelt land and should not be permitted as this would be inappropriate development.

Policy DM44.2 Loss of greenbelt: Coombe playing fields, Crohamhurst and Sandemead plantation - none of these sites should be downgraded from Greenbelt to metropolitan open land or any other designation. They are greenbelt and this protection should not be withdrawn and the Council should both respect and vigorously defend the greenbelt.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Carly Litchfield, Object DM44.2 661

Objection to the policy; no other information/justification provided.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
In response to details of The Croydon Local Plan, I am objecting to the suggested plans to change the current Green Belt land at Coombe Farm AND AT Coombe Lodge Nurseries into temporary or permanent areas for Traveller/Gypsy sites. The reason being in my opinion it will drastically change the character of our area very much for the worse. We desperately need new housing, but it should be built on brownfield sites not our remaining precious green spaces, particularly in this area.

Object

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object Soundness - Justified

I wish to notify you of my objections to some of the Council’s proposals in the Croydon Local Plan, which has recently been brought to my attention. As I understand from Gavin Barwell MP (Croydon Central) there are plans to build three gypsy/traveller camps in the Green Belt (eg Coombe Farm), and to allow large housing developments on some of our precious green spaces. Once gone these are gone forever. The character of parts of the Borough could be dramatically changed for the worse and this might discourage people from living, working, shopping and investing in the area. Whilst I acknowledge that there is a need for more accommodation in Croydon it is preferable to utilise effectively those brownfield sites which I am given to understand do exist in the area. More brownfield sites might become available in the future and I should like to think that the Council is establishing and/or maintaining and updating a list of suitable locations.

Object Soundness - Justified

Object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; object to: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b;

Object Soundness - Justified

Object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; object to: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b;

Object Soundness - Justified

Object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; object to: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1827/01/08</td>
<td>Jane &amp; Paul Riley</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but will be objecting to building on precious open space. Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829/01/06</td>
<td>Christine Cafferkey</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 (p179). The council plans to create a Gypsy/Traveller site here. This is a greenbelt site, and it is not appropriate to put a traveller site here. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835/01/08</td>
<td>Peter Docherty</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>This location is in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the government in August say very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of this policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840/01/01</td>
<td>Barbara Muldoon</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>It is one of the most attractive areas in Croydon. Any development in this area would be unacceptable. Apart from the poor access for travellers lorries and caravans, the adjoining businesses Coombe Café and Coombe Lodge would be affected. Has it been considered where residents would take their children to school, as I think only private schools locate in that area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
1843/01/006/DM44.2/O Mrs A L Winkley

Object DM44.2

661

I object to DM44.2 table 11.17 site 661

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

1844/01/003/DM44.2/O Annette and Robert Butler

Object Soundness - Justified DM44.2

661

We strongly object to the following:
The use of the following as gypsy/traveller sites:

Coombe Lodge nurseries of Conduit Lane reference number 661

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

1853/01/005/DM44.2/O Brian Matthews

Object Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 (p179). This is a greenbelt site, and it is not appropriate to put a traveller site here. Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

1854/01/003/DM44.2/O C Myring

Object The proposed Traveller site in Conduit Lane would seem to be in an inappropriate area and the reclassification of Green Belt areas should be flagged up as unacceptable and should be defended against at all costs

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

1860/01/001/DM44.2/O Mrs Cathy Sidholm

Object DM44.2

661

I am writing to object to:

1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:

Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502;

as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b;

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Such development is in breach of Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that "Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites now, and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough. If the number of Gypsy/Traveller sites really needs to be increased by this amount, then a more appropriate location would be around the existing site at Purley Way. The positioning of a Gypsy/Traveller site adjacent to the car park for Coombe Woods, between the Chateau Restaurant and the Hotel/restaurant, would probably deter me from using any of these attractions.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object

Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661: As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I would like to register my concern in relation to the specific proposal to develop a Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane, next to Coombe Wood Gardens. My objection is based on the following: This is a greenbelt site, and it is not appropriate to put a traveller site here. It is in contravention of Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The site is too close to current and proposed schools in the immediate vicinity and presents safety concerns to the many children who will occupying these schools in addition to them travelling to and from their schools. The impact on businesses close to the proposed site will be severally blighted. The enjoyment of local parks, and in particular the gardens in Conduit Lane will be adversely impacted and the like loss of very limited parking in the area will be severe. I trust my objections will be duly noted and taken into consideration when taking action on this proposed development.'

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I am writing to register my objections for the following proposed sites for Gypsy and Travellers Sites:

- Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane - Reference 661

The Policies laid out on the Mayor of London - London Assembly website, and Policy 7.17 clearly states that the Mayor’s office truly supports the protection of Metropolitan Open Land, and indeed states that “The strongest protection should be given to London’s MOL and inappropriate development refused”. The Policy lays out what needs to be established to designate an area as MOL, but does not make it clear how a Council can re-designate an area. I therefore object to any permanent Traveller site being constructed on MOL and especially if the area is simply going to be re-designated without any consultation with the local residents and businesses.

I object strongly that Croydon Council can re-designate Metropolitan Open Land or Green Belt land to suit their needs to accommodate a permanent pitch. I cannot see any Planning justification to change the designation, nor for the intrusion into the lives of the residents of Oaks Road and surrounding area. This will massively affect the urban attractiveness of the area and have both emotional and financial repercussions on many lives.

Policy 7.18 relating to Protection of Open Spaces clearly states that open spaces in London must be protected, and any loss must be resisted. I cannot believe the Council would want to go against both of these policies laid down by The London Assembly.

This Club not only provides sport and social activities to over 700 members in the local vicinity, but also provides an important ecological role in the area. The proposed site of Coombe Farm as a site for Gypsies and Travellers has come as a shock to everyone in the area, as borne out by the recent press coverage and attendance at the Consultation Meetings.

The history of unauthorised “pitches” in this area over the past few years has left a bitter resentment, especially in view of the residual mess and threatening behaviour that has always accompanied their trespass. On each occasion that Gypsies/Travellers have been in the area, the club members here have been threatened with physical and verbal abuse. This behaviour is totally unacceptable and despite the subsequent eviction of the Travellers on each occasion, the residual...
psychological effect on tax payers and constituents’ lives cannot be trivialised. We also have a large Junior Section and children play the course during holidays as well as weekends. They are often unaccompanied and the parents need to know they are in a safe environment. This would certainly not be the case in the parents’ minds if there was any chance of aggressive behaviour, as previously experienced, towards these children. I am certain that you would not wish to be responsible for putting children in any sort of potentially dangerous situation.

Surely these detailed real issues must be taken into account when determining any permanent site.

I understand that the proposed sites are not within the required distance to both schooling and medical needs, therefore I also object on that basis. The land is in private ownership at Coombe Farm, and any funds spent on “compulsory or otherwise” purchase could surely be spent more wisely on behalf of the population of Croydon. No doubt Central Grants will be available, but Council owned land in an area that will not radically impact on established residents’ lives would be a sensible and prudent choice.
We want to object to the locating of three traveller sites in and around South Croydon. The building of these sites on green land is wrong and will change significantly the area we live in. We live in Gravel Hill between Featherbed Lane and Coombe Lodge Nurseries and we will therefore be impacted by two if not all three of these sites. As the Council acknowledges the sites is within the Green Belt and borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development" and the Council’s approach is clearly a breach of this policy.

Gypsy and Traveller sites should not be located in the Green Belt.

Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of pitches then why not increase the size of the site on the Purley Way where the existing site is.

The sites should be closer to public services and located where the existing site is.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr Dermot O'Reilly

I am writing to register my objections for the following proposed sites for Gypsy and Travellers Sites:

Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane - Reference 661

The Policies laid out on the Mayor of London - London Assembly website, and Policy 7.17 clearly states that the Mayor’s office truly supports the protection of Metropolitan Open Land, and indeed states that “The strongest protection should be given to London’s MOL and inappropriate development refused”. The Policy lays out what needs to be established to designate an area as MOL, but does not make it clear how a Council can re-designate an area. I therefore object to any permanent Traveller site being constructed on MOL and especially if the area is simply going to be re-designated without any consultation with the local residents and businesses.

I object strongly that Croydon Council can re-designate Metropolitan Open Land or Green Belt land to suit their needs to accommodate a permanent pitch. I cannot see any Planning justification to change the designation, nor for the intrusion into the lives of the residents of Oaks Road and surrounding area. This will massively affect the urban attractiveness of the area and have both emotional and financial repercussions on many lives.

Policy 7.18 relating to Protection of Open Spaces clearly states that open spaces in London must be protected, and any loss must be resisted. I cannot believe the Council would want to go against both of these policies laid down by The London Assembly.

This Club not only provides sport and social activities to over 700 members in the local vicinity, but also provides an important ecological role in the area. The proposed site of Coombe Farm as a site for Gypsies and Travellers has come as a shock to everyone in the area, as borne out by the recent press coverage and attendance at the Consultation Meetings.

The history of unauthorised “pitches” in this area over the past few years has left a bitter resentment, especially in view of the residual mess and threatening behaviour that has always accompanied their trespass. On each occasion that Gypsies/Travellers have been in the area, the club members here have
been threatened with physical and verbal abuse. This behaviour is totally unacceptable and despite the subsequent eviction of the Travellers on each occasion, the residual psychological effect on tax payers and constituents’ lives cannot be trivialised. We also have a large Junior Section and children play the course during holidays as well as weekends. They are often unaccompanied and the parents need to know they are in a safe environment. This would certainly not be the case in the parents’ minds if there was any chance of aggressive behaviour, as previously experienced, towards these children. I am certain that you would not wish to be responsible for putting children in any sort of potentially dangerous situation.

Surely these detailed real issues must be taken into account when determining any permanent site.

I understand that the proposed sites are not within the required distance to both schooling and medical needs, therefore I also object on that basis. The land is in private ownership at Coombe Farm, and any funds spent on “compulsory or otherwise” purchase could surely be spent more wisely on behalf of the population of Croydon. No doubt Central Grants will be available, but Council owned land in an area that will not radically impact on established residents’ lives would be a sensible and prudent choice.
1896/01/001/DM44.2/O Divya Kumar
Object DM44.2
661
I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

1904/01/008/DM44.2/C Emma Smith
Object DM44.2
661
I object to the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off conduit lane reference number 661

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

1908/01/002/DM44.2/O Alisdair Davis
Object DM44.2
661
Soundness - Justified

These Gypsy and Traveller sites are being situated in Green Belt areas which goes against Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites issued by the Government. The sites also do not match the criteria described in Paragraph 4.17 in that the location of new pitches do not enable the residents to access services including schools and health facilities in the same way that residents of new houses need to be able to access community facilities. Both sites do by any stretch of the imagination give Gypsy and Traveller sites good access to the road network. Indeed both or accessed by single track roads For reasons stated above I do not believe this approach is deliverable and also will alienate existing Croydon residents to building these sites in Green Belt areas. The approach does not enable sustainable development as it compromises areas of outstanding beauty with vehicles which are the opposite. The main tenet of this proposal is Strategic Objective 10: Improve the quality and accessibility of green space and nature, whilst protecting and enhancing biodiversity

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

1915/01/005/DM44.2/O Andrew Hilton
Object DM44.2
661
Table 11.17, site 661 proposes a Traveller site on a greenbelt site which seems to run contrary to Government Policy (Policy E, Planning Policy for Traveller sites) which states such sites, whether permanent or temporary, in green Belt are inappropriate development. I do therefore wish to object to this proposal.

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
**1918/01/008/DM44.2/O**  Mr Gareth Champion  
Object  Soundness - Justified  
DM44.2  661  
Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The Council's approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.  
If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).  
**Change**  This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

**1920/01/003/DM44.2/O**  Mr and Mrs Andrew and Kim Hack  
Object  Soundness - Justified  
DM44.2  661  
We are writing to say that we strongly object to the proposed plans in regards to two locations in Croydon becoming traveller sites.  
i) Coombe Farm off Oaks Road  
ii) Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane  
**Change**  This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

**1922/01/001/DM44.2/C**  Ann Simpson  
Gypsy and traveller site in south Croydon  
Inappropriate development and I would therefore object to the proposal  
**Change**  This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

**1926/01/046/DM44.2/C**  Councillor Luke Clancy  
Comment  Soundness - Effective  
DM44.2  661  
Site 661, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit lane. Transition Town have expressed an interest in restoring this site to a proper nursery facility, utilising the existing greenhouses for the growing of food, which would be a sustainable and appropriate activity within this green belt site.  
**Change**  This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -6. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I am e-mailing you to register total opposition regarding your proposal to put traveller’s sites in Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge. I am and have been a resident of Oaks Road for 20 years and apart from myself being strongly against such an idea, I do not know of one neighbour that is in agreement with this proposal. Apart from there not being adequate amenities in these areas, there is not sufficient transport, road ways, schools to support such a venture. Why would you want to put caravans in these areas, surely in this modern day and age people should live in houses? Also, both these areas are a natural area of beauty with wild life, birds etc…; travellers would lower the whole tone of this and bring mess and litter, such as in the past when we had illegal “visits” before they were moved on. I am also informed that these areas are “green belt” and that no such proposal would or should be allowed. I state once again that I am totally against these potential destructive proposals that would spoil a very beautiful part of Croydon if you go ahead with this scheme, or perhaps this is your plan as this is one of the other Conservative Wards that you are targeting to make your changes?

Mr Charles Marriott

Object DM44.2

objection to extremely worrying proposals to build 3 gypsy traveller sites in Croydon on Green Belt sites.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Writing to object to the proposed sites for Gypsy and Travellers at Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, Reference 661. The Policies laid out on the Mayor of London-London Assembly website and Policy 7.17 clearly state that the Mayor’s office truly supports the protection of Metropolitan Open Land and states the strongest protection should be given and inappropriate development refused. The Policy does not make it clear how a Council can de-designate an area. I object to any permanent Traveller site being constructed on MOL and especially if the area is simply going to be de-designated without any consultation with the local residents and businesses. I object strongly that Croydon council can de-designate Metropolitan Open Land or Green Belt land to suit their needs to accommodate a permanent pitch. I cannot see any Planning justification to change the designation, nor for the intrusion into the lives of residents of Oaks Road and surrounding area. This will massively affect the urban attractiveness of the area and have both emotional and financial repercussions on many lives. Policy 7.18 relating to the Protecting of Open Spaces clearly states that open spaces in London must be protected, and any loss must be resisted. I cannot believe the Council would want to go against both of these policies laid down by the London Assembly. In relation to Shirley Park golf course and 700 members, the club provides sport and social activities and also provides an important ecological role in the area. The proposed site of Coombe Farm as a site for Gypsy and Travellers has come as a shock to everyone in the area, as borne out by the recent press coverage and attendance at the Consultation Meetings. The history of unauthorised ‘pitches’ in this area over the past few years has left a bitter resentment, especially in view of the residual mess and threatening behaviour that has always accompanied their trespass. On each occasion that Gypsy/Travellers have been in the area, the club members have been threatened with physical and verbal abuse. This behaviour is totally unacceptable and despite the subsequent eviction of the Travellers on each occasion, the residual effect on tax payers and constituents’ lives cannot be trivialised. We also have a large Junior section and children play the course during holidays as well as weekends. They are often unaccompanied and the parents
need to know they are in a safe environment. This would certainly not be the case in the parent’s minds if there was any chance of aggressive behaviour as previously experienced, towards these children. I am certain that you would not wish to be responsible for putting children in any sort of potentially dangerous situation. Surely those detailed mail issues must be taken in to account when determining a permanent site. I understand that the proposed sites are not within the required distance to both schooling and medical needs, therefore I also object on that basis. The land is in private ownership at Coombe Farm and any funds spent on compulsory or otherwise purchase could surely be spent more wisely on behalf of the population of Croydon. No doubt central grants will be available, but Council owned land in an area that will not radically impact on established residents’ lives would be a sensible and prudent choice.

1944/01/001/DM44.2/O Mr Mark Barrows

Object DM44.2

I am writing to object to:

Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 for use as a gypsy and traveller site as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b; or with Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites” published by Government in August which states “Traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”;

1955/01/002/DM44.2/O Christine McLaughlin

Object DM44.2

Strongly objects to the proposals for permanent encampments on the grounds of safety of the people who use the area, expenditure and environmental damage.

1970/01/001/DM44.2/O Derek Mezo

Object DM44.2

Inappropriate development at Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane - as a member of Shirley Park Golf Course for over 50 years, I wish to express by support for the objections to this development.

DM44.2

661

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

DM44.2

661

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

DM44.2

661

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Dr Kevin Barber

Object Site 502, Coome Farm is in the middle of Lloyd Park. This is Green Belt land given by the Lloyd family to the people of Croydon for recreation. People walk here enjoying the peace and beauty. Joggers, dog walkers, whole families go there and in one area sports are played. In another there is a café for people to sit and relax and enjoy the ambience and clean air in relative safety.

Site 661 Coombe Lodge Nursery is next to the popular beautiful gardens with lovely tea room, of Coombe Wood with its wooded area. And many enjoy the peace and beauty and space, joggers, dog walkers and families. It is an inappropriate location for a gypsy and traveller site. A few years ago a group of travellers pitched up at the end of Grimwade Avenue at the top of Sandilands. The camp was quite unsightly and when they were persuaded to move on a pile of mess remained which Croydon Council, and in turn Croydon residents had to pay to clear up.

Object to Site 502 and 661 for gypsy and travellers sites on grounds of impact on surrounding environment and use of open spaces nearby.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

E McNally

Object I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 as gypsy and traveller site as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b;

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr & Mrs E Soper

Object because:
- inappropriate use of Green Belt and against Govt advice (DCLG, 20115)
- selection of sites should be biased towards brownfield or industrial sites
- detrimental to amenity of residents
- lack of infrastructure to accommodate the demands and other sites should be considered

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987/02/02/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Frances &amp; Mark Monaghan</td>
<td>My wife and I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the Council's proposal to create gypsy/traveller sites on Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries. Both of these sites are in the green belt and one borders a site of nature conservation interest. It is my understanding that to create a Traveller site in such locations would contravene recent Government Guidance on such matters. This is a semi-rural area with no public services or shops nearby - it is inappropriate for both the Travellers and the local environment. To create a Gypsy/Traveller site in such locations would send out a very important message to Croydon Residents about how little the current Council cares for the areas of Croydon that are worth preserving and we have so few of them!</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989/01/07/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>S R Samuel</td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/01/06/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>J. M Lewis</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for a gypsy and traveller site as it would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/01/01/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mrs Jeanne F. Wells</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 as gypsy and traveller site as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mrs Jane M. Smith</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objection to the proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Coombe Farm (site 502).

The London Plan in Policy 7.17 supports the protection of Metropolitan Open Land and inappropriate development should be refused. This policy sets out the criteria for designation as Metropolitan Open Land but does not make it clear how a Council can re-designate an area. I object to any permanent Traveller site being constructed on MOL.

I cannot see any planning justification to change the designation, nor for the intrusion into the lives of residents of Oaks Road and surrounding area. This will massively affect the urban attractiveness of the area and have both emotional and financial repercussions on many lives.

Policy 7.18 of the London Plan relating to open spaces clearly states that open spaces in London must be protected and any loss must be resisted. I cannot believe the Council would want to go against both Policy 7.17 and Policy 7.18 laid down by the London Assembly.

The history of unauthorised pitches in the area over the past few years has left a bitter resentment, especially in view of the residual mess and threatening behaviour that has been accompanied by their trespass. On each occasion that Gypsies and Travellers have been in the area the club members of Shirley Park Golf Club have been threatened with physical and verbal abuse. This behaviour is totally unacceptable and despite the subsequent eviction of the Travellers on each occasion, the residual psychological effect on people's lives cannot be trivialised. The golf club has a large junior section and children play the course during holidays as well as weekends. They are often unaccompanied and parents need to know they are in a safe environment. This would certainly not be the case in the parent's mind if there were any chance of aggressive behaviour as previously experienced towards the children.

Surely these detailed real issues must be taken into account when determining any permanent site.

I understand that the proposed site is not within the required distance to both schooling and medical needs, therefore I object on that basis.
I object to the proposal as Coombe Lodge Nurseries is Green Belt Land. Policy E of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August states very clearly that “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. Previous use does not mitigate this policy. The proximity of this site to the Coombe Farm site, also proposed, would mean a total of up to 45 pitches on 2 sites within a very small area of the Borough.

Paragraph 4.19 refers to the need for good access to roads, stating that Gypsies and Travellers “often need to move larger vehicles as part of their livelihood and way of life”. Coombe Road junctions with Oaks Road and Conduit Lane are busy and potentially hazardous intersections and are unsuitable for increased, safe movement and manoeuvring of larger vehicles, especially entering and existing these sites. The proposed Coombe Lodge Nurseries site is adjacent to a Site of Nature Conservation Interest which would be vulnerable.

The close proximity of the proposed sites to one another has not been taken into account. All three sites are proposed for a small area in the South of the Borough when there seems to be a successful site in Purley Way which could be expanded. None of three sites proposed has good access to schools, shops and other services. The consequent need for private transport goes against environment and climate initiatives. Government Guidelines ask that local planning authorities policies ensure that children can attend school on a regular basis. These three sites are well away from schools, particularly primary schools and clearly do not reflect the aims of Guidelines or facilitate regular school attendance. The number of Gypsy/Traveller sites in Croydon is to increase from 1 to 4 when our recent experience locally is of travellers responsible for damage, parking illegally, leaving piles of rubbish behind when they are moved on an even engaged in firearms confrontation with the police.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Petition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2027/01/001</td>
<td>Mr John Webster</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 as gypsy and traveller site as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036/01/002</td>
<td>Ms Zoe Lazard</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is a lower risk of the site being exposed to unauthorised encampments due to its enclosed boundaries. Access to the site will be problematic with increased traffic. The detrimental affect on local businesses also applies. The nursery could be a great revenue earner for the Council. Allotments area a rare opportunity for Londoners. The space is for the enjoyment of all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036/02/002</td>
<td>Ms Zoe Lazard</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is a lower risk of the site being exposed to unauthorised encampments due to its enclosed boundaries. Access to the site will be problematic with increased traffic. The detrimental affect on local businesses also applies. The nursery could be a great revenue earner for the Council. Allotments area a rare opportunity for Londoners. The space is for the enjoyment of all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposal to develop Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane as a residential development for a Gypsy and travelers site does not fall within the Strategic Objectives because:

Objective 2: This development will not Foster an environment where existing enterprise can prosper, but will reduce enterprise.

Objective 4: This development will not reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation. It will not reduce unemployment, improve skills and education and improve environmental conditions, the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Objective 5: This development is not high quality and will not enhance the borough’s natural environment but will reduce the natural environment by turning a farm into a travelers housing site.

Objective 7: This development will reduce the area as a safe, healthy and cohesive community.

Objective 10: This development will reduce the quality and accessibility of green space and nature.

If this development is undertaken it will not deliver the strategic objective. This development will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The development will change the outlook and community within the South Croydon area and future generation will suffer because of this.

This proposed development of a travelers site within the Coombe Road area is not within keeping of the current development within this area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with out housing in the area.

Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area and is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Building a travelers site will increase noise levels and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area.

Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

This development would diminish the striking view of the area of Addington.
Hills and Coombe Farm area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 661, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit lane. Transition Town have expressed an interest in restoring this site to a proper nursery facility, utilising the existing greenhouses for the growing of food, which would be a sustainable and appropriate activity within this green belt site;</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object | DM44.2
-----|------
661  | I object to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site 661; as a gypsy and traveller site as it would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 220 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

Change | This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political…consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Soundness - Effective</th>
<th>DM44.2 661</th>
<th>Site 661, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit lane. Transition Town have expressed an interest in restoring this site to a proper nursery facility, utilising the existing greenhouses for the growing of food, which would be a sustainable and appropriate activity within this green belt site.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td></td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Soundness - Effective</th>
<th>Site 661, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit lane. Transition Town have expressed an interest in restoring this site to a proper nursery facility, utilising the existing greenhouses for the growing of food, which would be a sustainable and appropriate activity within this green belt site.</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites", published by the Government in August, states very clearly that 'Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development'. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of 'extensive political consultation'. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2078/01/06</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane)</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2087/01/02</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2093/06/01</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2094/01/01</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Date format: YYYY/MM/DD
- Object types: Object, Change
- Reference numbers: DM44.2
- Site numbers: 661
- Discussion topics include: Incorrect calculation, unsuitability for residential development, objections to gypsy/traveller sites, proximity to amenities and schools, and government policies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2096/01/009/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Alfred Lancaster</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the site for a permanent traveller site.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2103/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Miss DC Smith</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.1 Object to use of Coombe Nursery site 661, as stated in Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015 that ‘Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. Previous use does not mitigate against this policy.

1.2 The site is too close to the Coombe Farm Site also proposed and would mean a total of up to 45 pitches on 2 sites in a very small area of the Borough.

1.3 The Croydon Local Plan paragraph 4.19 (CLP1.1) refers to the need for good access to roads. Coombe Road junctions with Oaks Road and Conduit Lane are busy and potentially hazardous intersections and are unsuitable for increased, safe movement and manoeuvring of larger vehicles, especially entering and exiting these sites. Travellers ‘often need to move larger vehicles as part of their livelihood and way of life’.

1.4 The proposed Coombe Lodge Nurseries site is adjacent to a Site of Nature Conservation interest which would be vulnerable. None of the three sites have good access to schools, shops and other services. The consequent need for private transport goes against environment and transport initiatives. Government Guidelines ask that local planning authorities’ policies ensure that children can attend school on a regular basis. These three sites are well away from schools, particularly primary schools and clearly do not reflect the aims of the Guidelines or facilitate regular school attendance.

None of the three sites take into account the need for good access to roads as in CLP1.1 Para 4.19. Oaks Road, Coombe Road, Conduit Lane and Featherbed Lane are unsuitable for safe increased movement and manoeuvring of larger vehicles, especially entering and exiting these sites.

Object to Site 661 for use as a travellers site, as goes against Government policy. Sites 502 and 661 as proposed traveller sites are too close to each other with potentially 45 pitches in a small area of the Borough. Object to location as issues with busy, potentially hazardous roads roads for larger vehicles the travellers need and junctions and entrance and exit from both site 502 and 661.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

The site should be allocated for the growing of food.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Cllr Steve O'Connell AM

Object

DM44.2 661

Transition Town have expressed an interest in restoring this site to a proper nursery facility, utilising the existing greenhouses for the growing of food, which would be a sustainable and appropriate activity within this green belt site.

The site should be allocated for the growing of food.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Cllr Steve O’Connell AM

Object DM44.2 661

The site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites. I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political…consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

The site should not be allocated as a Gypsy and Traveller site.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

R. W. Taylor

Object DM44.2 661

I object to the planned new sites for travellers, why not expand the site they have at present, on the same basis as the expansion of the housing that is being mooted for estates such as Forestside and New Addington. I object to Travellers being treated differently. Why should they be given new private prime sites?

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2141/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>P Graham</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I am writing to object to: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 for use as a gypsy and traveller site as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2144/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>P Busby</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 652; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2147/01/008/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Patrick Thomas</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I am writing at this time to record my objection to the use of the following location for a gypsy and traveller site - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road: site 661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2150/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>R. V. Lewis</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2152/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>David Moulton</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objection to gypsy and traveller site on site 661 as inappropriate, not sustainable, and not deliverable. From the Croydon gypsy and traveller accommodation needs assessment 2013, gypsies and travellers living in the Croydon area for a small family sized sites, with similar size to size having fewer into family tensions. The plan is clearly go against this. There is evidence of periodic overcrowding on traveller sites throughout the year and at peak during winter months. This would yet further increase demand on local services. The plan makers have made no indication that they would take this into consideration or look to them at overcrowding.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
This site is not suitable for the use and the access is not practical. Conduit Lane is a bridalway. In principle I have no objection for the sitting of a school on this site, as long as a practical and safe access can be provided. This proposed development will result in the loss of Greenbelt land which does compromise on the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

Coombe Wood is a beautiful and delicate environment and needs to be protected not developed into a traveller’s site. The access into Conduit Lane bridalway has no through vehicle access and is not suitable for the amount of vehicle movement. This is designated as Greenbelt Land and should be for the benefit of residents of the Borough, for the purpose of recreational pursuits. We know for a fact that a travellers site will result in higher crime, flytipping and vandalism. We have recent, recorded evidence. This site ould be better used as a school, but even then it has difficult access and Coombe Road would be very dangerous for children. If a traffic and access solution can be found, a school is a far more sustainable development and brings far better benefit to the borough and its community.

The Council have chosen two site within 1/2 a mile of each other, both in open green space and adjacent to delicate woodland.

Croydon Council’s plans to build three gypsy/traveller sites in the Green Belt, allow housing on some of our precious green spaces and back gardens and completely change the character of the borough. I agree with Gavin Barwell With regards this destruction of our green belt land.

The respondent objects to the proposal to site three gypsy and travellers sites in the green belt, allowing housing on some of the Precious green spaces and back gardens and would completely change the character of the borough. The sewage and water is up to the limit.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I consider the development at Coombe Lodge Nurseries to be inappropriate for the following reasons:
- The site is in a green belt area. National guidelines say that traveller sites in the green belt are inappropriate development.
- The access road to the site, Conduit Lane, is completely unsuitable for a large number of such large vehicles - it simply was not designed for the high traffic levels we can expect with the additional residents.
- Conduit Lane is used for parking for people to access the beautiful Coombe Gardens. The high levels of traffic that the traveller site will create could not be accommodated while maintaining these parking bays which narrow the road. If these parking bays go and the high traffic levels make the road much more difficult to cross for children and the elderly, then accessibility to the park will be reduced.
- The size of the development will completely dwarf Coombe Gardens, which is a wonderful local amenity. It is a beautiful public park containing numerous memorial stones and benches to commemorate war dead and more recently lost loved ones. Many local residents choose this location because it is such a tranquil and beautiful place.
- The access to Conduit Lane is from Coombe Road, and is already very congested at rush hour and this will be made worse by the traveller traffic.
- The traveller development will damage the three local businesses which thrive as a result of their unusual and rural location so close to Croydon. These being Coombe Lodge - Beefeater and Travel Lodge, Coombe Park, Coffee Shop and the Chateau Napoleon restaurant and wedding venue. The Council should be looking to grow the local economy, not hamper these businesses that offer good service to the population.
- The proposed size of the traveller site is 15-25 pitches, which can each house 3 mobile homes so there could be up to 75 mobile homes on the site. Should further caravans pitch up to use the site, it is unclear how this could be monitored or controlled - so the numbers could even increase. Even at proposed level, the size of this traveller population, compared to the local community on Coombe Road, Oaks Lane and Oaks Road is totally overwhelming and would not be conducive to social cohesion in the area.
- The schools in this area are so over subscribed that there has been some proposals that a new school needs to be developed off Coombe Road. With
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2175/01/004/DM44.2/D</td>
<td>Mrs Veronica Prigg</td>
<td>I wish to object to Policy DM 44.2 Table 11.17 Gypsy/Traveller site Conduit Lane. This site is designated Greenbelt and as such is not appropriate for a Traveller site, as clearly stated in Policy E of planning for Traveller sites published by Government in August 2015.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2181/01/004/DM44.2/C</td>
<td>Ray &amp; Anne Smith</td>
<td>I strongly object to the following policies: Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane Policy DM44.2 Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2186/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>A., G., H., &amp; M. Vigor</td>
<td>This area is greenbelt land and as such according to Government documents, such land is not appropriate for traveller sites. A gypsy and traveller site should not be located in the Green Belt.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2191/01/004/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Rodney Beale</td>
<td>Objection to the proposals for gypsy and travellers as not the most appropriate for Croydon and unsuitable for the lovely country area of Croydon visited throughout the year by families, residents and visitors. The approach is deliverable but undesirable and will ruin the only real part of the country area in Croydon, which grows with housing and office blocks almost daily. The preferred approach will not enable sustainable development as it will spoil the existing areas where sites are suggested and which will never be the same again. It will also affect schooling, health, and cause disturbance around all areas. If Croydon must comply, areas such as Purley Way or an extension of facilities at Laythams Farm should be the correct options.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Croydon has a poor reputation across London as a grey, urban, nasty place. I hear this often. If we are to attract inward investment then we must retain our green spaces in their pristine, green condition, by not permitting any changes to Conduit Lane, Addington Hills or Coombe Wood.

The areas around Conduit Lane have seen a recent revival. Many more people are visiting the now attractive tea rooms and are dining there. At the same time they are exploring the very beautiful grounds and also the woods.

I adore living in Croydon, and have been paying full council tax as a resident since July 2011, and I love it mainly because of its fabulous woods, hills and green spaces. Let’s celebrate and keep them pristine and unaltered. This matters even more now that the town centre is being heavily redeveloped - which I applaud. The green spaces afford a balance and areas of respite from the town centre for many people I know, and many people who we introduce to our green spaces.

These proposals would also have a considerable negative impact on local wildlife.

Permitting alterations to such wonderful, green spaces is a dangerous precedent to set. Please do not allow this proposal to proceed.

This is an inappropriate use of Green Belt. It would be detrimental to the owners of local owners, and there is insufficient local infrastructure to support the planned development. All this goes to show how ill thought out the plans are.

It is not deliverable without considerable cost to Council taxpayers, huge disruption to amenities and permanent problems for traffic flows into Croydon which are already very congested and slow, even outside rush hours.

We do not know of any people that believe that Gypsy / Traveller Sites are compatible with achieving a nice neighbourhood and neither do we. Using green spaces for this purpose would be a double whammy in bringing down the quality of life in Croydon Borough.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2301/01/01/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Breda Mohan</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I object to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane Ref: 661 as a gypsy/traveller site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2302/01/08/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Brenda Stratford</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>The use of the following locations ref 502 &amp; 661 as gypsy/traveller sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2304/01/01/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mandy Lambert</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2318/01/01/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Julie Litchfield</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2326/02/06/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mrs Mollie Dagnell</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I object to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane as a gypsy and traveller site as the site would constitute in appropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The council plans to create a Gypsy/Traveller site here. This is a greenbelt site, and it is not appropriate to put a traveller site here. Policy E of "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites", published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

I would have thought it would be in the Council’s interest to arrange for travellers to be in permanent housing and send their children to school. This is because I understand that many travellers do have permanent housing that they live in during the winter and other months when their caravans would get stuck in the mud.

I believe the Council should look to existing sites (e.g. off the existing site on Purley Way) and brownfield sites but only where local services are already available, or even on redeveloping under-used garage spaces, with much needed permanent housing.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

The traveller site will have an adverse impact on what is a prime recreational and green area of Croydon which is used by people from all over the borough. This area has recently won a Green Flag award as one of the best kept green spaces in the country and such a development would obviously affect this status. It will have a detrimental effect on local businesses which are adjacent to the site. There are not enough local amenities – schools, health facilities, shops etc. to support a site of this size in the immediate vicinity. The proposed approach does not enable sustainable development due to the detrimental effect the site will have on the surrounding green belt land and adjacent businesses.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

My objections are based on the fact that the proposals are not in the best interests of the electorate of the borough and that the proposals will only be harmful to the environment offering no benefits to the community. Building on the Green Belt is not the best option. In the case of the proposed traveller sites PTF is green belt, there are no suitable transport, school or social services in the vicinity. Combe Farm is green belt and Conduit Lane are both close to well-established businesses which will be blighted by having such sites in close proximity:

Conduit Lane would be better used as an educational establishment for young adults or people with learning difficulties giving them an opportunity to make a contribution to the local economy.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2363/01/03/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Anthony Cole</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified DM44.2 661 I believe the proposed traveller sites are inappropriate in these Green Belt areas. Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2364/01/07/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Alison Crane</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified DM44.2 661 Coombe Lodge Nursery, Conduit Lane site is not a suitable site for a traveller site. Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2366/01/02/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Adrian Little</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661 I strongly object to using Conduit Lane as a traveller site as it is part of the largest and most beautiful green spaces close to Croydon and such development would detract from the entirety of this wonderful amenity gifted to Croydon in perpetuity. Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2382/01/02/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Miss Lorraine Gooding</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Consistent with National DM44.2 661 I strongly object to the proposals for a Gypsy and Traveller site in this area of Croydon. It will certainly change the character of this beautiful part of Croydon. The two locations (Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries) are in the Green Belt and therefore contrary to government policy (Policy E of Planning Policy for Gypsy Sites) which states traveller sites temporary or permanent in the Green Belt are inappropriate. Our neighbourhood has encountered continual and numerous travellers campsites over the years. They left rubbish, human excrement and were seen trying to steal vehicles and prowling around private homes. It took weeks to clear up. I also have weekly encounters near where I work on Imperial Way. Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Code</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2429/02/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs E Abdul-Nabi</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Consistent with National DM44.2 661</td>
<td>Object to the use of Coombe Nurseries as a Gypsy and Traveller site as it would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2448/01/046/DM44.2/C</td>
<td>Andy Stranack Croydon Council</td>
<td>Comment Soundness - Effective DM44.2 661</td>
<td>Site 661, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit lane. Transition Town have expressed an interest in restoring this site to a proper nursery facility, utilising the existing greenhouses for the growing of food, which would be a sustainable and appropriate activity within this green belt site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites', published by the Government in August, states very clearly that 'Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development'. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the 'Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers'. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of 'extensive political consultation'. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -6. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 661</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>DM44.2 661</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Jeffrey</td>
<td>It will be objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| DM44.2 661 | Alan Warner | The purpose of this e mail is to register my objections to the proposed change to the designation of Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. I understand that the Council have identified two locations for travellers/gypsy sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries ref 661. These proposals are contrary to Government Policy (Policy E of Planning Policy for Travellers sites) which states that Travellers sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. | This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found. |

| DM44.2 661 | Ben Plummer | I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation. | This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found. |

<p>| DM44.2 661 | Mrs Sandra Cooper | I object to the use of this site as a Gypsy and Traveller site. | This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms Susanne Million</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Johnceline</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Object DM44.2 661:** Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661 for the use as a Gypsy/Traveller site.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object to proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane (reference number 661). This site is in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b: - inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in exceptional circumstances. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. There are no ‘very special circumstances’ that warrant the proposed use of these Green Belt sites.

Exit and entrance to the Conduit Lane site is limited and would have to be improved, resulting in additional cost to the Council and considerable disruption to traffic in Oaks Road (an already busy main road) and the Tram Line. Would such widening of the road (which would have to be implemented) mean concreting over part of historic gardens at Coombe Wood, a site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI)? This would clearly have repercussions for the community gardens/ café/park.

Additionally, Conduit Lane is part of the Vanguard Way, a historic path used by ramblers, walkers, families etc for generations.

The site does not have any local amenities-shops, healthcare, primary schools (I think there is only one secondary school in the immediate area), so will not serve the traveller community. Surely expanding the existing brownfield site in Purley Way would be more cost effective and preferable to the travellers as it provides opportunities for employment, schools and medical care in the immediate vicinity, which the proposed sites do not.
Mr William Barnett

Object
DM44.2
Site 661 and 502

Objection to Site 661 and 502 for a gypsy and traveller site as inappropriate development within the Green Belt, with traffic issues at Coombe Road junction and the proposed sites are not within reasonable walking distance of local amenities. Walkways are inadequate and it is difficult for pedestrians to cross Coombe Road in heavy traffic. Also object to the alternative option of a school on site 661 as there is already a school at the other end of Melville Avenue which causes traffic during term time in the morning and evening in the surrounding area. Traffic in Melville Avenue which is approached via Crohan Road or Coombe Road (busy roads) is often chaotic and any increase should not be countenanced and may lead to accidents.

Objection to alternative use of site 661 as a school on grounds of traffic impact.

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

---

Mr & Mrs Robert & Patricia Cole

Object
Soundness - Justified
DM44.2
Site 661

The plans for travellers sites on the local green belt are unacceptable and will change the character of the area and also overburden the already problematic local road infrastructure.

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

---

Sally Grenville

Object
DM44.2
Site 661

I am writing to object to Coombe Lodge nurseries off Conduit Lane site ref 661. Site would constitute inappropriate development in the green belt and would not comply with policy SP2.7a & SP2.7b. In the consultation process with the Gypsy & Travellers they requested small sites that are more manageable. Site is close to a busy road and tram lines that could be dangerous to children. They also requested sites near to doctors, primary schools and shops. There is a suitable brownfield site/ existing site along the Purley way, offering more opportunities for employment. It is very important that the sites offer safe entrance and exits to sites to ensure there is no danger of accidents. This site is not suitable and would be costly to the council's already stretched budget. The consultation refers for the need for good access to roads as they often move larger vehicles as part of their livelihood and way of life. Coombe Road and Oaks Road are already very busy, the sites would cause no end of delays and frustration to drivers.

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25/01/006/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Ms Cliona Moore</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Miss F Matthews</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/02/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Sean McDermott</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>Objects to the siting of a Gypsy and Traveller site in this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/03/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Sean McDermott</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>We must protect our green areas and surely there are better sites than this one. It would be detrimental to the green belt and the character of the area. The idea that there are glass houses already in Council owned nursery that it can bypass the usual green belt restrictions seems dubious. The site is completely impractical in terms of access and safety being close to very busy roads. Suggestions are: 536- Croydon Airport, Waddon 632- Kent gate way, Bridle way 767- Cane Hill-South part, Coulsdon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I object to the building of Traveller Sites. 1. Ref No 502 Coombe Farm off Oaks Road identified as suitable for 15-20 pitches. 2. Ref No 661 Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane identified as suitable for 15-25 pitches. I strongly object to either of these areas being used as gypsy/traveller sites. They are both in the Green Belt and are totally inappropriate for such use. In addition they would be in close proximity to Coombe Lodge Travelodge, a very popular local venue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I object to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane Ref 661 as a gypsy/traveller site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am writing to object about Site References 661/502, both being inappropriate use and development of Green Belt land. There are adjacent areas of outstanding beauty, sites with biological significance, as well as playing fields for the local community. These would all be affected, not least during the construction of Travellers Sites. The London Plan does not advocate such a development and seems unrealistic for two such sites to be located in the London Borough of Croydon, already over-stretched owing to refugees and asylum seekers arriving at the borough’s Home Office. Not only will this proposed development overburden Croydon as a whole, but also our homes (within 2 miles of said sites). Amenities, Schools, GP practices and the like will be inadequate for an influx of such a population.

Without adequate provision of facilities more than homes alone, not only will the Travellers be disappointed but also local residents who chose to live, close to this location owing to the outstanding open spaces. We have seen the Riots of 2012. Many foreign visitors have sought to live in our Borough. However, the very nature of the name ‘Traveller’, suggests this new group of people may be transitory; we may find our Schools and Hospitals will be overstretched and with a nomadic population, teachers and doctors to name but a few will be unable to provide continuity of care, to the excellent standard we desire for the existing community.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

I am writing to oppose the proposed traveler site at conduit Lane. I frequently visit Coombe Gardens with my family and would be concerned for the potential damage to these woods, considering a historic disregard and lack of respect for their surroundings in the traveler communities. I would be equally concerned at our safety, as we have in the past, been subjected to verbal abuse from travellers playing in the playground at Ashburnton park when they managed to break in there last year.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Object DM44.2 661

Objections to allocate 661 site for Gypsies and Travellers Inappropriate use of Green Belt land lack of relevant amenities close to hand adverse affect on neighbouring businesses and leisure amenities site has a more appropriate use for a school

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object DM44.2 661

I am writing to give my objections to the following location as a traveller/gypsy site: Coombe Lodge Nurseries -off Conduit Lane Ref 661

This site is on the green belt and so inappropriate for development according to government policy. Coombe Wood is a site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) and is on the list of historical parks and Gardens (2008). The area is a local beauty spot used for recreation by people all over the borough. This peaceful area would disappear. The Borough Character Appraisal 2015 has listed this area as having special character. The proposed development is not sensitive to this. The access along Conduit Lane is not suitable for large vehicles. The exit onto Coombe Lane is dangerous with limited visibility. There are no footpaths along Coombe Lane in that area making it dangerous for pedestrians. There are few local amenities in the area. There are no shops within walking distance. There are no buses along Coombe Lane. Lt is a dangerous walk along the road to the tram stop.

I am writing to give my objections to the following location as a traveller/gypsy site: Coombe Lodge Nurseries -off Conduit Lane Ref 661

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object DM44.2 661

I am writing to object to site 661's use as a gypsy and traveller site. This would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with SP2.7a and b.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
The proposals to develop this site for Gypsy and Traveller pitches is completely inappropriate because:

- It is in Green Belt and is therefore contrary to Policy E of Planning for Traveller Sites (government guidance)
- The site is some distance from public services
- A site should be found in the Purley Way area instead where the existing site is
- A site here would compromise the ability of the current generation and future generations to enjoy this green space
- Damage to this green space would make Croydon a less attractive place to live in and discourage business relocation to Croydon reducing employment opportunities for Croydon's residents
- The scoring system does not reflect the importance of green spaces and is highly objectively
- There is a mistake in the scoring system and it should be recorded as -5 for being in Green Belt, not +5
- The social deprivation criterion is illogical as pressures on services apply equally across Croydon

The assessment should be reassessed by an independent party.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Object: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, reference number 661

1. This site is also in the green belt and according to Government Policy is deemed inappropriate.
2. The council has gone to great expense to protect the site from mobile travellers and this seems to have been a great waste of taxpayers' money if they now allow a permanent site.
3. Several businesses which make a big contribution to the local economy and also provide much needed amenity to the public will be detrimentally affected by the site.
4. Coombe Park which is a beautiful landscaped park and contains many memorials to war dead and families' loved ones will be completely overwhelmed by this enormous traveller development for up to 75 mobile homes right next door. The huge amount of traffic going along Conduit Lane will make access to the park from the parking bays on the other side of the road much more difficult and dangerous. These parking bays are used by the very young and the very old to give them easy and safe access to this beautiful public park.
5. Again the size of the site will totally overwhelm the nearest settlement of residents on Coombe Road, Oaks Road and Oaks Lane.

Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object: DM44.2 661

Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 681 (Conduit Lane)

Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Comment: This is inappropriate in this location.

Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>2592/02/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Lewis</td>
<td>I am concerned about Conduit Lane/Coombe Lodge Nurseries being allocated - this is inappropriate in this location adjoining Lloyd Park, Coombe Gardens and in the Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>2592/03/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Lewis</td>
<td>I am concerned about Conduit Lane/Coombe Lodge Nurseries being allocated - this is inappropriate in this location adjoining Lloyd Park, Coombe Gardens and in the Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary:
Not in line with Government planning policy on the Green Belt.

Detail:
• Government planning policy with regards to traveller sites wants to ensure that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development.

• The proposal to create a permanent traveller site on land designated as Green Belt land is contrary to Policy E of the Planning Policy: “Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances.” There are no very special circumstances.

• The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the “very special circumstances” justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt.

• The local character description is clearly at odds with the proposal.
• The justification acknowledges the Green Belt issue, though insufficiently, but relies on the fact that there are existing structures. These are not in fact substantial – being glasshouses – and could be said to be at least environmentally consistent with the Green Belt. But there is no very special circumstance justification proposed as required by Planning Policies.

• Approving the proposal would set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to subject to similar development. It is not in the community’s interests to allow the erosion of the green spaces surrounding the community and we object to the impact this site could have on the environment and wildlife.

In the light of these issues, it is not appropriate simply to weight Green Belt as one of many factors to be considered, but rather it presents an overarching policy objection that cannot be over-ridden in the way proposed.

The decision making process is contrary to Government guidance. To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now and we do not believe that the site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Assessment and selection of sites for Gypsy and Travellers undertaken was credible.

Plan makers have not considered the time it will take to commence development on site need for infrastructure improvements – roads, GPS, schools and transport.

There is basis for challenging the way in which this potential site has been selected.

1 Para 3.1 – Green Belt sites included for review of eligible sites “to ensure that all locations for a site considered”, but at the same time “Exclusion of sites in Croydon Metropolitan Centre and within District Centres and Strategic Industrial Locations and Conservation Areas due to viability, deliverability and impact on heritage considerations”. Is this a balanced view?

4 Para 4.1 sets out the criteria and weightings. As indicated above, Green Belt with no built form is given a weighting (-10) which, though high, is not very significant given that there are 29 or 30 criteria and can easily be outweighed by other factors that are less significant in policy terms. Furthermore, Coombe Nurseries has been weighted -5 for Green Belt, in recognition of the fact that there are some structures on the site, AND has been given 5 for the fact that (in the assessor’s view) such structures as there are can be converted to traveller use (if the buildings had to be demolished, on a green field site, this would have attracted -5).

1 SP2.7 on the Council’s proposals to deliver 39 additional gypsy and traveller sites indicates that land will be allocated in accordance with the proposals, but that any ADDITIONAL sites that are not so allocated should meet some stated criteria, including good access to local shops and essential services and good transport access; these seem to be criteria that were excluded from the proposed allocation, suggesting that any alternative proposals would need to meet stiffer criteria. Is this a fair view?

2 The bases for site criteria weightings are unclear.

The proposed development does not meet the needs of the present (see further info in section 3). Gypsies and Travellers needs are not addressed: not enough local amenities, sites are too big, unfit
local roads.

The proposed development does compromise the future of the local area.

- Government planning policy is to ensure local planning authorities have due regard to the protection of local amenities and the local environment.
- It is likely the proposals will have an adverse effect on local businesses.
- Coombe Wood is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) (List of Historical Park and Gardens 2008) and borders the proposed Coombe Lodge Nurseries site, and would be negatively impacted by the plans. Croydon Council has already recognised this in its Development Management Policies document.
- The Borough Character Appraisal of 2015, the local area is listed as having special character. The proposed development is not sensitive to, and does not respect, this.

Based on survey responses, most Gypsies and Travellers living in the Croydon area would prefer small, family-sized sites. Stakeholder comments suggested that smaller sites have fewer inter-family tensions and are therefore easier to manage. The plan goes against these wishes.

- The proposed plan does not take into account the need for good access to roads. The Croydon Local Plan paragraph 4.19 refers to the need for good access to roads, stating that Gypsies and Travellers "often need to move larger vehicles as part of their livelihood and way of life", this may be an assertion relevant to the assessment of sites and the narrowness of Coombe Lane. The proposed sites are not suitable for traveller vehicles.
- It is very important that the site has a safe entrance and exit. There are very strict Highway regulations about visibility at the entrance/exit to sites to ensure there is no danger of accidents. This links into the insufficient local infrastructure and we know how dangerous the junctions Coombe Road/ Oaks Road/ Conduit Lane can be. Both sites are accessed by single lane roads and the proposed plans do not take into consideration the potential extensive alterations needed to the local road network.

10.18 The settled community neighboring the sites should also be involved in the consultation from an early stage. There may be scope for expanding existing sites to meet some of the need. However, the
preference is for smaller sites which tend to be easier to manage.

• Is there not scope for extending existing sites in the Borough to meet some of the need? It is not clear how much consideration has been given to this.

10.19 In terms of identifying broad locations for new sites, there are a number of factors which could be considered including:

Social
School catchment areas
The area is not in a school catchment area.

10.21 Gypsies and Travellers undertaking the survey also suggested that new sites should be close to amenities such as shops, schools, nurseries and hospitals.

• There are no local shops and there is no local hospital.

10.22 CLG (2012) guidance suggests that Local planning authorities should ensure that no Gypsies and Travellers undertake mixed-use employment sites (as they often run a business from the place where they live). The proposed sites are too isolated. Gypsies and Travellers often need mixed-use employment sites as they often run a business from the place where they live. The proposed sites are too isolated and far away from local facilities and amenities such as shops, schools, nurseries and hospitals.

• The site is well away from schools (particularly primary school provision) and clearly does not reflect the above.

• From Government Guidelines, Local planning authorities should ensure that their policies ensure that children can attend school on a regular basis. The site is well away from schools (particularly primary school provision) and clearly does not reflect the above.

• The site is not in a school catchment area.
aim, or facilitate regular school attendance. Widely recognised by Government source that literacy can be an issue within the Travelling community, this would place even more pressure on local schools to provide for support of their needs. Recent studies suggest a greater proportion of ill-health amongst the travelling community, adding more pressure to local health centres. In addition to going against Government Planning Policy for traveller sites, the closest services will therefore have further demands placed on them.

- There is evidence of periodic overcrowding on traveller sites, throughout the year and at a peak during winter months. This would yet further increase demand on local services. The plan makers have made no indication that they would take this into consideration or look to limit overcrowding.

The Croydon Local Plan Note that paragraph 4.19 in referring to the need for good access to roads, states that “they often need to move larger vehicles as part of their livelihood and way of life” – this may be an assertion relevant to the assessment of sites and the narrowness of Coombe Lane. The local roads would not be suitable for the continuous use of “larger” vehicles.

- gypsy-traveller.org - The best type of land is a ‘brown field’ site. The site should be close to local amenities. It is very important that the site has a safe entrance and exit. There are very strict Highway regulations about visibility at the entrance/exit to sites to ensure there is no danger of accidents and this is very important.

The objections may be summarized as:

- inappropriate use of Green Belt land
- lack of relevant amenities close to hand
- Lack of supportive infrastructure
- adverse effect on neighboring businesses and leisure amenities
- site has a more appropriate use for a school
2599/01/008/DM44.2/O Helen Armstrong
Object DM44.2 661 Coombe Lodge should be acknowledged as Green Belt Coombe Farm should be acknowledged as Green Belt
Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

2600/01/002/DM44.2/O Hitesh Patel
Object DM44.2 661 I am writing to register my objections for the following proposed sites for Gypsy and Travellers Site Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane - Reference 661.

Following up from the letter sent by Steve Murphy (General Manage). I too am not happy with what you are planning to impose on our lives. Rattle the travellers/Gypsies are very rude & me being of Indian origin, little children of not older than 6 or 7 came over, took our golf balls, calling me racially abusive names with their guardians not standing more than few yards. I do not believe a society of such vulgarity should be accommodated at the cost of decent law abiding citizens. I'm not being a Nimby, just want to enjoy my time at this beautiful golf course at the weekends in the main, so please put yourself in our shoes. Please reconsider your options. As a suggestion, opposite Purley way playing fields would be ideal place to create an enclosure.

Its also not fair that whereas we pay for our way in life these get handed pieces of land at our expense. I've every faith in you & your team to make the right choice without upsetting the apple cart.

2604/01/003/DM44.2/O I and W Smith
Object DM44.2 661 We are writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites: - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Croydon has very few green places that are actually loved and residents are proud of so they need to be left as they are or enhanced. The proposal to place travellers site is not acceptable. These sites are stated by the Council to be in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". Also these sites are far from schools and shops therefore not suitable for the proposed change of use.

The site should not be allocated as gypsy and traveller site.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Re Proposals for Traveller’s Site on Conduit Lane Proposal for School on Coombe Playing Fields

We are writing to object to the above proposals. We have grown up in South Croydon and have been regular visitors to Coombe Wood and gardens, and now with our young daughter. This green belt refuge in dense suburban Croydon would suffer great from any development in Conduit Lane. A traveller site would be inappropriate and adversely affect the character of this special environment.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

I am writing on behalf of the school and its Governors to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; The ground for my objections is:

- both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b, with Policy SP7.2 and the protection of the green grid or with 6.15 Strategic Objective 10 relating to the green grid;

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Why do Gypsies and Travellers have preferential treatment with regard to having sites where public transport accessibility is not an issue disregarding government guidance. Likewise over privacy.

This site will require access to Coombe Road at a staggered junction which is congested at the best of times and a nightmare in the morning and evening peaks.

If Green Belt sites are being considered why not consider sites such as Site 536, 632 or 767 as well?

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26/02/002</td>
<td>Mrs A Little</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>The proposed gypsy and traveller site at Coombe Road Nurseries has inadequate access. The site has no local amenities for mothers and young children. There are no local shops or schools. This development is harmful to the green belt. There is a need for improved infrastructure; roads, Primary schools, doctors surgeries etc and therefore gypsies and travellers needs are not addressed. The proposed development compromises the future of the local area; (a) adverse impact on local business (b) Coombe Wood is a site of nature conservation interest, which borders Coombe Lodge nurseries site and would be negatively impacted by the plans ©The plans are not sensitive to the Borough Character Appraisal 2015, where the area is listed as having special character. Gypsies and travellers prefer smaller sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/02/001</td>
<td>Mr Marin Little</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/01/040</td>
<td>Paul Sandford</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2635/01/040/DM44.2/O**

**Paul Sandford**

**Bourne Society**

**Object**

**DM44.2**

**661**

661, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit lane. Transition Town have expressed an interest in restoring this site to a proper nursery facility, utilising the existing greenhouses for the growing of food, which would be a sustainable and appropriate activity within this green belt site

**Change**

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Object

I object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site 502; Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane, site 755; as all three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/R/O, when the score should be 6. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Object Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane is on the Green Belt.
Not in line with Government Planning policy on the Green Belt.

- Government Planning Policy with regards to traveller sites wants to ensure that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development.

- The proposal to create a permanent traveller site on land designated as Green Belt land is contrary to Policy E of the Planning Policy

"Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. There are no very special circumstances. The preferred approach is not deliverable. To be considered deliverable, the sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now and we do not believe that the Assessment and selection of the sites for Gypsy and Travellers undertaken was credible.

Plan makers have not considered the time it will take to commence development on site, need for infrastructure improvements - roads.

There is basis for challenging the way in which this potential site has been selected.

1. Para 3.1 Green Belt sites included for review of eligible sites "to ensure that all locations for a site considered" but at the same time "Exclusion of sites in Croydon Metropolitan Centre and within District Centres and Strategic Industrial Locations and Conservation Areas due to viability, deliverability and impact on heritage considerations". Is this even handed?

4. Para 4.1 sets out the criteria and weightings. As indicated above, Green Belt with no built form is given a weighting (-10) which, though high, is not very significant given that there are 29 or 30 criteria and can easily be outweighed by other factors that are less significant in policy terms. Furthermore, Coombe Nurseries has been weighted -5 for green belt, in recognition of the fact that (in the assessors view) such structures as they are can be converted to traveller use (if the buildings had to be demolished, on a green field site, this would have attracted -5).

1. SP2.7 on the Council's proposals to deliver 39 additional gypsy and traveller sites indicates that land will be allocated in accordance with the proposals, but that any ADDITIONAL sites that are not so allocated should meet some stated criteria, including good access to local shops and essential services and good transport.
access; these seem to be the criteria that were excluded from the proposed allocation, suggesting that any alternative proposals would need to meet stiffer criteria. Is this fair and even handed? The basis of the criteria weightings are unclear.

-The national planning policy framework makes it clear that unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the “very special circumstances” justifying inappropriate development on a site within a green belt.
- The local character description is clearly at odds with the proposal.
- The justification acknowledges the green belt issue, though insufficiently, but relies on the fact that there are existing structures. These are not in fact substantial - being glass houses, and could be said to be at least environmentally consistent with the green belt. But there is no very special circumstance justification proposed as required by planning policies.
- Approving the proposal would set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to be subject to similar development. It is not in the community's interests to allow the erosion of the green spaces surrounding the community and we object to the impact this site could have on the environment and wildlife.

In light of these issues, it is not appropriate simply to weight Green Belt as one of the many factors to be considered, but rather it presents an overarching policy objection that cannot be over-ridden in the way proposed. The decision-making process is contrary to Government guidance.
Building on the green belt does not meet the strategic objectives. The National Planning Policy for Travellers states that temporary and permanent sites are inappropriate development in the green belt. This would set an unwanted precedent and there are no apparent exceptional circumstances that could warrant the proposed use of this green belt site.

The road infrastructure is inadequate to allow caravans and vans in and out of Conduit Lane. The road is already dangerous considering the existing junction with Oaks Road. Conduit Lane is currently used as a car park for the historic gardens at Coombe Wood, which is an SNCI and any impacts on the community gardens and parking arrangements must be considered. The Council has stated it will protect and enhance parks and gardens that are part of the borough's historical heritage.

There are no services such as schools.

Conduit Lane is an important public right of way and part of Vanguard Way, used by many walkers, dog walkers and families. The interests of the local community must be considered equally as part of the planning process.

If sustainable development is a strategic objective for the Council then we must consider returning the site to its former use and develop a local sustainable organic food source. Such a project could be combined with education to enable children from across the borough to learn about food sources and sustainable development for future generations.

National policy states that the Council must relate the number of pitches or plots to the circumstances of the specific size and location of the site and the surrounding population's size and density, when planning for a traveller site. With 10 houses accessed directly from the proposed site, these properties are relatively isolated and would be dominated by a community situated at the north end of Conduit Lane. The interests of residents at the south end of Conduit Lane must also be considered. The interests of local businesses and employees must be considered. An impact assessment must also be considered.

Very special circumstances must be provided if a school is to be delivered on the site. There are existing playing
fields that could be incorporated in to plans for a new school which are currently under-utilised. The area is currently lacking in state school provision. There will be extreme pressure exerted on primary schools and secondary schools. This would suggest that use of the site for a school would be preferable and essential - but very special circumstances would need to be proven.

Mr John Walsh

Object DM44.2

661

Objects to all gypsy and traveller sites (as chairman of Campion Close Freeholders Limited and Parkland Management Company Limited which comprise 75 properties). This site could be used as a community asset using the existing greenhouses. The proposals conflict with Policy E “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites” which states that temporary or permanent sites are inappropriate development in the green belt. What happens if the travelling community outgrow these sites? Surely the many industrial sites in the area would be more suitable, or Valley Park?

The proposals would clearly harm the green belt and would have a negative impact on the environment and wildlife in Coombe Wood, Shirley Hills and Lloyd Park some of which is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest and it would create a precedent for further erosion of our valuable local amenity.

Coombe Road and Coombe Lane are already very busy roads. These proposals would exacerbate this problem if significant road improvements were not carried out. These proposals would also exert pressure on local services that are already stretched. The junctions at Coombe Road, Oaks Road and Conduit Lane are already dangerous.

What social and economic benefits would a gypsy and travelling community bring to the existing local community in this area as well?

Mrs E Ballard

Object Soundness - Justified DM44.2

661

I object to the allocation of Coombe Farm as a Gypsy and Traveller site. In the past few years we have suffered from frightening results from unauthorised Travellers sites. Residents and local businesses alike have experienced unsociable behaviour problems and unacceptable mess, with both physical and psychological effects. I urge you to see that these plans are not allowed.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I am writing to object to: The use of the following locations as traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane Site reference 661, Coombe Farm off Oaks Road Site reference 502, Pear Tree Farm Featherbed Lane 755. Because these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

To build so close to award winning gardens such as Coombe Gardens, Heathfield or a picturesque Wedding Venue such as Coombe Farm will be detrimental for the local businesses and residents. People from the wider area also enjoy these places. People travel from miles around - even by the coachload - to see these parks in Croydon. If they are built right up to with mobile homes or prefabs and other semi-permanent residences, they cannot fail to appear less attractive. With regard to homes for Travellers, I do not wish to stereotype any group in our society, but first-hand experience of travellers staying recently in Sunken Lane has shown that they do not respect our precious green areas in the same way as the Heathfield and Ballards Farm residents do. I visited Sunken Lane after their recent departure and saw bathroom suites, mattresses and piles of other waste including dirty nappies and rubbish dumped in and around the beautiful Shirley Hills area. Pathways were blocked and cars could not turn in Sunken lane. Street lights in the local area had been broken so that this fly tipping could not be filmed by CCTV. In the days before, my sons had felt intimidated when travelling home from school by the travellers' children and had to call me to collect them by car from the Coombe Rd tram stop. I took the time to visit the Layhams Farm Traveller site so that I could make an informed opinion and I was greeted by dogs off leads and groups of men gathering as soon as I approached. They did not trouble me, but I was made to feel decidedly unwelcome. Outside of the area some of the teenagers were crouched in the road and were smashing the top off bottles and then sprinkling glass in the road where cars were passing. If the sites proposed are to be like this, then I would be very unhappy if the plans were to go ahead.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Effective</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Croydon Transition Town, a local community group, would like to register its objection to the proposals outlined in the Croydon Local Plan 2 to the proposed (preferred and alternative options) to the Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane in South Croydon. Although Croydon Transition town accept and understand the assessment that there is an identification of need to have more gypsy and traveller sites within the borough, the group would like to object to the preferred and alternative option proposed for site 661 for the reason outlined below. The loss of the greenhouses at the Nurseries site (Conduit Lane) has potential significance for community, educational and employment opportunities. Croydon Transition Town first made enquiries in April 2015 about bringing the glasshouses in Conduit lane back into serviceable condition and wished to discuss feasibility of starting a food growing project there as a community based initiative. Initial enquiries have been made with the Place department and Quadron about using the site and, although in its early stages, the group is very keen to register the site as an asset of community value and to present an alternative plan. Therefore, for this reason Croydon Transition Town oppose the current proposal. This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td>Croydon Transition Town first made enquiries in April 2015 about bringing the glasshouses in Conduit lane back into serviceable condition and wished to discuss feasibility of starting a food growing project there as a community based initiative. Initial enquiries have been made with the Place department and Quadron about using the site and, although in its early stages, the group is very keen to register the site as an asset of community value and to present an alternative plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Premier Inn Hotels

Object

The assessment and selection of sites for Gypsy and Travellers has been unacceptably skewed in favour of remote and unsustainable sites. Premier Inn Hotel Ltd objectives to the proposed allocation for the following reasons:

- The site is located in Metropolitan Green Belt. The DCLG’s Planning Policy for Traveller Sites explicitly states in Policy E that traveller sites are inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It also notes that unmet need is not ‘very special circumstances’ that would justify development in the Green Belt. The proposed allocation is contrary to this policy.

- In the Council's assessment it states that a score of -5 will be applied to sites with ‘built form' in the Green Belt. However, in the assessment a score of +5 was applied to this site. The importance of this site's Green Belt designation has been undervalued. The assessment draws a distinction between Green Belt sites with and without ‘built form', a distinction that is not supported by national level policies and guidance. Other assessment criteria (e.g Flood Zone) with -5 is given a "red" status whereas the -5 for Green Belt has only been given "amber". This indicates that the Green Belt has not been properly taken into account.

- The Council notes that the Gypsy and Traveller population prefer to use their own transport and be located away from the existing residential community. This is contrary to CLG guidance.

- The changes proposed in the Housing and Planning Bill are also relevant as this indicates that Central Government is against Gypsy and Traveller housing being treated in isolation from the rest of the population, contrary to the approach adopted by Croydon Council in this assessment.

- The Council's assessment under ‘privacy' gives a score of +10 to sites away from existing residential areas and -10 for sites in existing residential areas. Other criteria only have a 5 point swing. The assessment therefore gives a strongly weighted preference to comparatively remote and unsustainable potential sites that are considered to be ‘private’ while understating factors that are relevant to the sustainability of potential sites which is directly contrary to the NPPF.

- Premier Inn would also question whether the Gypsy and Traveller community would agree with the assessment that this site is private. The site shares a boundary with the Coombe Lodge Beefeater restaurant.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

The site should not be allocated for a Gypsy and Traveller site and the assessment criteria should be reviewed.
and Premier Inn hotel. At the nearest point hotel bedrooms are just a few meters from the boundary of the site and the beer garden also faces onto the boundary. The proposed allocation would therefore not deliver the preferences of the Gypsy and Traveller community.

- The site has been given a score of +5 for ‘Building on Greenfield site’. A score of +5 indicates that there are ‘buildings on site that can possibly be converted for the gypsy and traveller use’. However, the majority of the buildings on site are glass houses associated with the former use which are unlikely to be reused by the Gypsy and Traveller community in any meaningful way. A score of -5, indicating that there are buildings on site that will need to be demolished, is more appropriate for this site.

In conclusion the proposed allocation is the result of a flawed assessment and should be removed from the Local Plan in favour of a more sustainable site.
Oaks Farm Receptions Ltd objects to the proposed allocation of Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane and Coombe Farm, Oaks Road as Gypsy and traveller sites for the following reasons. Both sites are located within the Metropolitan Green Belt. Policy E of the DCLG’s Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (August 2015) explicitly states that traveller sites are inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It also notes that unmet need is not a “very special circumstance” that would justify development in the Green Belt. The proposed allocation is therefore contrary to this policy.

Table 1 of Croydon Council’s Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers (ASSGT, August 2015) states that a score of -5 will be applied to sites (with “built form”) in the Green Belt. However, in the assessment (page 8 for site no.502, Coombe Farm and page 9 for site no.661, Coombe Lodge Nurseries) a score of +5 was actually applied to each site. The importance of this site’s Green Belt designation has therefore been undervalued in the assessment that led to these sites’ proposed allocation. Further, the assessment methodology draws a distinction between Green Belt sites with and without “built form”, a distinction that is not supported by national level policies and guidance. (In other words, the fact that there was pre-existing appropriate development on these sites does not mean that the proposed inappropriate development becomes more acceptable.)

In conclusion, the proposed allocation of Coombe Farm, Oaks Road (site number 502) and Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane (site number 661) as Gypsy and traveller sites is the result of a flawed assessment process. These proposed allocations should be removed from the Local Plan and more sustainable sites that would not result in inappropriate development in the Green Belt should be sought.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
1. Travellers/Gypsy Sites: We echo concerns raised by other voices in Croydon. While accepting the need for appropriate sites for travellers and gypsies we question the ability of the Council with current levels of resourcing to manage an increased number of sites effectively. With specific reference to Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm:
• The loss of the greenhouses at the Nurseries site (Conduit Lane) has potential significance for community, educational and employment opportunities.
• This will be a new, permanent development on green belt land.
• Access to and from the site on a dangerous section of Coombe Road will impact on traffic flow and road safety more generally.
• There is no overflow space if and when the site becomes full.
• There is likely impact on parking for access to Coombe Woods, the café and on the elderly visiting the area.
• As the two nearest schools (Royal Russell and Cedars Catholic) are independent, does this satisfy the criteria that travellers sites be located close to schools?
• Similarly, the criteria that sites should be close to shops will not be met.
• There is a real concern that there will be a negative impact on the environment of Coombe Woods, its biodiversity and the contamination of groundwater. Recent experience in Lloyd Park demonstrates a potentially serious problem with litter and lack of rubbish disposal. This leads to the Council having to collect rubbish and the creation of a hazardous refuse collection point.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Effective</th>
<th>DM44.2</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Pullinger</td>
<td>The more specific site allocations represent a large reduction in the amount of designated and non-designated open space. While we acknowledge the need to build new homes and associated infrastructure such as schools, Croydon's growing population also needs quality open spaces for all the human amenity and ecosystem services which they provide. This area of Green Belt has not been removed from the Green Belt via the Review process, therefore it must be assumed that it continues to meet the criteria for designation and the proposed Gypsy and Traveller Site would be inappropriate development: the council would need to prove exceptional circumstances exist to allow development here. The fact that it may in part be brownfield is not a reason in itself to waive this protection. We request clarification that any proposed development at the site would use the same footprint of the building without any height increase, ensuring that the openness of the Green Belt is not affected.</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPRE London</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Effective</th>
<th>DM44.2</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Paul Quaintance</td>
<td>Building a secondary school and traveller pitches in this area will not be in keeping with the area. The area is very green and popular as a place to spend time in Croydon's natural areas for many many people. Building these sites on green belt land here would not be appropriate. It would detract from the special characteristics of the local area. It would also bring heavy traffic with regards to the secondary school to an area where there is also difficulty parking in the week with other schools / nursery's also in this area. I believe it would affect negatively the local amenities and also would be inappropriate for people enjoying Lloyd Park, Coombe Lodge Café and the wooded areas around these very important local areas. Coombe Wood and Lloyd Park are some of Croydon's few special places. We should not be building on Green Belt land and detracting from the special characteristics of local areas. We should keep and protect the few special places that Croydon has such as Lloyd Park and its surrounding areas and woodland. This is critical given all the development in the centre of Croydon for people to escape and relax in.</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2659/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Paul Quaintance</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2660/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>P Snooks</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2652/01/006/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Terrence Pais</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Reference</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2662/03/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Terrence Pais</td>
<td>The proposal will not help to meet strategic objective 5, 9 and 10. The greatest impact will be on Strategic Objective 10 as the increased traffic, noise and light will affect the fauna of the area, including badgers, deer, owl and pheasants. The access road is narrow and currently used for parking for users of Coombe Wood Gardens and the café. Increased regular traffic will adversely affect these users. There is a lack of amenities in the immediate area. Lack of amenities will adversely affect the intended users of the site. Development in the Green Belt is inappropriate because the Green Belt is designed to prevent urban sprawl. The increased development in central Croydon will increase the population of the area and that population will need green space. Returning the site to use as woodland would provide better protection for the SNCI.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2664/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Ms Alison Lawton</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation as it would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. I believe that in your report you have miscalculated. The category where the mistake has been made is GB/MOL where an amber rating has been correctly given. The score for an amber is -5 and a +5 score has been incorrectly allocated. This reduces the overall score for the site by ten points from 26 to 16.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2666/01/003/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>C Morley-Smith</td>
<td>Any permanent sites for these people need to be properly managed and controlled and the occupants seen to be paying their way as other residents in the borough are expected to.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2668/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mrs Zelda Levy</td>
<td>Site is in the Green Belt and is contrary to Government Policy. Croydon needs Green Belt more now than ever due to the number of high-rise blocks of flats. It is vital that the Green Belt is kept open, permanent and not subject to encroachment.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mrs M Goodwin
Object
Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, reference number 661

1. This site is also in the green belt and according to government policy is deemed inappropriate.
2. The Council has gone to great expense to protect the site from mobile travellers and this seems to have been a waste of taxpayers' money if they now allow a permanent site.
3. Several businesses which make a big contribution to the local economy and also provide much needed amenity to the public will be detrimentally affected by the site.
4. Coombe Park which is a beautiful landscaped park and contains many memorials to war dead and families' loved ones will be completely overwhelmed by this enormous traveller for up to 75 mobile homes right next door. The huge amount of traffic going along Conduit Lane will make access to the park from the parking bays on the other side of the road much more difficult and dangerous. These parking bays are used by the very young and very old to give them easy and safe access to this beautiful public park.
5. Again the size of the site will totally overwhelm the nearest settlement of residents on Coombe Road, Oaks Road and Oaks Lane.

Ms Lorna Bennett
Object
Soundness - Justified

I have witnessed numerous incidents where travellers have occupied parts of Lloyd Park and the surrounding area without permission. I have always felt intimidated and have been personally threatened and insulted by them. I believe it would be a gross misuse of our vital Green Belt and a detriment to the whole area for this site to be used for Gypsy and Traveller pitches.

Mrs Valerie Mickelburgh
Object

The site is on green belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Comment or Object</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2680/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Ms Meenal Sambre</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM44.2 661 Build a School instead as the infrastructure cannot cope with the expanding population. It should not be on Green Belt as it is disastrous for the environment but building on brownfield sites should be explored. What are the criteria behind selecting sites within 1 mile of each other? There is very limited Green Belt and not enough existing infrastructure for existing population and we need green belt for the health of our citizens.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2685/01/003/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Dr Peter Newlands</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>This Policy makes no reference to the impact it would have on the surroundings of the site and nearby residents. Additional criteria should be added whereby development of the site must be acceptable in relation to its impact on nearby public spaces, residents, businesses and local traffic, schools and medical practices. If such criteria were applied then sites 502 and 661 would be considered unacceptable. Coombe Lane/Coombe Road is already very congested. Coombe Farm is within the confines of Lloyd Park and any changes should comply with the terms of the original deed of gift of Frank Lloyd.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2685/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Dr Peter Newlands</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>This Policy makes no reference to the impact it would have on the surroundings of the site and nearby residents. Additional criteria should be added whereby development of the site must be acceptable in relation to its impact on nearby public spaces, residents, businesses and local traffic, schools and medical practices. If such criteria were applied then sites 502 and 661 would be considered unacceptable. Coombe Lane/Coombe Road is already very congested. Coombe Farm is within the confines of Lloyd Park and any changes should comply with the terms of the original deed of gift of Frank Lloyd.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2695/01/004/DM44.2/C</td>
<td>Cllr Chris Wright</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>There is concern that sites that have been identified as locations for gypsies and travellers are considered inappropriate in green belt and constitute a dangerous precedent.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Mr Beresford Walker

Object

5. Proposed Policy DM43 Creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites at Coombe Farm, off Oaks Road, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, off Conduit Lane and Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage Featherbed Lane.

I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Such development is in breach of Policy Eat Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that ‘Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites now, and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough. If the number of Gypsy/Traveller sites really needs to be increased by this amount then a more appropriate location would be around the existing site at Purley Way. The positioning of a Gypsy/Traveller site adjacent to the car park for Coombe Woods, between the Chateau Restaurant and the Hotel/restaurant, would probably deter me from using any of these attractions.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I have restricted my objections to those plans that primarily affect the area of Shirley I which I live, but the same objections apply to other proposals in other parts of the borough.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>DM44.2</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2699/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Tahir</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness -</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Object to site 661 as it should stay as Green Belt and will have adverse impact on the adjacent wood and the café The parking of vehicles on Conduit Lane will be a cause for concern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>DM44.2</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2700/01/003/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Thomas</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness -</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consistent with National</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is inappropriate to site a Travellers site at this location. It is contrary to government policy as it is Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We wish to object to the proposal Gypsy/Traveller site Ref 661 for the following reasons:

- Sustainability of the proposed site and the need for any such provision

The current proposals seem to have been produced in isolation from the other neighbouring Councils even though the above clearly indicated that nearby councils such as Sevenoaks, Tandridge and Bromley have a higher demand. Proposals in the Housing and Planning Bill 2015-16 are to remove the statutory requirement on local authorities to assess the specific accommodation needs of Gypsy and Travellers - the emphasis being that when authorities are carrying out a review of housing need that it considers the needs of all the people residing in or resorting to their district, without any references to Gypsies or Traveller.

We hope that the Council will consider the needs of our neighbours and local services and businesses as weighty as those of the Gypsy and Travelling people. There is a lot of opposition to the proposed sites from people currently residing in the district due to the threat of the Green Belt, increase traffic and increased pressure on local services.

The Assessment selection for the sites for Gypsies and Travellers scored lowly should have resulted in an acceptance that none of the sites are really particularly suitable and that the Council will need to liaise with other Councils if determined to make provision.

With regard to the sustainability of the sites, following on utilising the scoring assessment, we strongly object on a number of grounds:
- All sites lie within the Green Belt. This raises concerns about the impact on the Green Belt as a result of having to provide amenity blocks, communal facilities, safe play areas and areas for grazing horses.
- All three sites are unsuitable because they do not have good means to transport.
- Sites should have access to essential services including health and education facilities and access to local shops. None of the sites have good access to local schools (the nearest primary is over subscribed and the nearest post office is 1.7 miles away.)

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2703/01/02/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs McFeat</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Objects to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation as it would have negative impacts on the adjacent golf course and would not encourage others to join the club. There have been instances in the past where illegal encampments have been set up in the area. Also the junction of Oaks Road onto Oaks Lane is not suitable for the amount and type of vehicles that travellers utilise on a daily basis. It would only be a matter of time before an accident would happen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2706/01/02/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Panagakis</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Object to proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane (reference number 661). This site is in the Green Belt and borders a Site of Nature Conservation Importance. Policy E of Planning Policy for Travellers Sites published by the government in August [2015] says very clearly: &quot;Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development&quot;. Traffic along Coombe Road is already heavy and the development of these sites would make this even worse. The site is someway from public services. Finally from past experience of Gypsy stays (illegal) in the area, a large amount of rubbish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We enclose our statement of objection to the local development plan which we believe would profoundly damage the Shirley area and in particular, we wish to oppose the proposed use of the Coombe Farm site Ref 502 for use as a Gypsy/Traveller site.

We have unpleasant first-hand experience of living in close proximity to gatherings of travellers who have from time to time descended on fields neighbouring our house. We believe that allowing large groups to have sites in the same vicinity as the borough is proposing, is likely to bring similar problems. In the past the site of their encampment has been left strewn with litter and with evidence close to the mobile homes themselves, of illegal fly tipping. At times, we found the behaviours of some individuals to be intimidating.

The case against the broader proposals as well as against the choice of the traveller sites as is well made in the documents to which we have added our signatures.

There may in the fullness of time be a case for making a legal objection to the Borough's plans along the lines of a judicial review, given the apparent breach by the borough of regulations designated to protect the green belt in the interest of the wider community, a legal objection we believe would command the support of many local residents who share our views.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
We strenuously object to the redevelopment of Conduit Lane.

We are concerned about the proposals to convert the Coombe Lodge Nurseries at Conduit Lane into a site for gypsies and travellers.

Clearly this would be significant change of use for a site which is located in the green belt. Furthermore it is designated as being of special character and as such merits protection from redevelopment which would be contrary to the conservation of the local habitat. As in other boroughs such development tends to precipitate and accelerate the erosion of natural conservation areas.

The proposed development site is adjacent to Addington Hills, Coombe Gardens, Lloyd Park and Coombe Lodge playing fields. Such development would be totally inappropriate for the area as the character of these local areas of leisure and relaxation would be seriously impacted.

A private contractor proposing to develop the site for residential housing would have been rejected without further consideration. We do not feel that this proposed redevelopment would be desirable nor in the local interest.

It is hard to believe that there are no vacant brownfield sites (such as the former Redgate School site, Cherry Orchard Road/East Croydon Sites etc) in the borough that have remained empty which could be better utilized for a gypsy/traveller site.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
We strenuously object to the redevelopment of Conduit Lane. We are concerned about the proposals to convert the Coombe Lodge Nurseries at Conduit Lane into a site for gypsies and travellers. Clearly this would be significant change of use for a site which is located in the green belt. Furthermore it is designated as being of special character and as such merits protection from redevelopment which would be contrary to the conservation of the local habitat. As in other boroughs such development tends to precipitate and accelerate the erosion of natural conservation areas.

The proposed development site is adjacent to Addington Hills, Coombe Gardens, Lloyd Park and Coombe Lodge playing fields. Such development would be totally inappropriate for the area as the character of these local areas of leisure and relaxation would be seriously impacted.

A private contractor proposing to develop the site for residential housing would have been rejected without further consideration. We do not feel that this proposed redevelopment would be desirable nor in the local interest.

It is hard to believe that there are no vacant brownfield sites (such as the former Redgate School site, Cherry Orchard Road/East Croydon Sites etc) in the borough that have remained empty which could be better utilized for a gypsy/traveller site.
Quadron Services Limited currently occupy the site known as Coombe Lodge Nurseries under a lease from the Mayor and Burgesses of the London Borough of Croydon for the term of 5 years from and including the 1st February 2014. The site is used for the performance of a number of key Quadron Service operations for its operation of the Grounds Maintenance Contract for the London Borough of Croydon. Currently the site houses and facilitates the following:
- The contract mechanical engineering workshop for all plant and equipment
- The handyman workshop
- The Rangers operational office and welfare facilities
- The contract administration and management offices
- The GM staff welfare facilities
- The central training facilities
- Machinery and equipment storage facilities
- Parking and storage for both GM and road going vehicles
- An agreed location for the use of a 35 yard skip critical to the cleansing operation
- A central hub for all tractor operations

The site is the operational base for up to 60 staff. The site facilitates the use of public transport by these staff or the safe parking of privately owned vehicles. The site's geographical location lends itself to the borough wide operation, this being key to operational performance and service delivery to our client. A substantial amount has been invested in the site by Quadron Services in the past 20 months to improve H&S, security, welfare facilities, storage facilities and office provision. Should the proposal for the site proceed, Quadron Services Limited would require an alternative operational site within the Borough in order to fulfil its contractual obligations to the Borough and the minimum operational requirements are as follows:
- Office space required of approximately 100sqm
- Welfare facilities for 7 depot based staff plus visitors
- Welfare facilities for approx 60 staff operating out of the depot
- Overnight parking for approx 25 vehicles
- Vehicle and plan workshop of approx 700sqm
- Secure covered storage of approx 1400sqm
- Open yard space of approx 6000sqm

If the site is to be allocated an alternative site should be found for the existing occupier.

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr Alan Magrath  
Object  
DM44.2  
661  
It is green belt. The Council has spent a lot of money keeping travellers out of this area up until not and it seems strange now to allow a permanent site. The site will be an appalling eyesore in the middle of a beautiful area.

Mrs & Mrs Rutherford  
Object  
DM44.2  
661  
I am writing to object to: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 for use as a gypsy and traveller site as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b, or with Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites” published by Government in August which states “Traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”

Based upon the Scoring criteria Table 1, there are errors in the scoring in the policy designation assessment table under the GB/MOL. In view of the errors the following site should be considered:

16 - Heath Clark playing fields, Stafford Road Waddon  
518 - Wandle Road surface car park, Wandle Road, Croydon Opportunity Area.  
536 - Land of former Croydon Airport runway, south of Imperial Way, Waddon.  
552 - Wandle Road surface car park, Wandle Road Croydon Opportunity Area.  
632 - Land south of Threehalfpenny Woods, Kent Gateway, Bridle Way Addington.  
767 - Cane Hill south part, Hollymuck Road, Portraits Road, Coulsdon.

Change  
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mrs & Mrs Rutherford  
Object  
DM44.2  
661  
I am writing to object to: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 for use as a gypsy and traveller site as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b, or with Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites” published by Government in August which states “Traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”

Based upon the Scoring criteria Table 1, there are errors in the scoring in the policy designation assessment table under the GB/MOL. In view of the errors the following site should be considered:

16 - Heath Clark playing fields, Stafford Road Waddon  
518 - Wandle Road surface car park, Wandle Road, Croydon Opportunity Area.  
536 - Land of former Croydon Airport runway, south of Imperial Way, Waddon.  
552 - Wandle Road surface car park, Wandle Road Croydon Opportunity Area.  
632 - Land south of Threehalfpenny Woods, Kent Gateway, Bridle Way Addington.  
767 - Cane Hill south part, Hollymuck Road, Portraits Road, Coulsdon.

Change  
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Object Page 5 Green Belt designation - the applicable scores are -10, -5 and +10. The proposed sites all scored +5. The applicable score should be -5. Page 6 Privacy - this attracts a +10 or -10. A Green Belt/Open Land site will naturally provide greater privacy and so attracts +10, meaning the difference in score from a site with privacy to a site without privacy is 20 points - a sizable margin that impacts heavily on the ultimate score for each site. Page 6 Social Deprivation - why should these areas be treated differently and therefore attract a score of -10? Page 6 Access to Services - attracts a neutral 0 score. Why is access to essential services scored as unimportant? Page 6 Employment and community use re-provision - only scores -5. This should be higher if businesses need to relocate or cease to exist with loss of employment, such as the wedding venue business on the Oaks Farm land. Page 7 Brownfield vs Greenfield site - The criteria indicated that a brownfield site that has a building that can be converted for traveller use will score 0, whilst a Greenfield site with the same criteria score +5. Please explain.

Object I note with some concern the proposals in the Croydon Council Local Plan dated August 2015. In particular, the proposal to develop three sites in close proximity for the use of the travelling population and the proposal to build a new Secondary School on Coombe Road Playing Fields.

Croydon is acknowledged as the ‘greenest’ Borough in South London, with many Croydon parks and open spaces achieving ‘Green Flag’ status including Lloyd park and Coombe Woods. These are accreditations that we should be proud of and wish to preserve.

Royal Russell School objects to these proposals on the basis of the development of Green Belt land and flaws and inconsistencies in the scoring criteria that identified these sites as appropriate for development.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr A Zelisko

Object  Soundness - Justified  DM44.2 661

I object to the use of this site as a Gypsy and Traveller site. The site is in Green Belt and contrary to national policy (as it is inappropriate development in the Green Belt).

The immediate area is sparsely populated. National guidelines state the such sites should not overwhelm the nearest settlements and this site would.

The Croydon GTANA 2013 specifies that proposed sites for Gypsies and Travellers should have good access to local shops. There are none near this site.

The Croydon GTANA 2013 specifies that proposed sites for Gypsies and Travellers should be near bus routes and have good access to roads, with a specific reference to larger vehicles. This site is a considerable distance from public transport.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr David Martin

Object  DM44.2 661

I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr D Lawton

Object  DM44.2 661

I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation as it would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. I believe that in your report you have miscalculated. The category where the mistake has been made is GB/MOL where an amber rating has been correctly given. The score for an amber is -5 and a +5 score has been incorrectly allocated. This reduces the overall score for the site by ten points from 26 to 16.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr Colin Campbell

Object  Soundness - Justified  DM44.2 661

I am writing go object to:

1. The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661

as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2740/01/01/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Ian K White</td>
<td>I object to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane Ref: 661 as a gypsy/traveller site.</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2741/01/05/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Colin Dunk</td>
<td>Soundness - Consistent with National</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2742/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr E Tilly</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2749/05/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr A Kennedy</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td></td>
<td>Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School is a viable option as there are no schools in our area.

Criteria of selection:
The plan makers have missed a big point that existing infrastructure cannot cope with the influx of additional population at such a fast pace. Also, it has to be planned over few years. It should never be on a green belt/attached to green belt sites as it is disastrous for the environment. There are quite a few brown field sites in Croydon. Those should be explored. What are the criteria behind selecting two sites within 1 mile of each other? The plan makers do not know the grass root situation. They have just assumed things without actually knowing the facts. This is a grave situation.

There are quite a few public and independent schools in the nearby area. Building a new school will support the selsdon and nearby citizens. Besides we do not have a Grammar school in Croydon. So, it would be ideal if we build a grammar school in croydon on one of the proposed sites.

Existing infrastructure just cannot cope with additional population in Croydon:
1. We have to wait for at least 4-5 days to get appointment at doctors – many times we do not get appointment
2. We have to wait for at least 15 minutes to get a turn to play swing/slide for my son in any local park. The parks are so crowded during summer. Already children are getting very less exercise. If 40 families come over with more than 80 children then it would be extremely over crowded.
3. There are not enough schools in the area. We should build more schools
4. There is very limited green space in Croydon. Government policy states that you cannot build temporary or permanent sites on green belt. Putting the travellers site near green belt will endanger the
5. Conduit lane is a no drive through zone. Increased traffic due to a planned school and travellers sites will cause traffic chaos.
6. We need green belts for good health of the citizens. Steps like these would encourage the encroachment of green belts

Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane) and 502 (Coombe Farm) - if a site is Green Belt/MOL- built form then it is marked as (Amber/Orange), which...
means a score of "-5". "+5" has been used which increases the rating by 10 points. Error in calculating site access for 661: There are cars parked on that road and the entrance is through a very busy main road. The site cannot have a rating of "+5". It should be "-2. That is a difference of 7 rating points.

The site requires re-designation and this would be contrary to London policies to protect the Green Belt and would detract from the attractiveness of the open space. It would also cause traffic and access problems in the area. The proposed use as a travellers site would be incompatible with the "green link" status and a mobile home site of any kind is unacceptable. Also concern regarding the costs of the facilities that would be necessary.

The appropriateness of a school adjacent to a travellers site is questionable.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site is within the green belt. Schools/shops and medical facilities are a considerable distance from the site and therefore could result in increased vehicle use of Conduit Lane and exacerbate the present hazards at Oaks Rd/Coombe Rd/Coombe Lane junction. The potential number of families/homes could overwhelm the existing community.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Change

Change

Change

Change
Object 661
The Council acknowledges that the site is in the Green Belt (and one of the sites borders an SNCI). The Planning Policy for Traveller Sites states that traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Brownfield or industrial land should have been proposed not green belt. Why does the Council need to quadruple the number of sites for gypsy and travellers. The intention may be to do away with illegal encampments but may instead mean the area becomes a hub for travellers.

Why were no appropriate sites suggested for Coulsdon? Opening sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm will be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining owners. There is a lack of amenities close as hand. There are insufficient local infrastructure to accommodate the plans.

Other sites the council should reconsider instead of both Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm are: Expand existing permanent sites in Lathams Way off Beddington Farm Road Heath Clark playing fields, Stafford Rd, Waddon Timebridge Community Centre, Field Way, New Addington Land adjacent to 103 Goodenough Way, Old Coulsdon Wandle Road, car park, Wandle Rd, Croydon Land of former Croydon Airport runway, south of Imperial Way, Waddon Land adjacent to Ashburton playing fields at rear of 2-88 Coleridge Rd, Addiscombe By Pavilion Playing Fields, Purley Way Land south Of Threehalfpenny Woods, Kent Gate Way, Beddington Village West of Timbebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lande, Elmside, Addington Cane Hill-south part, Hollymeak Road, Portnalls Rd, Coulsdon

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object 661
would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Site 661, Coomba Lodge Nurseries, Conduit lane. Transition Town have expressed an interest in restoring this site to a proper nursery facility, utilising the existing greenhouses for the growing of food, which would be a sustainable and appropriate activity within this green belt site.</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soundness - Effective 661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object Soundness - DM44.2

All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross-party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria.

Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Object Soundness - DM44.2

Object  

661

All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Furthermore, Policy E of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites', published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the 'Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers'. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of 'extensive political consultation'. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Soundness -</th>
<th>DM44.2</th>
<th>Site Details</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2776/01/046/DM44.2/C</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
<td>Cllr Helen Pollard</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Soundness -</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Site 661, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit lane. Transition Town have expressed an interest in restoring this site to a proper nursery facility, utilising the existing greenhouses for the growing of food, which would be a sustainable and appropriate activity within this green belt site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2784/01/008/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>01/00/28</td>
<td>Iain Waterson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>This policy is in complete contradiction to the national policy which very clearly says that “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. This Government policy, published as recently as August (Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”), and the proposed policy does not benefit the environment: the site proposed is a greenbelt site and therefore not appropriate for a traveller site.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2785/01/006/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>01/00/26</td>
<td>Ian Cutts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness -</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>This contrary to established policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2801/02/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>02/00/28</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs Michael Somers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>We wish to object to the above referenced Sites which are being considered for the location of two gipsy and traveller locations on the following grounds: • Inappropriate use of Green Belt Land • Sites that are located on the Green Belt, considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and against Government Policy (”Planning policy for Traveller Sites”, DCLG, August 2015) • Selection of Proposed Sites should have a bias towards Brownfield or Industrial Land not Green Belt • Detrimental to the Amenities of Adjoining Owners • Lack of relevant Amenities close at hand • Insufficient Local Infrastructure to accommodate the plans However, we do wish to be seen as entirely negative and would ask that consideration be given to locating at the Existing Permanent Gipsy Site in Lathams Way off Beddington Farm Road.</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr and Mrs Michael Somers

Object

It is surely totally inappropriate to consider Greenfield areas as gipsy encampments. There must be brownfield sites available as alternatives which not result in a loss of amenity to local residents.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Jim Gibbons

Object

The council plans to create a Gypsy/Traveller site and it is not appropriate to put a traveller site here because of the nature of the existing use. A conspiracy theorist would opine that the proposed development of such a site relieves the Council of the need to maintain the facility.

Croydon has one of, if not the densest populations in London and therefore open spaces are at a premium. ‘Housing’ which a site of this nature is, should be sited on a brown field site and not an area used for recreation and bio-diversity. For this reason, Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by Central Government states very clearly: ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

John Bannon

Object

Soundness - Justified

The proposals to develop this site for Gypsy and Traveller pitches is completely inappropriate because:
- It is in Green Belt and is therefore contrary to Policy E of Planning for Traveller Sites (government guidance)
- The site is some distance from public services
- A site should be found in the Purley Way area instead where the existing site is
- A site here would compromise the ability of the current generation and future generations to enjoy this green space
- Damage to this green space would make Croydon a less attractive place to live in and discourage business relocation to Croydon reducing employment opportunities for Croydon’s residents
- The scoring system does not reflect the importance of green spaces and is highly objectively
- There is a mistake in the scoring system and it should be recorded as -5 for being in Green Belt, not +5
  - The social deprivation criterion is illogical as pressures on services apply equally across Croydon

The assessment should be reassessed by an independent party.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
In addition to my comments below, which have been acknowledged, I would like to add that your calculation published in the paper in August 2015 shows the weighting and calculations for site 661 incorrectly. Please see attached for the correct calculation.

Using the colour keys and weighting published in the August 2015 paper, this site needs to be recalculated. I would also suggest you re-check the figures for all sites, as this is a very basic and fundamental error.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Objections summarised as:
- Inappropriate use of Green Belt land
- Lack of relevant amenities close to had
- Adverse effect on neighbouring businesses and leisure amenities
- Site has a more appropriate use for a school

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Object Soundness - 661

DM44.2

All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -6. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

DM44.2

661
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Site 661, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit lane. Transition Town have expressed an interest in restoring this site to a proper nursery facility, utilising the existing greenhouses for the growing of food, which would be a sustainable and appropriate activity within this green belt site.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Detrimental to the amenities of adjoining owners. 
Inappropriate use of green belt land. 
-Sites that are located on green belt, considered to be inappropriate development for traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and against Government Policy ("Planning policy for Traveller Sites" DCLG, August 2015). 
-Lack of relevant amenities close to hand. 
-Insufficient Local Infrastructure to accommodate plans. 
-Selection of proposed Site should have bias towards brownfield or industrial land not green belt. 
-Why are two sites in very close proximity to one another being proposed. 
-Imbalance across the borough with all sites being proposed in the south of Croydon. 
-Why not expand the existing permanent gypsy site in Lathams Way off Beddington Farm Road. 
-If one has to select one of the proposed sites, the preference s for Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane. 

Other sites that the Council should reconsider instead of both Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm are the following. 

- 16 Heath Clark playing fields, Stafford Road Waddon 
- 120 Timbridge Community Centre Field Way, New Addington 
- 518 Land adjacent to 103 Goodenough Way, The Admirals Walk, Old Coulsdon 
- 522 Wandle Road surface car park, Wandle Road, Croydon Opportunity Area 
- 536 Land of farmer Croydon Airport runway, south of imperial way, Waddon 
- 552 Land adjacent to Ashburton playing fields at rear of 2-88 Coleridge Road, Addiscombe 
- 533 By Pavilion playing fields Purley Way, Waddon 
- 632 Land south of Threehalfpenny Woods, Kent Gate Way, Braidy Way, Addington 
- 636 Land west of Timbridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, Elmside, Addington 
- 707 Cane Hill south part, Hollymeak Road/Portnalls Road, Coulsdon

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Our client is deeply concerned about the manner in which the Evidence for the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options) ("the Evidence Paper") has been prepared. The scoring assessment applied by the Council is reductionist and disregards the wider context (for example outreach programme and supports) within which sites sit. Without that appreciation we do not consider that the Evidence Paper adequately supports the Council’s Strategic Objectives. The Evidence Paper identifies four “absolutes” for the initial screening. In the absence of any justification and evidence backed rationale behind these “absolutes” we are left to conclude that there is none. A site should be available and deliverable. We consider that to be an appropriate test in determining the suitability of a site for development. There is little explanation as to what factors the Council has taken into account for the purposes of scoring whether a site is deliverable—particularly over a 20 year period. No consideration is given to the use of CPO powers where a site for example could be suitable save for possible issues over deliverability. The use of CPO powers should be a consideration for the purposes of deliverability.

The existence of contamination cannot be considered in isolation. There does not appear to be any detailed analysis of whether the extent of contamination on some sites, and the costs of remediating that contamination, would render that site undeliverable in the plan period. A failure to acknowledge the need for sites to be located in proximity of public transport services does not support the principle of sustainable development.

In adopting this flawed approach the Council have failed to consider the contribution that smaller sites could make in delivering sites for gypsy and traveller communities. As a result, the initial screening process was biased towards larger sites despite the evidence base showing that such sites were not supported by the gypsy and traveller community. As a result, the Council has not properly considered if there are exceptional circumstances which justify any of the identified Green Belt sites coming forward for use as traveller sites.

To ensure transparency in the planning process the same tests should be applied to allocated sites and windfall sites.

For the reasons detailed above, the assessment proceeded from an erroneous starting point of “absolute” requirements that were neither justified nor supported by the Council’s existing gypsy and traveller policy. The Evidence Paper is lacking in detail, and the scoring criteria overly simplistic. As a result, the evidence put forward by the Council is lacking in transparency and is an unsound base for policy making.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

DM44.2 661

02 September 2016 Page 3075 of 4384
Object 661

Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for sites 661 and 502. If a site is Green Belt/MOL built form then it is marked Amber/Orange which means a score of -5 but +5 has been used which increase rating by 10 points. Error in calculating site access for 661, there are cars parked in that road and the entrance is through a very busy main road. The site site cannot have a rating of +5. It should be -2. That is a difference of 7 rating points.

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object 661

I wish to oppose the proposed gypsy site at Conduit Lane, South Croydon, CR0 5RQ (ref 661) for the following reasons. I suggest that the plan has overlooked some important issues that will affect the site and also the RAG calculation in the Councils 'Policy Designation Assessment' of is mathematically incorrect.
1) The site is a green belt site, which, referring to "4.1. The criteria and scoring" is as follows …..Green Belt/MOL- built form and this carries a weighted score of -5. In the 'Policy Designation Assessment' it is as shown as +5.
2) The Gypsy Community by their very nature are users of industrial vehicles including trailers and flatbed lorries and tipper trucks. The access at Conduit Road is not only restricted in width, the entrance is also shared by a Tea Room, The Coach House Café, serving walkers and locals. However, the Council seem to have allowed use of Industrial Vehicles to be classified as ‘Private Vehicles’ for the purposes of scoring. This is incorrect.
Conduit Lane also exits onto Coombe Road, a narrow main road where there have been several serious accidents in recent times including fatalities. The additional use of a plethora of industrial vehicles presents a real danger of personal injury.
3) The proposed site at Conduit Lane is currently used as a wood reclamation unit which reclaims tree cuttings in wood pellets. This is a green recycling unit and the loss of which will not only mean the wood having to be processed elsewhere but a loss of employment for those working there.
I strongly oppose the development and wish my views to be taken into account when re-evaluating the situation in order to present the true mathematical values and corrected mistakes.
I wish to object to the proposed gypsy site at Conduit Lane, South Croydon, CR0 5RQ (ref 661) for the following reasons.

I suggest that the plan has overlooked some important issues that will affect the site and also the RAG calculation in the Councils ‘Policy Designation Assessment’ of is mathematically incorrect.

1) The site is a green belt site, which, referring to 4.1. The criteria and scoring is as follows . Green Belt/MOL- built form and this carries a weighted score of -5. In the ‘Policy Designation Assessment’ it is as shown as +5. This mistake the Council has made alters the final score from +6 to -4.

2) The Gypsy Community by their very nature are users of Industrial Vehicles including trailers and flatbed lorries and tipper trucks. The access at Conduit Road is not only restricted in width, the entrance is also shared by a Tea Room, The Coach House Café, serving walkers and locals. However, the Council seem to have allowed use of Industrial Vehicles to be classified as ’Private Vehicles’ for the purposes of scoring. This is incorrect.

3) The proposed site at Conduit Lane is currently used as a wood reclamation unit which reclaims tree cuttings in wood pellets. This is a green recycling unit and the loss of which will not only mean the wood having to be processed elsewhere but a loss of employment for those working there.

I strongly oppose the development and wish my views to be taken into account when re-evaluating the situation in order to present the true mathematical values and corrected mistakes.
This is a greenbelt site, and it is not appropriate to put a traveller site here. Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development".

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Object Soundness - DM44.2

Justified 661

All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. I am concerned that all three sites are also some considerable walking distance away from GP practices, shops, schools, public transport and other local services which would be contrary to the Council’s Health and Wellbeing Strategy.

Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Traveller’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Cllr Margaret Mead  
Croydon Council

Comment Soundness - Effective  
DM44.2  
661

Site 661, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit lane. Transition Town have expressed an interest in restoring this site to a proper nursery facility, utilising the existing greenhouses for the growing of food, which would be a sustainable and appropriate activity within this green belt site.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
My answer: School is a viable option as there are no schools in our area. Criteria of selection: The plan makers have missed a big point that existing infrastructure cannot cope with the influx of additional population at such a fast pace. Also, it has to be planned over few years. It should never be on a green belt or attached to green belt sites as it is disastrous for the environment. There are quite a few brown field sites in Croydon. Those should be explored.

What are the criteria behind selecting two sites within 1 mile of each other? The plan makers do not know the grass root situation. They have just assumed things without actually knowing the facts. This is a grave situation.

There are quite a few public and independent schools in the nearby area. Building a new school will support the selsdon and nearby citizens. Besides we do not have a Grammar school in Croydon. So, it would be ideal if we build a grammar school in croydon on one of the proposed sites.

Existing infrastructure just cannot cope with additional population in Croydon:
1. We have to wait for at least 4-5 days to get appointment at doctors – many times we do not get appointment
2. We have to wait for at least 15 minutes to get a turn to play swing/slide for my son in any local park. The parks are so crowded during summer. Already children are getting very less exercise. If 40 families come over with more than 80 children then it would be extremely overcrowded.
3. There are not enough schools in the area. We should build more schools
4. There is very limited green space in Croydon. Government policy states that you cannot build temporary or permanent sites on green belt. Putting the travellers site near green belt will endanger the
5. Conduit lane is a no drive through zone. Increased traffic due to a planned school and travellers sites will cause traffic chaos.
6. We need green belts for good health of the citizens. Steps like these would encourage the encroachment of green belts.

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Incorrect calculation in selection criteria for site 661 and 502. If site is in Green Belt/MOL built form then it is marked as Amber/Orange which means a score of -5, +5 has been used which increase the rating by 10 points. Error in calculating site access for 661: There are cars parked on that road and the entrance is through a very busy main road. The site cannot have a rating of +5. It should be -2. That is a difference of 7 rating points.

The Methodology to assess the sites is flawed:
1) 3.8 It does not consider the Public Transport Accessibility Level. This is understood that it was established that the gypsy and traveller population have their own transport. However, the accessibility of the site in Coombe Lodge Nursery is not suitable for high level traffic for heavy vehicles such as those used by the gypsy and traveller community. I do not see how this has been taken into account when deciding on this site.
2) The area is a park that has constant access to the public and children. The higher level of traffic poses a danger for pedestrians and children using the park.
3) The score on the Rag Rating is not accurate. The nursery in Coombe Lodge Nursery is designated green belt/MOL – built form. This should be a rag rating of -5, not 5 as shown in the table. This means the assessment is wrong as it impacts on the final score of suitability.
4) The present area is used for recycling wood. Where would this go?

Heathfield and Coombe Wood is an area of natural beauty, which should be preserved for the enjoyment of Croydon residents. While not directly objections to the erection of static sites for gypsy and travellers in this area. It is a great concern that passing travellers may overuse the site and cause disruption and degeneration. This comes from experience when travellers left a trail of devastation when parked on the current Coombe Field Playing Fields.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 661, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit lane. Transition Town have expressed an interest in restoring this site to a proper nursery facility, utilising the existing greenhouses for the growing of food, which would be a sustainable and appropriate activity within this green belt site;</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites', published by the Government in August, states very clearly that Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1996). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites. I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the 'Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers'. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge sites suitability and has been the subject of 'extensive political consultation'. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 861 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria.

Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -6. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28/01/046/DM44.2/C</td>
<td>Cllr Richard Chatterjee</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Comment - Effective DM44.2 661</td>
<td>Site 661, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit lane. Transition Town have expressed an interest in restoring this site to a proper nursery facility, utilising the existing greenhouses for the growing of food, which would be a sustainable and appropriate activity within this green belt site.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/07/01/010/DM44.2/C</td>
<td>Philip Talmage</td>
<td></td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>Two proposed gypsy/traveller sites in Shirley (reference numbers 502 and 661 on Changes to the Policies Map) Both sites are inappropriately located in the Metropolitan Green Belt and poorly located for public services, and there is in any case no need for such an increase in the number of such sites within the Borough.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/09/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Philip Edmonds</td>
<td></td>
<td>Object DM44.2 661</td>
<td>The Gypsy/Traveller site proposal on Conduit Lane, next to Coombe Wood Gardens, is out of step with Government Policy and a completely inappropriate suggestion for the use of this green belt land (Policy DM 44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 (p 179). Policy F of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) published in August states clearly that “traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.” This location brings pleasure to many people in the borough, and it is staggering that something like a traveller site (with all its potential to have such a negative environmental impact) is proposed for an area that must be a contender for the most picturesque in Croydon. The site should not be allocated as a Gypsy and Traveller site.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/03/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Jonathan Nicholas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Object DM44.2 661</td>
<td>In appropriate development in the green belt. There is an imbalance in the borough with both this site and 502 being in the south of the borough and in close proximity to each other. Such proposals should be located on industrial/brownfield land rather than greenbelt. As an alternative, expand Laytham’s Way. Other sites considered suitable are: 552, 536, 120 - which would not interfere with the little green space we have left.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Objections raised to the use of the following locations as Gypsy/Traveller sites:-
Coombe Farm off Oaks Road Reference Number 502
Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane Reference Number 661

1. How has the London Borough of Croydon involved its Community in the planning of the Coombe Farm and Coombe Gardens Traveller Sites? What opportunity was given by Croydon Council for the local residents to put forward their own ideas and participate in the development of the Sites? See - London Borough of Croydon's “Statement of Community Involvement - October 2012” (https://www.croydon.gov.uk/sites/default/files/articles/downloads/involvement-oct12.pdf) Reference 2.11 & 2.12 - these Guidance Rules have been ignored
2. There is no pavement access to either of the proposed sites therefore most travel to and from these sites to local amenities, (shops/doctor/schools) would be by vehicle – causing even greater traffic problems to the Coombe and Oaks Road junction.
3. Residents call for an independent (i.e non-Labour) lead enquiry into the full extent Mr Ansari (owner of Coombe Farm, a proposed traveller site) has been able to influence Croydon Council specifically & Labour Government more broadly through financial bribery?

Quote from the 2011 Localism Act; "Through the Localism Act, the Government has abolished the Standards Board regime. Instead, local authorities will draw up their own codes, and it will become a criminal offence for councillors to deliberately withhold or misrepresent a financial interest."
Tens of thousands of pounds including cash equivalent goods & services (e.g supply of rent-free premises for council business, travel expenses and campaign donations) have been disclosed but misrepresented as donations. These are in fact bribes in return for planning leniency (see press article.) http://insidecroydon.com/2015/08/21/property-developer-ansari-donates-to-cooper-and-khan/
4. In the restrictive Covenants for Coombe Farm, (defined as 80 Oaks Road) which are for "the Settlers and their successors in title" states "No part of the Property shall be used for any offensive noisy, dangerous pursuit or occupation of any
purpose which shall or may grow to be in any way a nuisance damage grievance or annoyance to neighbouring properties or the neighbourhood."

2867/01/002/DM44.2/O J Giles Object DM44.2 661 I object to the site for the following reasons: -Detrimental to the Amenities of Adjoining Owners -Inappropriate use of Green Belt Land -Sites that are located on the Green Belt, considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and against Government Policy (Planning policy for Traveller Sites, DCLG, August 2015) -Lack of relevant Amenities close at hand -Insufficient Local Infrastructure to accommodate the plans -Selection of Proposed Sites should have a bias towards Brownfield or Industrial Land not Green Belt -Why are the Two Sites in very close proximity to one another being proposed -Imbalance across borough with all Sites being Proposed in the South of Croydon -Why not Expand the Existing Permanent Gypsy Site in Lathams Way off Beddington Farm Road -If one has to select one of the proposed sites, the Preference is for Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane

Pear Tree Farm should be allocated or Lathams Way should be extended. The Council should also consider sites 16, 120, 518, 522, 536, 552, 553, 632, 636 and 767.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

2868/01/006/DM44.2/O Graham Lyon Object DM44.2 661 Council's approach breaches national policy. The site is some distance from services. The Purley Way should be looked at.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I am objecting to the following sites being considered as suitable as Permanent Sites for the above use:
1) Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane, Coombe Road, South Croydon, CR0 5RQ
2) Coombe Farm, Oaks Road, Shirley, CR0 5HL

I am very disturbed to hear of the proposed plans for providing permanent sites for the Gypsy and Traveller people on these sites, mainly on the grounds that they are both much valued and appreciated areas of natural beauty and relatively unspoiled areas on Green Belt land, which I consider is an inappropriate use of such areas. I understand, in fact, that it is against stated Government Policy (“Planning policy for Traveller Sites” DCLG, August 2015).

My objections are based on the following grounds:

1) Neither of these areas has local amenities nearby, or sufficient infrastructure to accommodate these plans.

2) Whilst it is a statutory duty of local councils to provide these sites for travelling people - and, indeed, an act of common humanity that such groups are catered for - it is usual that brownfield or industrial land is used, rather than open greenbelt land.

3) Both these sites are comparatively close to each other, certainly both are in residential areas in South Croydon, thus impacting on amenities of local owners, and arousing local feelings. What is the reason behind this decision?

4) Can the existing permanent site in Lathams Way off Beddington Farm Road be expanded?

There are many sites which might be considered which are not near areas of heavy residential occupancy, in the Waddon playing fields areas, for example. The Pear Tree Farm area in Featherbed Lane is also more suitable.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
School is a viable option as there are no schools in our area.

Criteria of selection:
The plan makers have missed a big point that existing infrastructure cannot cope with the influx of additional population at such a fast pace. Also, it has to be planned over a few years. It should never be on a green belt/attached to green belt sites as it is disastrous for the environment. There are quite a few brown field sites in Croydon. Those should be explored.

What are the criteria behind selecting two sites within 1 mile of each other? The plan makers do not know the grass root situation. They have just assumed things without actually knowing the facts. This is a grave situation.

There are quite a few public and independent schools in the nearby area. Building a new school will support the residents and nearby citizens. Besides we do not have a Grammar school in Croydon. So, it would be ideal if we build a Grammar school in Croydon on one of the proposed sites.

Existing infrastructure just cannot cope with additional population in Croydon:
1. We have to wait for at least 4-5 days to get appointment at doctors – many times we do not get appointment
2. We have to wait for at least 15 minutes to get a turn to play swing-slide for my son in any local park. The parks are so crowded during summer. Already children are getting very less exercise. If 40 families come over with more than 80 children then it would be extremely overcrowded.
3. There are not enough schools in the area. We should build more schools
4. There is very limited green space in Croydon. Government policy states that you cannot build temporary or permanent sites on green belt. Putting the travellers site near green belt will endanger the
5. Conduit Lane is a no drive through zone. Increased traffic due to a planned school and travellers sites will cause traffic chaos.
6. We need green belts for good health of the citizens. Steps like these would encourage the encroachment of green belts.

Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane) and 502 (Coombe Farm) - if a site is Green Belt/MOL built form then it is marked as (Amber/Orange), which
means a score of "-5". "+5" has been used which increases the rating by 10 points. Error in calculating site access for 661: There are cars parked on that road and the entrance is through a very busy main road. The site cannot have a rating of "+5". It should be -2. That is a difference of 7 rating points.
I will oppose the gypsy site on the following grounds:

1. Mis-calculation of the score while selecting the site:
   - If a site is Green Belt/MOL- built form then it is marked as (Amber/Orange), which means a score of -5
   - If you go to page number 9 of the document in the link below, you can find that Amber is scored as +5 as opposed to -5.
   - Also, the score for the site access should be -2 as there are issues with the site access. This brings the overall score down to 12. Please, check the other scores too before finalising this site. This site is clearly not suitable for building on the gypsy site as it is a green belt site.

2. I will be objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

   “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.”

   The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Criteria of selection:

The plan makers have missed a big point that existing infrastructure cannot cope with the influx of additional population at such a fast pace. Also, it has to be planned over few years. It should never be on a green belt/attached to green belt sites as it is disastrous for the environment. There are quite a few brown field sites in Croydon. Those should be explored.

My answer: School is a viable option. Building a new school will support the Selsdon and nearby citizens. Besides we do not have a Grammar school in Croydon. So, it would be ideal if we build a grammar school in Croydon on one of the proposed sites.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
knowing the facts. This is a grave situation.

Building a new school will support the schools and nearby citizens. Besides we do not have a Grammar school in Croydon. So, it would be ideal if we build a grammar school in Croydon on one of the proposed sites. Existing infrastructure just cannot cope with additional population in Croydon:

1. We have to wait for at least 4-5 days to get appointment at doctors – many times we do not get appointment
2. We have to wait for at least 15 minutes to get a turn to play swing/slides for my son in any local park. The parks are so crowded during summer. Already children are getting very less exercise. If 40 families come over with more than 80 children then it would be extremely over crowded.
3. There are not enough schools in the area. We should build more schools.
4. There is very limited green space in Croydon. Government policy states that you cannot build temporary or permanent sites on green belt. Putting the travellers site near green belt will endanger the
5. Conduit lane is a no drive through zone. Increased traffic due to a planned school and travellers sites will cause traffic chaos.
6. We need green belts for good health of the citizens. Steps like these would encourage the encroachment of green belts.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I am writing to register my strongest possible objection to the following proposals for gypsy and travellers sites: - Coombe Farm, Oaks Road - Reference 502 - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane - Reference 661

I am an active member of Shirely Park Golf Club and vividly recall the hugely, disruptive presence of the gypsies when they trespassed onto Coombe Farm a couple of years ago. There is sometimes a romantic notion that gypsy/traveller community wish to get on with their lives and not affect the urban population wherever they pitch up; I am afraid that the bare facts reveal that this to be a complete fallacy and the stark reality is far from this rosy, TV documentary image.

It will come as no surprise to you to learn that there were numerous, illegal intrusions onto the golf course during their unwelcomed stay. Sadly but I am afraid rather predictably, these incursions resulted (of course) in a plethora of petty thefts and incidents of mindless damage to the course as well as necessitating a "marshalling" of parts of the course. These factors coupled with the constant verbal abuse made play almost untenable and at one point, a decision was made to close certain parts of the course until they were finally evicted.

I think it is important to stress that this is not just about my personal feelings, there are more far reaching implications. Certainly if their presence was to be made permanent, there is no way I personally would continue my membership at Shirley Park Golf Club and I can safely say a lot of the members feel the same way. It was apparent what the inhabitants of Croydon thought when another historic business at Reeves Corner was attached not so long ago.

Shirley Park Golf Club has been a valuable part of our community for over 100 years providing enjoyment for thousands of members, safe recreation for youngsters and of course valuable employment for many, not to mention the thousands of pounds raised to help Croydon Opportunities.

The success of the club also allowed the purchase of the land in recent history and it often surprises my guests to see this beautiful side of Croydon. Surely it is not right to jeopardise this great part of our local heritage in attempting to temporarily resolve this long running problem? Croydon is attracting huge investment and is seemingly working...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2879/01/010/DM44.2</td>
<td>Mr Roy Saunders</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2882/01/003/DM44.2</td>
<td>Ms Nina Maund</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2884/01/003/DM44.2</td>
<td>Mr David Brown</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2886/01/002/DM44.2</td>
<td>Mrs Dianne Haile</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Phillip Moore  
Object DM44.2 661  
I object to the use of the site as a gypsy and traveller site as it would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore there is an incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for this site. If a site is Green Belt/MOL - built form then it is marked as (Amber/Orange), which means a score of +5. A score of +5 has been used which increases the rating by 10 points. There is also an error in calculating site access for this site; there are cars parked on that road and the entrance is through a very busy main road. The site cannot have a rating of +5. It should be -2. That is a difference of 7 rating points.  
Change  
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr Peter Lawton  
Object DM44.2 661  
I object to the use of this site for a gypsy and traveller site.  
Change  
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Object

- Detrimental to the Amenities of Adjoining Owners
- Inappropriate use of Green Belt Land. Sites that are located on the Green Belt, considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and against Government Policy (Planning policy for Traveller Sites, DCLG, August 2015)
- Lack of relevant Amenities close at hand
- Insufficient Local Infrastructure to accommodate the plans
- Selection of Proposed Sites should have a bias towards Brownfield or Industrial Land not Green Belt
- Why are the Two Sites in very close proximity to one another being proposed and also imbalance across borough with all Sites being Proposed in the South of Croydon.
- Expansion of the Existing Permanent Gypsy Site in Lathams Way off Beddington Farm Road would be better solution
- If one has to select one of the proposed sites, the Preference is for Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane as this would have least impact of the 3 sites.

Other Sites that the Council should reconsider instead of both Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm are the following. Just because a number of the following Sites are GB/MOL (Green Belt / Metropolitan Open Land) this should not preclude them, as it’s not impossible to have them redesignated:

16 - Heath Clark playing fields, Stafford Road, Waddon
129 - Timesbridge Community Centre, Field Way, New Addington
518 - Land adjacent to 103 Goodenough Way, The Admirals Walk, Old Coulsdon
522 - Wandle Road surface car park, Wandle Road, Croydon Opportunity Area
536 - Land of former Croydon Airport runway, south of Imperial Way, Waddon
552 - Land adjacent to Ashburton playing fields at rear of 2-88 Cotenloge Road, Addiscombe
553 - By Pavilion Playing Fields, Purley Way, Waddon
632 - Land south of Threehalfpenny Woods, Kent Gate Way, Birdley Way, Addington

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006/01/02</td>
<td>DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Gypsy Traveller Site Hands off - Coombe Wood Gardens is a Green Belt site and must remain so. Do NOT ruin the site and cause real anguish to local residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2906/02/002</td>
<td>DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>The site is in Green Belt and is deemed inappropriate. The Council has gone to great expense to protect the site from mobile travellers and this seems to have been a great waste of taxpayers money if they now allow a permanent site. Several businesses which make a big contribution to the local economy and also provide much needed amenity to the public will be detrimentally affected by the site. Coombe Park will be completely overwhelmed by this enormous traveller development for up to 75 mobile homes. The huge amount of traffic going along Conduit Lane will make access to the park from the parking bays on the other side of the road much more difficult and dangerous. These parking bays are used by the very young and the very old to give them easy and safe access to this beautiful public park. Again the size of the site will totally overwhelm the nearest settlements of residents on Coombe Road, Oaks Road and Oaks Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2910/02/006</td>
<td>DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness</td>
<td>I object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites: Coombe Far off Oaks Road reference number 502; and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I am a member of Shirley Park Gold Club as well as a local resident. I am writing to register my objection to the following proposed gypsy and traveller sites:
- Coombe Farm, Oaks Road, Ref 502
- Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane, Ref 661

The policies laid out on the Mayor of London, policy 7.7 clearly states that the mayor’s office fully supports the protection of Metropolitan Open Land, and states that the strongest protection should be given to London MOL and inappropriate development refused. The policy lays out what needs to be established to designate an area as MOL but does not make it clear how Council can de-designate an area.

I therefore object to any permanent traveller site being constructed on MOL, especially if the area is simply going to be de-designated without any consultation with local residents and businesses.

I object strongly that Croydon Council can de-designate MOL or Green Belt to suit their needs to accommodate a permanent pitch. I cannot see any justification to change the designation, and intrude into the lives of the residents of Oaks Road and surrounding area. This will massively affect the attractiveness of the area and both the emotional and financial reprehension for many lives.

Policy 7.18 relating to protection of open spaces clearly states that open spaces within London must be protected and any loss must be resisted. I cannot believe the Council would want to go against both of these policies laid down by London assembly.

The Shirley Gold Club provides sport and social activities for up to 700 members in the local vicinity, and also provides an important ecological node in the area. The proposed sites for gypsies and travelers has come as a shock to everyone in the area, as come out of the recent press coverage and attendance at the consultation meetings.

The history of unauthorised "pitches" in this area over the past four years has left a bitter resentment, especially in view of the residual mess and littering, and crime that is accompanied their trespass. This does not change when the site is official. On each occasion that gypsies/travellers have been in the area, the residents have been affected by verbal and physical abuse. We also have a junior section at the club and children play in the comp during holiday period, as well as weekends. They are often unaccompanied and parents need to
know that they are in a safe environment. The proposed sites would change that. Please consider other sites.

I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller site as it would constitute inappropriate development I the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. An incorrect calculation has been applied to the selection criteria for the site. If a site is Green Belt/MOL built form then it is marked as (Amber/Orange), which means a score of -5. A score of +5 has been used which increases the rating by 10 points. There are cars parked on that road and the entrance is through a very busy main road. The site cannot have a rating of +5. It should be -2. That is a difference of 7 rating points.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

The existing infrastructure cannot cope with an increased population. The site should be used as a school

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

I am deeply concerned about the proposed site. As a ladies golf member of the golf club, I use the area by the 4th hole regularly to play and practice golf. I remember the last time when the traveller/Gypsies were in the area and the mess and debris that were constantly left behind on the Shirley Park golf course. It was extremely upsetting and worrying. There was a lot of unacceptable behaviour like verbal abuse and bikes being used on the golf course. Additionally, as a mother of two teenage boys who are very fond of this sport and play golf I felt extremely uncomfortable and unsafe for them to use that area for practice or golf play when the gypsies and travellers were in the area last time. I would certainly discourage them to use that area in the future if these plans go ahead due to possible aggressive behaviour and verbal abuse from the gypsies and travellers.

I agree with the Club that Policy 7.18 relating to Protection of Open Spaces clearly states that open spaces in London must be protected and any loss resisted. I am shocked that Croydon Council would want to go against both of these policies laid down by the London Assembly.
I write concerning Croydon Council’s proposals contained in the consultation document of the Croydon Local Plan that includes the re-designation of Metropolitan Open Land in Shirley and specifically within the confines of Shirley Oaks. I consider these proposals and others listed above to be inappropriate as they would significantly change the character of the area in which I have lived all 61 years of my life and I wish to add my voice to those already expressing concerns and objections about these proposals.

I strongly object to the proposal to re-designate Metropolitan Open Land to facilitate the building of new homes on land in Shirley Oaks and the provision of temporary or permanent traveller/gypsy sites in areas that are acknowledged by the Council to be in the green belt at Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries in Conduit Lane.

These proposals are totally out of keeping with the character of the area which predominantly comprise owner-occupied semi and detached homes. Surely areas considered to be brownfield sites are more appropriate than the unacceptable use of Metropolitan Open Land?

The proposals affecting the area surrounding Shirley Library are also of concern as this would adversely change the character of the area and potentially result in the establishment of additional unsightly car-parking sites on the south side of Wickham Road, similar to that at the front of the Shirley Medical Centre at 370 Wickham Road.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
The planning authorities should protect local amenity and environment. These do the opposite and will do nothing but harm. Travellers sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The scale of such sites should not dominate the nearest settled community whose interest should be respected. These sites will have a highly deleterious effect on four neighbouring businesses namely The Chateau restaurant, Coach House Café in Coombe Wood, the Premier Inn and the Oaks Farm wedding venue. The numbers being housed will be greater than the occupants already living along Oaks Road. In addition there is no nearby public transport, schooling, doctors surgery or shops. There are not even pavements on both sides of the roads involved. They will be damaging to the nearby site of Nature Conservation Interest. The Council has already spent time and money ensuring that travellers could not park in Conduit Lane. They must have had a reason for so doing. If travellers are allowed on the nursery site there is will make Coombe Wood and gardens a no go area. Why is the Council intending to destroy one of the few remaining unspoilt green spaces in the borough. There must be less sensitive sites within the Croydon boundary where the establishment of a base for the travelling and gypsy communities would be more harmonious.

I object to the allocation of a traveller site at Conduit Lane. I do not think a traveller site is appropriate for this site; it is inappropriate in this location, out of keeping with parkland location of Coombe Gardens and Lloyd Park.

The proposals are contrary to the Government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites and are totally unsuitable for the location for large numbers of families with young children.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
2931/01/016/DM44.2/O Mr John Newman

Object DM44.2 661

I object to the use of the site for a gypsy and traveller site. All three sites are in the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of Planning for Traveller Sites published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the borough, it would be more appropriate to expand existing sites eg. Off the Purley Way. None of these sites have easy access to local schools, healthcare, retail and other amenities. The vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the junction is likely to create additional road hazards.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

2932/01/001/DM44.2/O Mr James Lawton

Object DM44.2 661

I object to the use of the site as a gypsy and traveller site.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

2934/01/002/DM44.2/O J A Meyer

Object DM44.2 661

I object to the use of the site for a gypsy and traveller site as it would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. There are incorrect calculations in the selection criteria for the site. If a site is Green Belt/MOL - built form then it is marked as (Amber/Orange), which means a score of -5. A score of +5 has been used which increases the rating by 10 points. There is also an error in calculating the site access for the site. There are cars parked on that road and the entrance is thought a very busy main road. The site cannot have a rating of +5. It should be -2. That is a difference of 7 rating points.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

2935/01/003/DM44.2/O Mr Ian Cameron

Object DM44.2 661

The proposed travellers sites are not suitable and are in breach of the Government's statement that "sites are inappropriate in the Green Belt". These sites are also some distance from public services.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Lingwood</td>
<td>This would be in breach of the Government's intentions - Policy E of the Planning Policies for Traveller Sites and that travellers sites (temporary or permanent) are inappropriate development in the greenbelt. This would drain Council resources and reflect on the quality of other services that the Council is required to provide. It would result in the reduction in free and easy access that is currently enjoyed by many. The proposal would have a considerable effect on the business at Oaks Farm and the Premier Travel Inn, forcing these to close potentially. Extending the site at Purley Way should be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Lemell</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object DM44.2

The proposal to develop Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane as a residential development for a Gypsy and travelers site does not fall within the Strategic Objectives because:

1. Objective 2: This development will not Foster an environment where existing enterprise can prosper, but will reduce enterprise.
2. Objective 4: This development will not reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation. It will not reduce unemployment, improve skills and education and improve environmental conditions, the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.
3. Objective 5: This development is not of high quality and will not enhance the borough’s natural environment but will reduce the natural environment by turning a farm into a travelers housing site.
4. Objective 7: This development will reduce the area as a safe, healthy and cohesive community.
5. Objective 10: This development will reduce the quality and accessibility of green space and nature.

This proposed development of a travelers site within the Coombe Road area is not within keeping of the current development within this area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with out housing in the area.

Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area and is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Building a travelers site will increase noise levels and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area.

Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

This development will diminish the striking view of the area of Addington Hills and Coombe Farm area, this development will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The development will change the outlook and community within the South Croydon area and future generation will suffer because of this.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mrs Mary Warner

DM44.2

Not in line with Government planning policy on the Green Belt. Sites are located on the Green Belt, considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and against Government Policy ("Planning policy for traveller sites", DCLG, August 2015): the proposal to create a permanent traveller site on land designated as Green Belt land is contrary to Policy E of the Planning Policy. Inappropriate development, harmful to the Green Belt, should only be approved in very special circumstances. There are no very special circumstances that have been, or can be, advanced to allow the use of this land (The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) does NOT constitute exceptional circumstance). It is not in the surrounding community's interest for the Green Belt to be eroded - approving this application would also set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to be subject to similar planning applications. Negative impact on the local environment and wildlife. Inappropriate to simply weight Green Belt as one of many factors to be considered in the assessment process, rather it presents a policy objection that cannot be over-ridden in the way proposed.

- Government planning policy with regards to traveller sites wants to ensure that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development.
- The proposal to create a permanent traveller site on land designated as Green Belt land is contrary to Policy E of the Planning Policy: "Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances." There are no very special circumstances.
- The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the "very special circumstances" justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt.
- The local character description is clearly at odds with the proposal.
- The justification acknowledges the Green Belt issue, though insufficiently, but relies on the fact that there are existing structures. These are not in fact substantial, being glasshouses and could be said to be at least environmentally consistent with the Green Belt. But
there is no very special circumstance justification proposed as required by Planning Policies.

- Approving the proposal would set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to be subject to similar development. It is not in the community’s interests to allow the erosion of the green spaces surrounding the community and we object to the impact this site could have on the environment and wildlife. In the light of these issues, it is not appropriate simply to weight Green Belt as one of many factors to be considered, but rather it presents an overarching policy objection that cannot be over-ridden in the way proposed. To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now and we do not believe that The Assessment and selection of sites for Gypsy and Travellers undertaken was credible. The site is clearly not a suitable location for development Plan makers have not considered the time it will take to commence development on site:

  - Need for infrastructure improvements (roads), need for local amenities improvement (primary school, doctor)
  - Plan makers have not considered the time and necessity to show due diligence in assessing the sites:
    - need for an Environmental Impact Assessment (this would be a schedule 2 development having significant effects on the environment and needing an EIA)
    - need for a Local Biodiversity Action plan to determine the sensitivity of the location
  - Plan makers have not ensured that the process has credibility and acceptance; the bases for site criteria weightings are unclear.
  - Plan makers will need to provide robust, up to date evidence to support the deliverability of sites, ensuring that their judgements on deliverability are clearly and transparently set out.
  - Plan makers have not taken the cost and time needed to mitigate the impact of the development on the sites. Croydon Council has already recognised in its Development Management Policies document that the Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) which borders the Coombe Lodge Nurseries Site, Coombe Wood (List of Historical Park and Gardens 2008) would be negatively impacted by the proposed development.

There is basis for challenging the way in which this potential site has been selected.
Para 3.1 Green Belt sites included for review of eligible sites "to ensure that all locations for a site considered", but at the same time "Exclusion of sites in Croydon Metropolitan Centre and within District Centres and Strategic Industrial Locations and Conservation Areas due to viability, deliverability and impact on heritage considerations". Is this even-handed?

Para 4.1 sets out the criteria and weightings. As indicated above, Green Belt with no built form is given a weighting (-10) which, though high, is not very significant given that there are 29 or 30 criteria and can easily be outweighed by other factors that are less significant in policy terms. Furthermore, Coombe Nurseries has been weighted -5 for Green Belt, in recognition of the fact that there are some structures on the site, AND has been given 5 for the fact that (in the assessor’s view) such structures as there are can be converted to traveller use (if the buildings had to be demolished, on a green field site, this would have attracted -5).

SP2.7 on the Council’s proposals to deliver 39 additional gypsy and traveller sites indicates that land will be allocated in accordance with the proposals, but that any ADDITIONAL sites that are not so allocated should meet some stated criteria, including good access to local shops and essential services and good transport access; these seem to be criteria that were excluded from the proposed allocation, suggesting that any alternative proposals would need to meet stiffer criteria. Is this fair and even-handed?

The proposed development does compromise the future of the local area. Government planning policy is to ensure local planning authorities have due regard to the protection of local amenities and the local environment. It is likely the proposals will have an adverse effect on local businesses Coombe Wood is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) (List of Historical Park and Gardens 2008) and borders the proposed Coombe Lodge Nurseries site, and would be negatively impacted by the plans. Croydon Council has already recognised this in its Development Management Policies document. The Borough Character Appraisal of 2015, the local area is listed as having special character. The proposed development is not sensitive to, and does not respect, this.
The objections may be summarized as:
- inappropriate use of Green Belt land
- lack of relevant amenities close to hand
- adverse effect on neighbouring businesses and leisure amenities
- site has a more appropriate use for a school
Not in line with Government planning policy on the Green Belt. Sites are located on the Green Belt, considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and against Government Policy ("Planning policy for traveller sites", DCLG, August 2015): the proposal to create a permanent traveller site on land designated as Green Belt land is contrary to Policy E of the Planning Policy. Inappropriate development, harmful to the Green Belt, should only be approved in very special circumstances. There are no very special circumstances that have been, or can be, advanced to allow the use of this land (The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) does NOT constitute exceptional circumstance). It is not in the surrounding community's interest for the Green Belt to be eroded - approving this application would also set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to be subject to similar planning applications. Negative impact on the local environment and wildlife. Inappropriate to simply weight Green Belt as one of many factors to be considered in the assessment process, rather it presents a policy objection that cannot be over-ridden in the way proposed. - Government planning policy with regards to traveller sites wants to ensure that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development. - The proposal to create a permanent traveller site on land designated as Green Belt land is contrary to Policy E of the Planning Policy: "Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances.". There are no very special circumstances. - The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the "very special circumstances" justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt. - The local character description is clearly at odds with the proposal. - The justification acknowledges the Green Belt issue, though insufficiently, but relies on the fact that there are existing structures. These are not in fact substantial, being glasshouses and could be said to be at least environmentally consistent with the Green Belt. But
there is no very special circumstance justification proposed as required by Planning Policies.

- Approving the proposal would set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to be subject to similar development. It is not in the community’s interests to allow the erosion of the green spaces surrounding the community and we object to the impact this site could have on the environment and wildlife. In the light of these issues, it is not appropriate simply to weight Green Belt as one of many factors to be considered, but rather it presents an overarching policy objection that cannot be over-ridden in the way proposed. To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now and we do not believe that The Assessment and selection of sites for Gypsy and Travellers undertaken was credible. The site is clearly not a suitable location for development Plan makers have not considered the time it will take to commence development on site:
  - Need for infrastructure improvements (roads), need for local amenities improvement (primary school, doctor)
  - Plan makers have not considered the time and necessity to show due diligence in assessing the sites:
    - Need for an Environmental Impact Assessment (this would be a schedule 2 development having significant effects on the environment and needing an EIA)
    - Need for a Local Biodiversity Action plan to determine the sensitivity of the location
  - Plan makers have not ensured that the process has credibility and acceptance, the bases for site criteria weightings are unclear.
    - Plan makers will need to provide robust, up to date evidence to support the deliverability of sites, ensuring that their judgements on deliverability are clearly and transparently set out
  - Plan makers have not taken the cost and time needed to mitigate the impact of the development on the sites: Croydon Council has already recognised in its Development Management Policies document that the Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) which borders the Coombe Lodge Nurseries Site, Coombe Wood (List of Historical Park and Gardens 2008) would be negatively impacted by the proposed development.

There is basis for challenging the way in which this potential site has been selected.
Para 3.1 Green Belt sites included for review of eligible sites "to ensure that all locations for a site considered", but at the same time "Exclusion of sites in Croydon Metropolitan Centre and within District Centres and Strategic Industrial Locations and Conservation Areas due to viability, deliverability and impact on heritage considerations". Is this even-handed?

Para 4.1 sets out the criteria and weightings. As indicated above, Green Belt with no built form is given a weighting (-10) which, though high, is not very significant given that there are 29 or 30 criteria and can easily be outweighed by other factors that are less significant in policy terms. Furthermore, Coombe Nurseries has been weighted -5 for Green Belt, in recognition of the fact that there are some structures on the site, AND has been given 5 for the fact that (in the assessor’s view) such structures as there are can be converted to traveller use (if the buildings had to be demolished, on a green field site, this would have attracted -5).

SP2.7 on the Council’s proposals to deliver 39 additional gypsy and traveller sites indicates that land will be allocated in accordance with the proposals, but that any ADDITIONAL sites that are not so allocated should meet some stated criteria, including good access to local shops and essential services and good transport access; these seem to be criteria that were excluded from the proposed allocation, suggesting that any alternative proposals would need to meet stiffer criteria. Is this fair and even-handed?

The proposed development does compromise the future of the local area. Government planning policy is to ensure local planning authorities have due regard to the protection of local amenities and the local environment. It is likely the proposals will have an adverse effect on local businesses Coombe Wood is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI)(List of Historical Park and Gardens 2008) and borders the proposed Coombe Lodge Nurseries site, and would be negatively impacted by the plans. Croydon Council has already recognised this in its Development Management Policies document. The Borough Character Appraisal of 2015, the local area is listed as having special character. The proposed development is not sensitive to, and does not respect, this.
The objections may be summarized as:
- inappropriate use of Green Belt land
- lack of relevant amenities close to hand
- adverse effect on neighbouring businesses and leisure amenities
- site has a more appropriate use for a school
Not in line with Government planning policy on the Green Belt. Sites are located on the Green Belt, considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and against Government Policy (“Planning policy for traveller sites”, DCLG, August 2015): the proposal to create a permanent traveller site on land designated as Green Belt land is contrary to Policy E of the Planning Policy. Inappropriate development, harmful to the Green Belt, should only be approved in very special circumstances. There are no very special circumstances that have been, or can be, advanced to allow the use of this land (The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) does NOT constitute exceptional circumstance). It is not in the surrounding community’s interest for the Green Belt to be eroded - approving this application would also set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to be subject to similar planning applications. Negative impact on the local environment and wildlife. Inappropriate to simply weight Green Belt as one of many factors to be considered in the assessment process, rather it presents a policy objection that cannot be over-ridden in the way proposed. - Government planning policy with regards to traveller sites wants to ensure that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development. - The proposal to create a permanent traveller site on land designated as Green Belt land is contrary to Policy E of the Planning Policy: “Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances.”. There are no very special circumstances. - The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the "very special circumstances" justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt. - The local character description is clearly at odds with the proposal. - The justification acknowledges the Green Belt issue, though insufficiently, but relies on the fact that there are existing structures. These are not in fact substantial, being glasshouses and could be said to be at least environmentally consistent with the Green Belt. But
there is no very special circumstance justification proposed as required by Planning Policies.  
- Approving the proposal would set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to be subject to similar development. It is not in the community's interests to allow the erosion of the green spaces surrounding the community and we object to the impact this site could have on the environment and wildlife. In the light of these issues, it is not appropriate simply to weight Green Belt as one of many factors to be considered, but rather it presents an overarching policy objection that cannot be over-ridden in the way proposed. To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now and we do not believe that The Assessment and selection of sites for Gypsy and Travellers undertaken was credible. The site is clearly not a suitable location for development Plan makers have not considered the time it will take to commence development on site:  
-Need for infrastructure improvements (roads), need for local amenities improvement (primary school, doctor)  
-Plan makers have not considered the time and necessity to show due diligence in assessing the sites:  
-need for an Environmental Impact Assessment (this would be a schedule 2 development having significant effects on the environment and needing an EIA)  
-need for a Local Biodiversity Action plan to determine the sensitivity of the location  
-Plan makers have not ensured that the process has credibility and acceptance: the bases for site criteria weightings are unclear.  
-Plan makers will need to provide robust, up to date evidence to support the deliverability of sites, ensuring that their judgements on deliverability are clearly and transparently set out.  
-Plan makers have not taken the cost and time needed to mitigate the impact of the development on the sites. Croydon Council has already recognised in its Development Management Policies document that the Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) which borders the Coombe Lodge Nurseries Site, Coombe Wood (List of Historical Park and Gardens 2008) would be negatively impacted by the proposed development. There is basis for challenging the way in which this potential site has been selected.
1 Para 3.1 Green Belt sites included for review of eligible sites "to ensure that all locations for a site considered", but at the same time "Exclusion of sites in Croydon Metropolitan Centre and within District Centres and Strategic Industrial Locations and Conservation Areas due to viability, deliverability and impact on heritage considerations". Is this even-handed?

Para 4.1 sets out the criteria and weightings. As indicated above, Green Belt with no built form is given a weighting (-10) which, though high, is not very significant given that there are 29 or 30 criteria and can easily be outweighed by other factors that are less significant in policy terms. Furthermore, Coombe Nurseries has been weighted -6 for Green Belt, in recognition of the fact that there are some structures on the site, AND has been given 5 for the fact that (in the assessor’s view) such structures as there are can be converted to traveller use (if the buildings had to be demolished, on a green field site, this would have attracted -5).

SP2.7 on the Council’s proposals to deliver 39 additional gypsy and traveller sites indicates that land will be allocated in accordance with the proposals, but that any ADDITIONAL sites that are not so allocated should meet some stated criteria, including good access to local shops and essential services and good transport access; these seem to be criteria that were excluded from the proposed allocation, suggesting that any alternative proposals would need to meet stiffer criteria. Is this fair and even-handed?

The proposed development does compromise the future of the local area. Government planning policy is to ensure local planning authorities have due regard to the protection of local amenities and the local environment. It is likely the proposals will have an adverse effect on local businesses Coombe Wood is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) (List of Historical Park and Gardens 2008) and borders the proposed Coombe Lodge Nurseries site, and would be negatively impacted by the plans. Croydon Council has already recognised this in its Development Management Policies document. The Borough Character Appraisal of 2015, the local area is listed as having special character. The proposed development is not sensitive to, and does not respect, this.
The objections may be summarized as:
- inappropriate use of Green Belt land
- lack of relevant amenities close to hand
- adverse effect on neighbouring businesses and leisure amenities
- site has a more appropriate use for a school
Object

DM44.2
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Not in line with Government planning policy on the Green Belt. Sites are located on the Green Belt, considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and against Government Policy ("Planning policy for traveller sites", DCLG, August 2015): the proposal to create a permanent traveller site on land designated as Green Belt land is contrary to Policy E of the Planning Policy. Inappropriate development, harmful to the Green Belt, should only be approved in very special circumstances. There are no very special circumstances that have been, or can be, advanced to allow the use of this land (The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) does NOT constitute exceptional circumstance). It is not in the surrounding community's interest for the Green Belt to be eroded - approving this application would also set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to be subject to similar planning applications. Negative impact on the local environment and wildlife. Inappropriate to simply weight Green Belt as one of many factors to be considered in the assessment process, rather it presents a policy objection that cannot be over-ridden in the way proposed.

- Government planning policy with regards to traveller sites wants to ensure that plan-making and decision-taking should protected Green Belt from inappropriate development.

- The proposal to create a permanent traveller site on land designated as Green Belt land is contrary to Policy E of the Planning Policy: "Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances." There are no very special circumstances.

- The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the "very special circumstances" justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt.

- The local character description is clearly at odds with the proposal.

- The justification acknowledges the Green Belt issue, though insufficiently, but relies on the fact that there are existing structures. These are not in fact substantial, being glasshouses and could be said to be at least environmentally consistent with the Green Belt. But

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
there is no very special circumstance justification proposed as required by Planning Policies. 
- Approving the proposal would set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to be subject to similar development. It is not in the community’s interests to allow the erosion of the green spaces surrounding the community and we object to the impact this site could have on the environment and wildlife. 
In the light of these issues, it is not appropriate simply to weight Green Belt as one of many factors to be considered, but rather it presents an overarching policy objection that cannot be over-ridden in the way proposed. 
To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now and we do not believe that The Assessment and selection of sites for Gypsy and Travellers undertaken was credible. 
The site is clearly not a suitable location for development Plan makers have not considered the time it will take to commence development on site: 
- Need for infrastructure improvements (roads), need for local amenities improvement (primary school, doctor) 
- Plan makers have not considered the time and necessity to show due diligence in assessing the sites: 
  - need for an Environmental Impact Assessment (this would be a schedule 2 development having significant effects on the environment and needing an EIA) 
  - need for a Local Biodiversity Action plan to determine the sensitivity of the location 
- Plan makers have not ensured that the process has credibility and acceptance: the bases for site criteria weightings are unclear. 
- Plan makers will need to provide robust, up to date evidence to support the deliverability of sites, ensuring that their judgements on deliverability are clearly and transparently set out. 
- Plan makers have not taken the cost and time needed to mitigate the impact of the development on the sites: Croydon Council has already recognised in its Development Management Policies document that the Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) which borders the Coombe Lodge Nurseries Site, Coombe Wood (List of Historical Park and Gardens 2008) would be negatively impacted by the proposed development. 
There is basis for challenging the way in which this potential site has been selected.
1 Para 3.1 Green Belt sites included for review of eligible sites “to ensure that all locations for a site considered”, but at the same time “Exclusion of sites in Croydon Metropolitan Centre and within District Centres and Strategic Industrial Locations and Conservation Areas due to viability, deliverability and impact on heritage considerations”. Is this even-handed?

Para 4.1 sets out the criteria and weightings. As indicated above, Green Belt with no built form is given a weighting (-10) which, though high, is not very significant given that there are 29 or 30 criteria and can easily be outweighed by other factors that are less significant in policy terms. Furthermore, Coombe Nurseries has been weighted -5 for Green Belt, in recognition of the fact that there are some structures on the site, AND has been given 5 for the fact that (in the assessor’s view) such structures as there are can be converted to traveller use (if the buildings had to be demolished, on a green field site, this would have attracted -5).

SP2.7 on the Council’s proposals to deliver 39 additional gypsy and traveller sites indicates that land will be allocated in accordance with the proposals, but that any ADDITIONAL sites that are not so allocated should meet some stated criteria, including good access to local shops and essential services and good transport access; these seem to be criteria that were excluded from the proposed allocation, suggesting that any alternative proposals would need to meet stiffer criteria. Is this fair and even-handed?

The proposed development does compromise the future of the local area. Government planning policy is to ensure local planning authorities have due regard to the protection of local amenities and the local environment. It is likely the proposals will have an adverse effect on local businesses Coombe Wood is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) (List of Historical Park and Gardens 2008) and borders the proposed Coombe Lodge Nurseries site, and would be negatively impacted by the plans. Croydon Council has already recognised this in its Development Management Policies document. The Borough Character Appraisal of 2015, the local area is listed as having special character. The proposed development is not sensitive to, and does not respect, this.
The objections may be summarized as:

- inappropriate use of Green Belt land
- lack of relevant amenities close to hand
- adverse effect on neighbouring businesses and leisure amenities
- site has a more appropriate use for a school

2962/02/002/DM44.2/O Charlotte Lewis Object DM44.2 661 I object to the council’s plans to create a Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane, next to Coombe Wood Gardens; travellers bring with them a whole host of anti-social problems & criminal activity such as the rubbish they leave behind, also I worry about the safety of people’s pets with them around. A colleague of my fiancé’s was threatened with extreme violence by travellers when he went to their site to try & read their electricity/gas meters.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

2965/01/004/DM44.2/O Janet Nightingale Object DM44.2 661 Recently I have heard of Croydon Council’s plans for the borough over the next 20 years. I object strongly to the plans for permanent sites for travellers using green belt land. My experience of travellers is not a happy one. In my opinion they are inclined to make a dreadful mess of any area they occupy. They then move on leaving the Council to clear up after them. If they have to be provided with another permanent site please choose somewhere which is not green belt.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

2967/01/002/DM44.2/O Janet Willings Object DM44.2 661 Government policy excludes green belt land from use as a site for Travellers. Coombe Wood Gardens is green belt land. Coombe Wood and Lloyd Park areas are surely one of the jewels in Croydon’s crown. They provide a green space of beauty, peace and fresh air and are well used by the people of Croydon. There are other places where Travellers sites could be located.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I understand that the following Policies will threaten our green spaces. I was born in Croydon and have lived in this area all my life (I am now 63). My parents came here from Scotland in the early 1950s. They chose this area specifically for its green spaces and it is quite unique in that facility. I spent more than 35 years in Real Estate in this area and know very well that the reason people continue to move here, is exactly for these facilities and yet remaining within easy reach of other amenities, London, the coast and airports. Of course, more housing is required but I believe the alternative suggestions to these proposals to be very valid and much more in keeping with the neighbourhood thus maintaining its attractiveness and good standard.

These proposals are ill conceived and will change this particular neighbourhood beyond all recognition and take away that for which it is well known and valued. Please hear the voices of people like me and do NOT continue with the proposed policies set out below and which can be found in your Local Plan:

6. Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 (p179): This is a greenbelt site, and it is not appropriate to put a traveller site here. Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Janet Borawiak
Object
Soundness - Justified
DM44.2 661

Change

Having learnt from reading frightening stories regarding the above, I now understand they are true. I hope you are going to listen to the people of Croydon in that this is not what we want

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
4) I understand that the Council has identified two sites in Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites, Coombe Farm off Oaks Road and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane. (Reference numbers 502 & 661). Both of these are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. Both Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries are some distance from public services and traveller sites here risk damaging some of the Borough’s precious green spaces. Extending sites in areas such as the one at Purley Way would be more suitable.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

I wish to register my objection to what I am hearing are your plans to develop the above areas.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

No, No, No, we should not be losing greenbelt land for a traveller site.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

We both agree that we do not want to lose any of our green belt. And the parking in the area is truly so bad especially in Coulsdon.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mrs Jeanne Driscoll  
Object DM44.2 661  I wish to add my objections made on this document by our local M.P. Chris Philp.  
Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Jennifer Houghton  
Object DM44.2 661  I object to the proposal to down grade the above site from green belt to Metropolitan. Croydon is a London Borough known for having green spaces and parks which are much appreciated by all the local residents and adds to its positive image. I also object to the proposed provision of Gypsy/ traveller site at Conduit Lane this is a green belt site. There are limited facilities for families who would be living there - no local shops or health centre. There is a shortage of local primary school places and no primary school within walking distance, I understand it is of paramount importance to encourage traveller family to send their children to school so that they can continue their education.  
Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mrs Angela Oakley  
Object DM44.2 661  We do not need or want anymore tower blocks at New Addington, nor do we need another school on Rowdown fields. The travellers when up here cause trouble being rude to people and stealing from the shops, which I have witness, also this happen many years ago on Forestdale shops, where I worked, do you really want to spoil all the green belt, there is the old Stewart Plastic site at Purley Way which has been left empty for years.  
Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Object: Soundness - Justified
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Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane, next to Coombe Wood Gardens. Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 (p179). The council plans to create a Gypsy/Traveller site here. This is a greenbelt site, and it is not appropriate to put a traveller site here. Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.”

Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object: DM44.2

661

I particularly wish to object to the proposal to locate a traveller site in the area of Conduit Lane. This is not in Heathfield Ward, but the area around Conduit Lane is a local amenity. The Gardens with their cafe and Coombe Woods are enjoyed not only by myself but by countless others for relaxation and exercise, and it beggars belief that the Council wishes to destroy such a lovely area.

Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object: DM44.2

661

I am writing to object to:

1. The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:
   - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661;
   - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502;
   - Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object: DM44.2

661

I will be objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would like to register my objection to DM44.2, Table 11.17, Site 661 (Gypsy/Traveller Site)
I am writing to you to express my objection to potential travellers sites in two locations and to detail the reasons why.

Coombe Lodge Nurseries (Conduit Lane) Ref 661

1. The land is green belt land and therefore deemed inappropriate by national guidelines.
2. The size of the site would mean that it could not be accommodated by simply demolishing exiting structures and hence would spill over into unspoiled land.
3. The area already struggles with amenities such schooling, doctors etc and this additional influx would be difficult to accommodate.
4. The site would add additional traffic to conduit lane/coombe lane intersection which could not be accommodated without major traffic improvements.
5. The traveller site would be next to Coobe park and overwhelming in terms of size.
6. Parking to access the Coombe Park and Coombe woods is already at a premium. The development would bring massive amounts of additional traffic.
7. The site will totally overwhelm near by residents on Coombe Lane and Oaks Road.
8. The site is very close to some of Croydon most unspoilt areas such as Coombe Woods, Combe Park and Lloyd Park. The additional influx of vehicles and residents would have a detrimental effect on the local environment.
9. The site has no amenities near by - shops, post offices etc and none within walking distance which means a massive increase in traffic to the local area.

Both locations would massively change the local characteristics of an area of Croydon which is largely unspoilt by development in an area with very few local amenities. Schooling is already an issue in this area. In my view Green Belt land is specifically created to prevent urbanisation of green spaces which this proposal amounts to.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr Jonathan Butcher  
Object Soundness - Justified  
DM44.2 661

I object in the strongest possible terms to the Council’s proposal to build gypsy/traveller sites in Croydon!!! We absolutely mustn’t lose our green open spaces. We have too few of them as it is.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I object to this proposal on the following grounds:

1.1 Coombe Lodge Nurseries is Green Belt Land. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly that "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". Previous use and Council ownership do not mitigate against this policy.

1.2 The proximity of this site to the Coombe Farm site, also proposed, would mean a total of up to 45 pitches on 2 sites within a very small area of the Borough.

1.3 The Croydon Local Plan paragraph 4.19 refers to the need for good access to roads, stating that Gypsies and Travellers "often need to move larger vehicles as part of their livelihood and way of life". Coombe Road junctions with Oaks Road and Conduit Lane are busy and potentially hazardous intersections and are unsuitable for increased, safe movement and manoeuvring of larger vehicles.

1.4 The proposed Coombe Lodge Nurseries site is adjacent to a Site of Nature Conservation interest which would be vulnerable.

All of the three preferred sites are on Green Belt Land, contrary to Government Policy.

The close proximity of the proposed sites to one another has not been taken into account. All three sites are proposed for a small area in the South of the Borough when there seems to be a successful site in Purley Way which could be expanded.

None of the three sites proposed have good access to schools, shops and other services. The consequent need for private transport goes against environment and climate initiatives. Government Guidelines ask that local planning authorities policies ensure that children can attend school on a regular basis. These three sites are well away from schools, particularly...
primary schools, and clearly do not reflect the aims of the Guidelines or facilitate regular school attendance.

The proposed plan does not take into account the need for good access to roads. The Croydon Local Plan paragraph 4.19 refers to the need for good access to roads. "Oaks Road, Coombe Road, Conduit Lane and Featherbed Lane are unsuitable for safe increased movement and manoeuvring of larger vehicles, especially entering and exiting these sites.

The number of Gypsy/Traveller sites in Croydon is to increase from 1 to 4, when our recent experience locally is of travellers responsible for damage, parking illegally, leaving piles of rubbish behind when they are moved on and even engaged in firearms confrontation with the police.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3014/01/003/DM44.2/D</th>
<th>Julie Lowe</th>
<th>DM44.2 661</th>
<th>I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites - coombe farm off oaks R's ref 502 - coombe lodge nurseries off conduit lane ref 661</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am emailing to object to the proposed travellers sites to be built in the Shirley/Croydon/South Croydon areas.

There are numerous reasons for my objections.

1. This is green belt land and should remain as such. We are lucky to have local green areas that I have enjoyed since my childhood and that my own family benefit from now. Green belt land is not appropriate for any form of dwelling. We need to preserve what we have in the area. Travellers are known to leave their mess around them, this is not what we want on our green belt land.

2. There are insufficient local school places as it is. The children (including my own) in the area will be adversely affected by an influx of travellers who normally have large extended families.

3. Travellers cause trouble, my son was set upon by a group of travellers in Lloyd's Park recently and we now avoid this area when the travellers are illegally staying there. I would like my children to be able to use the local parks and amenities without worrying about people who regularly do not abide by the law of the land.

4. My elderly parents who live in the Shirley hills area are vulnerable victims of crime as it is. Do we really need to add to their fears by making the area less safe with a group of people who generally have no regard for the law.

5. Crime rates in Croydon are up as it is. Do we really need more residents for our already overstretched police force to watch over.

6. And finally, the clue is in the name. These people are travellers and therefore travel, meaning there is no need for a permanent dwelling for them.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
The Council are proposing in total 45 permanent pitches. Both sites are some distance from public services. They should consider instead the expanding the existing site off the Purley Way.

More importantly the Council are in breach of policy E Planning Policy for Traveller Sites published by the Government in August which clearly states: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". The Council have acknowledged both sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest.

The access to both Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge is totally inadequate and the additional traffic would be dangerous. The Council should be promoting the interests of the people of Croydon who they are supposed to represent.

Policy DM43, reference Site 502
Coombe Farm reference Site 661
Coombe Lodge Nurseries and reference Site 755 Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage. I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and Coombe Farm is on a site of an Archaeological Priority Zone and contains an area of Nature Conservation Importance. Such development is in breach of Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that "Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites by 2017 and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough.
I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:-
• Coombe Farm off Oaks Road Reference Number 502
• Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane Reference Number 661

1. What is the Council’s rationale for proposing Traveller Sites on the very land previous illegal incursions, fly tipping and theft have occurred?
2. On what basis has Croydon’s Labour Council rejected the prior Conservative Council’s proposal for a second Traveller site located on the Purley Way, Roundshaw Open Space?
3. Under the Freedom of Information Act, what is the total tax payer investment, Croydon Council has made over the last 5 years securing land, preventing and obstructing illegal incursions?
4. Council representatives are referring to Travellers (universally) as “homeless Croydon residents”, yet they are of ‘no fixed abode’, not registered (with the Council) as homeless, not on the electoral role - let alone contributing to the use of amenities. Please clarify the difference between a ‘resident’ and a ‘visitor’. 
5. Council representatives advise ‘It is the right of a Traveller to live in a caravan and is part of their ethnic rights’. Has an Equality Impact Assessment (Government Planning Document) been conducted to ensure the rights of the settled community are not being infringed? (It is understood this is a requirement where there has been significant local opposition as in the case of Croydon).
6. Please confirm a) whether a traveller must reside within a given schools catchment area to attend and b) whether the proposed sites were selected with this in mind?
7. Actual number of fixed plots revealed during (verbal) consultation was 49, not 39 as documented, indicating likely expansion of a site(s) at later date. (See Dale Farm, Essex for unauthorised ‘sprawl’ beyond designated site)
8. What consideration has the Council given to the societal impact of introducing both Romany Gypsy & Irish Travellers (known to feud) into two locations just 500m apart on local community?
9. Government planning for Gypsies & Travellers determined Green Belt Development as ‘inappropriate’. (See Dale Farm, Essex eviction from Green Belt land). What is the rationale for Croydon looking at Green Belt vs. Brown Field?

9. Two of proposed sites in same Ward and the third in adjoining area, all held as Conservative seats with 2 locations less than 500m apart. Why are there no suitable locations in Labour held seats?

10. Croydon Council acknowledge these proposals will not prevent further illegal incursions, fly tipping, damage and theft at the residents/tax payer’s expense, suggesting more fixed sites are not the solution. The current investments in the prevention of illegal incursions are working to protect the settled community.

11. Coombe Farm itself is a listed building, yet at least one other site was dropped from the shortlist for this very reason. Why has the evaluation criteria for site selection not been applied in an unbiased, uniform manner?

12. Note Basildon Council ended up “leasing” land they did not already own to accommodate travellers. If Croydon Council is blocked from using its own land for the purpose of a Traveller Site, can it be confirmed that the Council will uphold Green Belt planning restrictions and decline private planning applications for the same? (Ref: Dr A Ansari).

13. ‘Homeless’ travellers evicted from Dale Farm returned to their "homes" in Ireland. (4:08 onwards. Http://youtu.be/T253zUOfXe0). What is Croydon Council’s position where a “homless Traveller” owns property? What investigation is carried out into the legitimacy of their homeless claim?

14. Taxpayers in Essex ended up funding Traveller-only amenities such as a community hall. What societal integration studies have been completed for homes, schools & businesses adjoining Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries? Precedent suggests their needs are greater than just plots.

15. Why was Coombe Farm initially considered for both Residential and Traveller site prior to Consultation only to be changed to Traveller-only during Consultation?

16. The proposed Coombe Farm Traveller site is:-
   a) Green Belt
   b) A listed Historic Property
   c) Is within ‘panoramic view’ of
Addington Hills
d) Has a number of covenants on its usage dating back to the 1950's set by the Garwood Family.

17. On what basis has Croydon Council classified these Travellers as homeless? They have the means to purchase their own vehicles, mobile accommodation and plant machinery. Why wouldn't they register with Croydon Council as homeless (if that is indeed their claim) and be 'Means Tested'?

17 a) Council representatives (at the recent Consultation) deemed adding Travellers to the homeless register as 'unworkable' as the housing waiting list was too long. Does this mean Travellers are being given PRIORITY over legitimate refugees and asylum seekers who are already on the housing register?

18. The introduction of a single traveller site (let alone two) in the Green Belt Heathfield Ward will increase localised fly tipping (please see area immediately surrounding the existing fixed site, Latham’s Way, CROYDON) and will therefore be in direct contravention to the NATURE CONSERVATION STRATEGY, Supplementary Planning Guidance No.5 for Croydon on the following grounds;

4.41 "Five of the 8 Golf Courses in Croydon (note; Shirley Park adjoins Oaks Farm) contain all or parts of Metropolitan Nature Conservation Importance in Croydon."

4.63 Problems –cites pollution as one of 7 key problems identified which particularly apply to Croydon."

5.5 "56 sites in Croydon are outlined in the Ecology Handbook 32 'Nature Conservation Guidelines for London' (updated in 1994). The criteria have been used by the Council to protect sites from harmful development through the operation of its own town planning powers."

6.9 Have the "Wardens for the green belt" (a role within the Council) a) been appointed in line with this policy and b) been consulted on the potential impact?

6.6 - Access [to the countryside] for All: "There are physiological & physical barriers [...] putting the countryside beyond the reach of some residents [...] They may be restricted by [list of reasons] or of not feeling safe in the countryside." The presence of at least one Traveller Site will be viewed as a deterrent with valid concerns for the personal safety of local residents and visitors alike.

- What consideration has been given to existing Tree Preservation Orders, Ancient Woodland (Oaks) & Hedgerows both on the Coombe Farm site as well as the shared access? Development of the access
road would lead inevitably to the loss of further wildlife habitat.
- protected species in the area include deer, badgers (sets in and around Coombe Farm) and bats in the listed building & outbuildings.
(4.13, 4.15 & 4.16) "Heathland is one of the rarest habitat types in London. The remnants of "Heather" heathland found on Croham Hurst & Addington Hills [...] are the most significant in London. Heathland is also increasingly rare on a national basis with much of its characteristic wildlife endangered".
Full Document can be found - https://www.croydon.gov.uk/sites/default/files/articles/downloads/spg5.pdf
19. Excerpt from the Aug 2015 'Planning and Travellers: proposed changes to planning policy and guidance' - Consultation response document Specifically: "re: sites on land designated as Green Belt; sites protected under the Birds and Habitats Directive and / or sites designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; Local Green Space; an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, or within a National Park (or the Broads)."
19a. How will the provision of a fixed site prevent the issue of illegal incursion, raised in the above consultation document, specifically Question 10, harm caused by intentional unauthorised occupation? Croydon Council representatives concede it will not, therefore please explain what positive outcome this proposal hopes to produce.
20. Excerpt - Planning policy for Traveller Sites:
"The new policy will help ensure that traveller sites are developed in appropriate places and not on Green Belt land, ensure planning policy is clear and consistent and thus can operate most effectively in a new localist planning system, and reduce community tensions that can arise over perceptions that planning policy for traveller sites is more lenient than planning policy for housing for settled communities." Perception upheld.
20a. During local Consultation, Counsellors advised repeatedly of a Central Government target being applied to Croydon for Traveller Sites. Excerpt from the 'Planning policyholders traveller’s sites - Equality Impact Assessment'
suggests otherwise:  

"Now the Localism Act is in place, the current policy points to a process that no longer exists for setting future traveller site targets because the Act removed the framework for regional strategies meaning that no further regional strategies can be created. The Government will expect local authorities to plan for strategic matters, including accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers, in their Local Plans. Through this process, local authorities will have to justify their policies for traveller site provision using robust evidence that will be tested at the Local Plan examination. However, it will not be clear if the circulars were left in place that local authorities should set targets as part of their decisions on the right level of provision in their areas. The new policy, therefore, asks local authorities to set targets based on their evidence of need and to bring forward land in their plans to meet these." 

21. Under the Freedom of Information Act, please supply burglary, assault, theft, disturbances, illegal incursion, damage and arrest data relating specifically to Travellers of 'No Fixed' address immediately following their arrival up to and including their eviction.

22. Under the Freedom of Information Act, please provide all Environmental Agency data relating to the treatment of Travellers waste during and after their occupation and specifically how a fixed site (providing basic sanitation & waste collection) will prevent illegally fly tipped builders waste all over the surrounding area. (See reports for all prior illegal incursions).

23. How has the London Borough of Croydon involved its Community in the planning of the Coombe Farm and Coombe Gardens Traveller Sites? What opportunity was given by Croydon Council for the local residents to put forward their own ideas and participate in the development of the Sites? See - London Borough of Croydon’s “Statement of Community Involvement - October 2012” (https://www.croydon.gov.uk/sites/default/files/articles/downloads/involvement-oct12.pdf) Reference 2.11 & 2.12 - these Guidance Rules have been ignored

24. In the restrictive Covenants for Coombe Farm, (defined as 80 Oaks Road) which are for "the Settlers and their successors in title" states "No part of the Property shall be used for any offensive noisy, dangerous pursuit or occupation or for any purpose which shall or may be grow to be in any way a nuisance damage grievance or annoyance to
neighbouring properties or the neighbourhood?.
25. There is no pavement access to either of the proposed sites therefore most travel to and from these sites to local amenities, (shops/schools) would be by vehicle – causing even greater traffic problems to the Coombe and Oaks Road junction.
26. If these proposals go ahead will the council be offering ‘blight’ compensation to all of the affected local residents and businesses?
27. Will the travellers be required to pay council tax, rent, gas, electricity, and all other charges?
I look forward to your response to the above questions/concerns.

3028/01/010/DM44.2/O Mr Nick Barnes
Object Soundness - Justified DM44.2 661
Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Road.
None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.

3029/01/008/DM44.2/O Mr Paul Newton
Object Soundness - Justified DM44.2 661
Happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but will be objecting to building on precious open space.
Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:
Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.
The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.

3038/01/008/DM44.2/O Samantha Freeman
Object Soundness - Consistent with National DM44.2 661
In particular I object to -
4. Use of greenbelt land for a traveller site (DM44.2)

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I am writing to protest in the strongest possible terms to the council’s proposals to create traveller sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm.

As you know, both of these sites are in the green belt, with one of them bordering a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, states: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the green belt are inappropriate development.”

The areas of Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm are not wasteland nor are they brownfield sites (as the current travellers’ encampment in Croydon is). Instead, they are precious stretches of green land well loved and well used by Croydon residents for sports and leisure activities. They also provide an invaluable habitat for wildlife, including deer.

I urge you to reconsider and will be continuing to campaign against this entirely inappropriate plan which will result in the desecration of two of Croydon’s valuable green spaces.
I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

I strongly object to this policy and the plan to create a traveller site at this location as it is a greenbelt site and not appropriate for this purpose, as per Policy E of "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites".

I believe this is inappropriate use of a green belt site. Brownfield sites are better suited to this purpose. In addition, government policy states green belt sites are 'inappropriate' for development.

I should like to protest against the site chosen for gypsy camps and a new secondary school being built on green belt. There must be better sites for them as we must protect our green belt sites.

I strongly object to this council building or using Green Belt sites for this and any other purpose. Also high rise flats will upset the balance of the areas. I do accept that we need more housing but these should be build on existing empty or land filled sites.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr Christopher Andrews  

Object  

DM44.2  

661  

Government planning Policy is clear that Traveler Sites are inappropriate developments within a green belt. The plan to create a Traveler Site is not in accordance with Government policy and should not therefore be under consideration.

Change  

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mrs Clare Gardner  

Object  

Soundness - Consistent with National  

DM44.2  

661  

I am writing to object to:

1. The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:  

   • Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661;  
   • Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502;  
   • Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference 756

   as all these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

   (If the Council really needs to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough they should look elsewhere, e.g., off the Purley Way where the existing site is.)

Change  

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr John Kallas  

Object  

DM44.2  

661  

The preferred approach would not be appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3 due to the following reasons:

1 Green Belt.  

   The proposal to create a permanent traveller site on land designated as Green Belt land is contrary to Policy E of the DCLG “Planning policy for traveller sites” (August 2015) (“the Planning Policy”)  

2 Access to amenities

   The site is well away from schools (particularly primary school provision), shops, doctors, dentists, etc., and clearly does not reflect the above aim, or facilitate regular school attendance.

3 Adverse effect on neighbouring businesses and leisure facilities

   It would not be practicable to site a traveller site adjacent to the proposed new school in Coombe Road Playing Fields, since the combined effect of additional school and traveller traffic would be too much.

An alternative and appropriate use of the Coombe Lodge Nursery site would be to use it for the school otherwise proposed for Coombe Road Playing Fields. To site the school on the playing fields is entirely inappropriate as it would eliminate a facility that is already used by other schools in the borough. If the school is built on the nursery site, the playing fields would be preserved for the new school’s use and for other schools as at present.

Change  

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Object DM44.2 661  I object to the use of the site for a gypsy and traveller site. As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change  This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object DM44.2 661  Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 (p179). The council plans to create a Gypsy/Traveller site here. This is a greenbelt site, and it is not appropriate for this purpose.

Change  This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object DM44.2 661  I wish to comment on the proposals for the following sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane (site 661) The proposal to use these sites as gypsy and traveller sites does not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Both sites are clearly isolated in respect of local services. Site 661 would be unsuitable for school use as it lacks access to nearby public transport. Both sites would be acceptable for residential development and at least would not be worse served than some other housing in the area.

Change  This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 661</th>
<th>Site reference 661 - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane and site reference 502 Coombe Farm off Oaks Road - both sites would constitute inappropriately development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. The proposals conflict with policy. The proposed options does not achieve sustainable development as it will compromise the ability of future generations to sustain Green Belt and SSSI as well as Nature Conservation.</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<p>| Object | DM44.2 661 | Third, the Council has identified two locations on the edge of Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane. I am objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in Green Belt areas and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in Croydon why don’t you develop the existing site at Purley Way? It is an outrage that our diminishing open spaces will be turned into Gypsy sites. Coombe Road is so busy. It is the link between Shirley, Addington, Forest Hill, Warlingham, Selby etc to central Croydon. It does not need more traffic nor traveller sites on it. We should be trying to diminish traveller sites, not expanding them or using valuable land to allow for more. I currently work for the Department of Work and Pensions and we have a joint operation with the local Police and other local service providers in our area to reduce fraud, rubbish, fly tipping etc. and we have been very successful in concentrating our efforts on gypsy areas. I do not want that for Croydon, especially near to where I live and where my children will grow up. My husband has his own house removals business and the amount of families he is moving from Croydon to other areas in England is astonishing. These families are not just moving down the road to the next borough to get away from Croydon, they are moving to Sussex, Devon, and Scotland etc. I wonder why??? | Change | This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3089/01/003</td>
<td>DM44.2/661</td>
<td>Mr Paul Grant</td>
<td>Site reference 661 – Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane and site reference 502 Coombe Farm off Oaks Road – both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3090/01/002</td>
<td>DM44.2/661</td>
<td>Mr Paul Gaines</td>
<td>I send you this email to state my objections to your current plans for the proposed traveller site at conduit lane.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3091/01/006</td>
<td>DM44.2/661</td>
<td>Mr Paul Gomm</td>
<td>Please note my objection to the following policy reference numbers within your current draft plan for planning &amp; development.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3094/01/001</td>
<td>DM44.2/661</td>
<td>Mr Paul Foster</td>
<td>Soundness - Consistent with National Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 (p179).</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Ben Lynam
Object DM44.2
661
Policy DM43, reference Site 502
Coombe Farm reference Site 661
Coombe Lodge Nurseries and
reference Site 755 Pear Tree Farm
and Pear Tree Cottage. I object to the
use of any of these locations for the
creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All
three locations are within the Green
Belt and Coombe Farm is on a site of
an Archaeological Priority Zone and
contains an area of Nature
Conservation Importance. Such
development is in breach of Policy E
of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites,
which says that “Traveller Sites
(temporary or permanent) in the Green
Belt are inappropriate development”. All
three sites are also a considerable
distance from public
services. I believe that the proposal
to create three new Gypsy/Traveller
sites by 2017 and 39 by 2036 is
excessive and will have an adverse
effect on the borough.

Mr Derrick Thurley
Object DM44.2
661
Locations for 15 to 25 gypsy/traveller
sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries off
Conduit Lane
These are both on Green Belt land
which is in breach of Government
policy which states as being
inappropriate development. Existing
site at Purley Way should be
expanded

Gillian Custance
Object DM44.2
661
I oppose to the site of Coombe Lodge
Nurseries being used as a travellers’
site for the following reasons.
Coombe Gardens and café are an
area of natural beauty an oasis in the
Croydon area. They are our pride and
joy not only visited by people who live
in Croydon but by people who live
outside the area. We, as Croydon
residents, are very proud of them.
They are a peaceful tranquil area to
get refreshments and then followed
by a walk around the picturesque
gardens. If you allow a travellers’ site
to be built all this will change. The
businesses in the area will suffer
huge losses and probably even close
down. I can understand the need for
a permanent site but this is not the
location. It will also have a
detrimental affect on adjoining owners.
I am asking you to walk around this
site and imagine the changes it will
bring to the elderly, children and
families who value this area, gardens
and café.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of
residential development, including Gypsy and
Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial
machinery located on an
adjacent site. Therefore, the
proposed allocation will be
deleted and an alternative
site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Site Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3102/02/03/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Richard Horton</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I wish to log my objection to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Coombe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Coombe Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3103/02/06/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Varsha Patel</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Varsha Patel

Object

DM44.2 661

Build a school please?

School is a viable option as there are no schools in our area. The Plan makers have missed a big point that existing infrastructure cannot cope with the influx of additional population at such a fast pace. Also, it has to be planned over a few years. It should never be on a green belt attached to a green belt sites as it is disastrous for the environment. There are quite a few brownfield sites in Croydon. Those should be explored. What are the criteria behind selecting two sites within 1 mile of each other? The plan makers do not know the grass root situation. They have just assumed things without knowing the facts. This is a grave situation. There are quite a few public and independent schools in the nearby area. Building a new school will support the resident and nearby citizens. Besides we do not have a grammar school in Croydon. So it would be ideal if we build a grammar school in Croydon on one of the proposed sites. Existing infrastructure just cannot cope with additional population in Croydon:

1) We have to wait at least 4-5 days to get a dr’s appointment
2) We have wait for at least 15 minutes to get a turn to play swing/ball for my son in any local park. The parks are so crowded during summer. Already children are getting very less exercise. If 40 families come over with more than 80 children then it would be extremely over crowded.
3) There are not enough schools in the area. We should build more schools.
4) There is very limited green space in Croydon. Government policy states that you cannot build temporary or permanent sites on green belt.
5) Conduit lane is a no drive through zone. Increased traffic due to a planned school and travellers sites will cause traffic chaos.
6) We need green belts for good health of the citizens. Steps like these would encourage the encroachment of green belts.

Build a school instead of a travellers site.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
The proposals to locate traveller sites at Coombe Farm, Ref 502 and Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Ref 661, are both inappropriate. As the Council acknowledges, both sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development."

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is). The proposals to locate traveller sites at Coombe Farm, Ref 502 and Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Ref 661, if adopted, would compromise the ability of the current generation and future generations to enjoy these green spaces. Enjoyment of green spaces is a basic need of any community. This is particularly relevant given the redevelopment of Croydon and the fact that many more people will be living in the centre of Croydon and will want and need to use these green spaces ("green lungs" of Croydon. Companies looking to relocate businesses to Croydon do not only consider factors such as cost, transport links and housing for staff - they also consider environmental factors. The damage to these two green spaces, which would inevitably arise should these proposals go ahead, would make Croydon a less attractive place to live in and would discourage businesses relocation to the area. This would reduce employment opportunities for Croydon’s residents. SP2.7 makes no mention of impact on the surroundings of the site or local residents. Accordingly, an additional criterion should be added as follows: “f. Must be entirely acceptable in relation to its impact on nearby public spaces and residents and businesses in the area” If this were included in the proposals, Ref. 502 Coombe Farm and Ref 661, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, would immediately be inappropriate. Coombe Farm is green belt land and Lloyd Park, Lloyd Park was left to the people of Croydon by the Lloyd Family. At present families enjoy the open space, children play in the play
area, joggers and walkers exercise, people walk their dogs, sports are played, and families snack in the café. Coombe Lodge Nursery is by the lovely gardens of Coombe Wood with its popular tea room and wooded area.

The proposals RE 502 and ref 661 if implemented would not be in accordance with the Green Grid concept (reference green Spaces 6.15, 6.16) in that they would significantly damage these two valuable assets and discourage their use by the residents of Croydon. I note under the Plan: “Local Green Spaces which make a contribution to the borough’s heritage value, visual character, recreational opportunities, tranquility, and amenity qualities will be protected and safeguarded. These proposals would have exactly the opposite effect.

I would make the following comments on the “Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers”:

A) The scoring system does not reflect the importance of the preservation of Green Spaces and is inconsistent with the Green Grid concept.

B) For both sites the scoring appears highly subjective.

C) In particular for both sites the scores for “green space”, “impact on local character”, “privacy”, and “local character” need to be reconsidered - they are all quite clearly wrong.

D) Site 502 is on a single track lane with very narrow access to Oaks Road. It would be practically inaccessible for large mobile homes. This fact is not reflected in the assessment.

E) For both sites “GB/MOL” is shown as amber and should therefore be minus 5 not plus 5.

F) The “social deprivation” criterion is illogical as pressures on local services apply equally across Croydon. If one was considering a large area such as a Country Park it would make sense; it makes no sense at the borough level. This criterion should be removed from the assessment.

I would recommend that this Assessment be reassessed by an independent party. I am sure that such a reassessment would indicate the unsuitability of these two sites.

I value Lloyd Park and Coombe Wood very highly, as, I am sure, do many other residents of Croydon. Lloyd Park and Coombe Wood are important and irreplaceable assets of our town, to be cherished. They should not be damaged by proceeding with these proposals.
Mrs Michelle Sawyer

Object

DM44.2 661

It is inappropriate development to locate Travellers sites at Coombe Farm (502) and Coombe Lodge Nurseries (661) as they are both in the Green belt.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Dr Natasha Newlands

Object

DM44.2 661

I am writing regarding two proposed Traveller site developments at the Coombe Lodge Nurseries (661). I am concerned about these developments for a number of reasons:

1) The two sites are proposed to be in locations that are not in easy walking distance of everyday amenities such as shops, schools and health services. This will mean that the Travellers who move in to these sites will have to drive to use these services adding further burden to an already very congested main route in to Croydon, Coombe Road.

2) Local schools and health services are also already stretched in catering for the current local population.

3) I feel it is important to discuss these propositions with local residents as many are unaware of the plans. It may alter how residents and visitors use the park and also the developments are likely to have a significant impact on local businesses.

4) Coombe Farm is situated within Lloyd Park and any change in usage should comply with the conditions with which it was donated.

5) These sites are in Green Belt areas and government publications advise that Traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate developments - Ref: Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr Dominic Quinn

A3 Architecture London LTD

Object

DM44.2 661

Object to the Travellers site as it would be in breach of government guidance and there would be no services local to the area.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference Code</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3111/02/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Nikhil Chandarana</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Effective DM44.2 661</td>
<td>A school should be built on this site. We do not have a grammar school in Croydon so it would be ideal to build one on this site. Existing infrastructure cannot cope and there are not enough schools to cope with the influx of population in Croydon.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3111/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Nikhil Chandarana</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Effective DM44.2 661</td>
<td>A school should be built on this site. We do not have a grammar school in Croydon so it would be ideal to build one on this site. Existing infrastructure cannot cope and there are not enough schools to cope with the influx of population in Croydon.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3112/01/004/DM44.2/C</td>
<td>Mr Paras Shah</td>
<td>Object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7c.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

02 September 2016  Page 3151 of 4384
Object

DM44.2

Not in line with government planning policy on the Green Belt.

Detail:

- Government planning policy with regards to traveller sites wants to ensure that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development.
- The proposal to create a permanent traveller site on land designated as Green Belt land is contrary to Policy E of the Planning Policy "Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances". There are no very special circumstances.
- The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that unmet housing need (including traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the "very special circumstances". Justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt.
- The local character description is clearly at odds with the proposal.
- The justification acknowledges the Green Belt issue, although insufficiently, but relies on the fact that there are existing structures. These are not in fact substantial, being glass houses - and could be said to be at least environmentally consistent with the Green Belt. But there is no very special circumstance justification proposed as required by the planning policies.
- Approving the proposal would set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to be subject to similar development. It is not in the community's interests to allow the erosion of the green spaces surrounding the community and we object to the impact this site could have on the environment and wildlife. The fact that this is a green belt area should be the end of the discussion. Green belt areas are designated as such, and should not be allowed to be disrupted when it is suitable for these Council. This opens up the area to manipulation, and is not in line with the character of the area.
- The current residents should be able to decide how they see the area being developed, and the current crisis around school places is much higher on the priority list. The needs of the majority of children and residents should not be swept aside. This is not a democratic outcome.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
My main objections are:

Both sites are some distance from the nearest public services, making them inherently inappropriate locations for the purpose intended. Increased congestion in the adjacent, and rather narrow, local roads. In turn, this will result in increased pollution and accident black-spots. Both sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, states: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. If enacted, the Council would be in breach of that policy.

Conclusion

The proposals I have highlighted can only been viewed as negative. If adopted, they will increase the local population - and the density of that population - without providing any supporting infrastructure. The new residents from the planned apartment blocks and traveller sites will need additional public services such as schools, medical services and shops. Older residents will give way to young families who require greater social support, yet no additional resources are identified to help manage the changing demographic. Traffic congestion along already busy roads will increase, as will pollution and accident black-spots. The few remaining green spaces will disappear. Overall, the proposals signal a reduction in the quality of life for both the existing residents and the newcomer.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

I want to object very strongly to the use of Conduit Lane (661) and Coombe Farm (502) being used as gypsy and traveller sites. It would be totally inappropriate for these greenfield, Green Belt sites being used for this kind of development. It would also be in contravention of other policies (SP2.7a and SP2.7c) which are there to protect the green grid.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
With reference to the above mentioned document, I am writing to strongly object to the following: The use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:
1. Coombe Farm off Oaks Road (reference no. 502)
2. Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane (reference no. 661)

The selection of these sites is clearly in breach of Policy E of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites - published by Government in August 2015, which clearly states;
"Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the green belt are in inappropriate development."

Can you please confirm why the Council is considering the use of Green Belt sites over Brownfield sites?

I live very close to the above mentioned sites and feel that this inappropriate development will destroy the local area and community. I have worked extremely hard to be able to afford to live in this area and would like the Council to re-consider their proposal.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites on Green Belt Land:

- Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661

This site will very much change the character of the area and should be located on alternative disused industrial sites, not our precious green space.

When camped illegally near the hills, these people have shown no respect for local residents or our beautiful surroundings. The children sped across Addington Hills on electric scooters and cars making it very dangerous for families, dog walkers and their dogs who have made good use of this location for many years. The rubbish and excrement was abysmal.

The proposed locations of these sites will adversely affect the local businesses such as the Coombe Garden Café, as no doubt the parking bays will be in constant use by the travellers and not available to those people who frequently use the café but who have to drive to that location. It will make Conduit Lane and other local roads a hazard. The local schools are also not within walking distance of these sites and as there is very little public transport nearby this will put more pressure on the already overcrowded tram.

As someone who has lived in Shirley for 25 years and a frequent walker in our surrounding area I see these proposals changing our local environment for the worst.

Please, please, please do not proceed with these sites but find alternatives away from our precious green space.

---

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3128/02/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Francis Kingsley Jones</td>
<td>Object DM44.2 661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the proposed use has serious drawbacks that are not adequately recognised in the Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers. Thus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• access to essential services is difficult, involving the use of a single busy road (or the use of Tramlink, the nearest stops of which are some distance away);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• there are no local shops;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• while there have been greenhouses on the site, the purpose and nature of such constructions and the small amount of traffic involved mean that it is effectively a green space, so it would not in any real sense be a case of replacing existing buildings; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• the proximity of Coombe Lodge Gardens means that biodiversity and the public enjoyment of the gardens would be adversely affected by the constant movement of people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3128/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Francis Kingsley Jones</td>
<td>Object DM44.2 661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Although the site may meet some of the specific site criteria, the proposed use has serious drawbacks that are not adequately recognised in the Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers. Thus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• access to essential services is difficult, involving the use of a single busy road (or the use of Tramlink, the nearest stops of which are some distance away);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• there are no local shops;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• while there have been greenhouses on the site, the purpose and nature of such constructions and the small amount of traffic involved mean that it is effectively a green space, so it would not in any real sense be a case of replacing existing buildings; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• the proximity of Coombe Lodge Gardens means that biodiversity and the public enjoyment of the gardens would be adversely affected by the constant movement of people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the impact on Coombe Lodge Gardens would be deleterious. Even if it was possible to slow the effect, the eventual result on future generations would be an inability without the need for large-scale investment to provide the opportunities for outdoor activity and refreshment that are currently met by Coombe Lodge Gardens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Laurie King

**Object**

DM44.2

661

Gypsy / Traveller sites in Featherbed Lane and off Coombe Road / Conduit Lane / Oaks Lane - These areas are Green Belt so why would the Council consider these suitable for such developments when this contravenes the current legislation? Additionally, the areas currently have considerable residential and community leisure activities and facilities, so again why would the Council be wanting to destroy the environment to create these Gypsy/Traveller sites for persons of no fixed abode and who are temporary residents to the borough only. It strikes me that this is an imbalance of priorities over the current fixed residents of Croydon and a set of proposals that I object to most strongly.

No change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Carole Shorey

**Object**

DM44.2

661

I am emailing to object to a number of the proposals.

My parents live in Forestdale so are close to Addington and Shirley and I worry for them if there are more gypsy sites located in the area.

My son was involved in a road traffic incident with a traveller from the Layhams Farm site, the traveller caused the accident by pulling out of the road next to the site in front of my son's oncoming right of way car, he then jumped out of his car and ran from the scene and the police were too frightened to enter the site. My view of the police has been very jaded since this incident. My son could have been killed in this crash. If the police are too frightened to patrol these sites, these people are above the law. I definitely do not want to see more sites in or around my local area, I feel very strongly about this.

I basically do not agree with many of the plans listed in Gavins email. I do agree we need more housing but that is mainly because too many people are being let into the country in the first place, housing them all is not the answer as other amenities will not be able to cope even if we build more houses.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Carolyn Heath

Object  
DM44.2  
661  

I am writing to object to:  
1. The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:  
   • Coombe Lodge Nurseries (site ref 661)  
   • Coombe Farm off Oaks Road (site ref 502)  
   • Poppy Lane (site ref 128)  
   • Stroud Green Pumping Station (site ref 504)  
   • Shirley Oaks Road/Beech House (site ref 541)  
   • Shirley Oaks Road (site ref 542)  
   • Honeysuckle Gardens (site ref 548)  
   • Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Cottage (site ref 755)  

All areas provide vital green space in already densely populated areas, and there is insufficient infrastructure to cope with the additional traffic/population. Some of these areas are in the Green Belt, others are in Metropolitan Open Land. They would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Change  

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Caroline Kohn

Object  
DM44.2  
661  

I am writing concerning the draft Croydon Local Plan. I have objections to the sites which have been designated for travellers sites including Coombe Lodge Nurseries Policy DM44 Site number 661, and Coombe Farm, Policy DM43, Site 502.

While accepting the need for appropriate sites for travellers and gypsies, I question the ability of the Council with current levels of resourcing to manage an increased number of sites effectively. In addition, this will be a new, permanent development on green belt land, which is against government policy.

Access to and from the site on a dangerous section of Coombe Road will impact on traffic flow and road safety.

There is no access to local amenities at these sites, including shops, schools and doctors surgeries, something recommended for travellers sites.

There is also a concern that there will be a negative impact on the environment of Coombe Woods, its biodiversity and the contamination of groundwater.

Change  

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I do not agree with the plans for Coombe Nurseries. Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr Clive Hodgson

I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as travellers / gypsy sites:
- Coombe farm site (ref no 502)
- Coombe lodge nurseries (ref no 661)

Both sites are in a beautiful green belt area which the public use a lot. I believe national guidelines do not agree with the use of green belt areas for these sites.

There are covenants which bind Croydon council to use the Lloyd park area only for recreational purposes which does not include these proposed sites.

The lane from busy oaks rd to Coombe farm is very narrow with potholes and no pavements, the lighting is poor and obviously this area is not suitable for lots of heavy traffic and caravans.

The families who would live on these sites would have children and need to use the lane to get to all needs facilities such as shops, schools, buses and trams etc.

There would be much coming and going along the narrow lane on to busy oaks rd and Coombe rd which are main thoroughfares to Croydon. This all creates a dangerous situation.

Nearby is Cedars school who use Lloyd park for rugby and other sports and this school is receiving more pupils in the future increasing the number of vehicle and people movement in the area of Lloyd park and the main roads to and from Croydon.

Large number of people use not only Lloyd park but also the nearby conduit lane, these visitors need to park in conduit lane to go to Coombe woods and gardens and to the local cafe there.

School parties often visit these woods and have to use conduit lane and it would be crazy and dangerous to have gypsy travellers using this lane to get to a permanent site there.

All of us have seen the terrible mess that these travellers have created wherever they have been and the owner of Coombe farm has himself allowed rubbish accumulation on his land in Lloyd park which the public have had to complain about.

The Coombe farm and conduit lane areas are just not suitable for permanent gypsy travellers sites and the council should find more suitable areas with less problems.

CHANGE

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 661</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Dinnick</td>
<td>I live on the Forestdale Estate and thankfully our management committee via Gavin have advised us of the Councils plans to build three gypsy/traveller sites in the Green Belt. I totally agree with Gavin that these plans will completely change the character of parts of the borough, including where I live. As resident of Croydon and employee of Croydon Council I completely understand the need for more housing and I am looking forward to the regeneration taking place in the town centre over the next few years. However one of the reasons I love Croydon and continue to defend its negative reputation is the mix of city feel and countryside. If the Council continue with these plans you will effect the character of the area and you will ultimately fail in your efforts to change peoples perception of Croydon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3140/01/003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr David Harwood</td>
<td>(2) I object to the following sites for use of Traveller sites at the following locations: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502 Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661 Pear Tree Farm &amp; Pear Tree Cottage reference number 755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3145/01/006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Cooper</td>
<td>I would like to object to parts of the recent Croydon Local Plan with particular reference to the following proposals, as they all will lead to degradation of the natural environment: DM2 Infill building on existing gardens DM44.2 Table 11.17 site 661 Loss of Green belt (It's there for a reason!) There must be more suitable site DM44.2 Table 11.17 site 662 Loss of Green belt DM31.4 Reclassification of areas of special interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3147/01/002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I'm writing to protest about the Council’s plan to designate two areas of Green Belt land (reference numbers 502, 661 and 775) suitable for gypsy/traveller sites. I acknowledge that such sites are needed but NOT on Green Belt land. I believe it is unlawful to build on such land and once this is ignored one wonders how far it will be allowed to encroach by default over the years. In fact I believe that Government policy states that traveller sites (temporary or permanent) on the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The use of the following locations to be established as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; I believe both sites would be found an inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would be in breach of Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b, in addition to Policy SP7.2 and the protection of the green grid or with 6.15 Strategic Objective 10 relating to the green grid.

I believe both sites would be found an inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would be in breach of Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b, in addition to Policy SP7.2 and the protection of the green grid or with 6.15 Strategic Objective 10 relating to the green grid.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
3162/01/024/DM44.2/O Mr Joe Toner

Object DM44.2

I would like to voice my objection to the following plan DM44.2

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

3164/01/004/DM44.2/O Jenny White

Object DM44.2

A traveller site proposed to be situated in Conduit Lane next to Coombe Wood Gardens, this is greenbelt A and is not appropriate for travellers to be sited here.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

3182/01/002/DM44.2/O Rev Simon Foster

Object Soundness - Consistent with National DM44.2

I am writing to object to: 1. The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: • Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; • Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b, with Policy SP7.2 and the protection of the green grid or with 6.15 Strategic Objective 10 relating to the green grid.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

3185/01/006/DM44.2/O Mr Stephen Woodward

Object DM44.2

We have lived in Sanderstead for over 40 years, and have thoroughly enjoyed the areas to the south of Croydon being unspoilt. In our view these ill conceived proposals will change this area beyond recognition and take away that for which it is well known and valued. Please rethink, and do not continue with the proposed policies set out below and which can be found in your Local Plan: Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 (p179). This is a greenbelt site, and it is not appropriate to put a traveller site here. Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr Simon Taylor

Object

DM44.2

661

I am writing to object to the proposed new travellers site at Coombe Farm and Conduit lane.

The siting of a permanent traveller camp will have a serious detrimental effect on the local areas Residents and Businesses, and our ability to enjoy safely the local area and amenities.

The Premier inn and Coombe lodge are major draws in the immediate area adjacent to conduit lane and Coombe farm. I have seen first-hand in areas in and around parts of Chelmsford where large groups travellers have completely overwhelmed local businesses including bars & restaurants and leisure facilities rendering them unusable by anyone else unconnected with the traveller community.

On a couple of occasions recently we have seen Travellers illegally set up camp in Sunken Road next to Coombe lane tram stop. This road and the near surrounding areas become a ‘no go ’ area with mountains of rubbish dumped in the road and in Shirley hills. We see youths riding around on motorbikes in the parks and woods without helmets apparently unchecked by the local Police force. This coincides with a rise in thefts from Gardens and Sheds in the area, as well as an increase in unsolicited and sometimes aggressive doorstep sales techniques for various building or landscaping works.

We are absolutely positive that this area cannot support a large community of people that will not assimilate, and actively distance themselves from the wider community in this area.

Sheila Childs

Object

DM44.2

661

I attended the open meeting on Wed 25th in Seladon and wish to express my concern over the 3 proposed travellers sites. Whilst I understand the council have to provide these I have to ask why are they all within a few miles of each other and all south of the borough ? Indeed the Oaks Farm and Conduit lane are only yard away. If you could address these proximity issues I would be pleased to hear why they cannot be more evenly spread and assume the plans will improve assess to them .
Sheila Wicks
Object
DM44.2
661

It is inappropriate to put a Gypsy / Travellers Site here. Policy E of planning policy for travellers site published by government says quite clearly Travellers Site temporary or permanent in Green belt are inappropriate development. Even considering two sites right close to one another is unbelievable. It will kill the trade of the three restaurants close by to the proposed sites stone dead. The smaller restaurant is run by local people who have taken ages to build up their trade. Why not support instead of destroy local businesses? I know of another restaurant not far away who had travellers come into it demanding children’s meals for many adults, manager hid and the staff were terrified and the police refused to come. I have seen a shopkeeper in Elmfield visibly upset by travellers coming in en-masse into a shop. Just recently Shortlands have had Travellers coming into shops wanting to change large money notes without buying anything and when the shopkeepers in a small row of shops asked the police for help, nothing. I remember the Sunken Road at the top of Gravel Hill when the Council had to foot the bill of a clean up when the Travellers went. I think the travellers should be housed on an open site where I have previously seen them live unofficially before - Purley Way

Sharon Smith
Object
DM44.2
661

I am writing to support my local MP Chris Phelp in his objections

Mr Stephen Massey
Object
DM44.2
661

I would like to register my objection to the proposed pitches for travellers/gypsy sites (ref 502 & ref 661). These are in an area of Green Belt and Metropolitan open land. As a resident of this area on Sandpits Road I strongly object these changes would massively effect the character of our area, the waste from when they have previously camped there was strewn all over the neighbouring roads for weeks after they had moved.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
3. The use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:
   - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502;
   - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; and
   - Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 755;

   As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

   “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

   The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

   Change

   This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Sarah Anderson

Object

I would like to make my objection known regarding the proposed travellers sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane and Coombe Farm, Oaks Road. Detrimental to the amenities of adjoining owners, inappropriate use of green belt land. Sites that are located on the green belt, considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and against Government Policy (planning policy for Traveller sites DCLG, Aug 2015). Lack of relevant Amenities close at hand. Insufficient local infrastructure to accommodate the plans. Selection of proposed sites should have a bias towards Brownfield or Industrial Land and not Green Belt. The two proposed sites are in very close proximity to one another Imbalances across the borough with all sites being proposed in South Croydon. Could the existing permanent Gypsy Site in Lathams Way be expanded? If one has to select one of the proposed sites, the preference is for Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane.

Saundra Dudman

Object

Soundness - Consistent with National

6) Gypsy/traveller site Policy DM44.2 Table 11.17 site 661 p179 green belt site. The Governments Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller sites published in August States that Green Belt sites are inappropriate for this type of permanent or temporary development, and I wholly agree with this.

Mr Paul Ashton

Object

I would like to register my strong objection to the Council’s proposals for the consideration of Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries as gypsy/traveller sites (Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals). The sites are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. The Government’s policy is I believe that traveller sites should not be located in the Green Belt, but that hardly needs stating, surely? I cannot imagine why such sites would be considered at all, or in preference to other, clearly more suitable and higher-scoring sites cited in Assessment and selection of sites for Gypsy and Travellers August 2015 – there appears to be no logic to this approach.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Patricia Jakaman  
Object DM44.2  
661  
I object to the proposal to create three gypsy/traveller sites reference numbers 502/661/755. All sites are in the Green Belt which makes them an inappropriate development. In addition they are some distance from schools, public services etc.

No change  
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr Peter Douty  
Object DM44.2  
661  
I wish to record my objections to this Plan as set out below: 

3. Policy DM44.2, Table 11-17, Site 661. Government Policy for ‘Traveller Sites’ states that these are an inappropriate development in the ‘Green Belt’. 

Change  
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr Peter Kenny  
Object DM44.2  
661  
I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gipsy/traveller sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502 Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661

Change  
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr Peter Howard  
Object DM44.2  
661  
I as a resident in Shirley, strongly object to gipsy/traveller encampments being built in Shirley area, and your proposal to put houses on Green belt land, and wholeheartedly agree with the Views of Gavin Barwell, MP. This land was left to ensure the residents in London had “Lungs” from the Pollution of the City and its environs. Next you will be wanting to put industrial units in the Green Belt!!

Change  
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Wayne Starr  
Object DM44.2  
661  
re Traveller Site at Conduit Lane near Coombe Wood Gardens. Seems to be in direct contravention of stated government policy that says development of Green Belt land for traveller sites is inappropriate development. This seems a perfectly reasonable stance to preserve to amenity of an area that should not be ignored by the local council.

Change  
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Detrimental to the Amenities of Adjoining owners, inappropriate use of Green Belt Land against government policy ("planning policy for Traveller Sites" DCLG Aug 2015), lack of relevant Amenities close at hand and insufficient local infrastructure to accommodate the plans. Alternative suggested sites: Pear tree farm & Pear tear cottage, Addington.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller site as it would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Object

The location in Green Belt should preclude all development per se apart from GDO rights to the few existing dwellings at Coombe Farm. The Conduit Lane site has been rejected in the past as unsuitable. Such erosion of the Green Belt runs wholly against the interests of the local community. It would set a precedent that can be used to further erode local and national planning policy. The impact would be more pronounced on both sites as the subject Group need mixed use sites. This is because they often run businesses from where they live. This issue is not addressed by the Consultation. Such a mixed use requirement is wholly inappropriate on both sites. Both sites are not deliverable now. Each would require the construction of a new access road as a minimum particularly to Coombe Farm. The construction of a two lane highway here with footpaths either side is bound to change the semi rural nature of this location as the existing access here is a narrow lane. A new access at Conduit Lane might be shorter but would put further pressure onto an already dangerous staggered junction with Oaks Road. This is again contrary to current policy. The Coombe Farm site is bound to require the application of more scarce resources into the maintenance of Lloyd Park if a large number of new residents are located onto its edge. This is a facility that serves the whole Borough, not just the surrounding area. Any impact here due to the development will affect adversely many in the Borough. Coombe Farm is not immediately available and as such again puts it outside Government policy. The proposal highlights the proximity to public transport at both sites. This is a consideration of low importance here as the subject socio-economic group concerned are known to be infrequent users of public transport. It ignores however the clear lack of local facilities nearby. The lack of local facilities goes against the stated preference of the particular Group concerned to be within a short walk of everyday amenities. These circumstances will promote the use of personal vehicles which is against environmental policy. The proposal mentions only the number of pitches at each site. No account is taken of the number of people who might use each site due to the tight knit nature of the subject community. The number of residents may therefore result in overcrowding which will be difficult to control. This is detrimental to public health and so in breach of environmental
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3266/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Mark Ashley</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the proposed plans for two locations in Shirley to be used as traveller sites as detailed below: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, which is identified as suitable for 15-25 pitches (pages 468-469, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 661).</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3269/01/003/DM44.2/C</td>
<td>Mr Matthew Searles</td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 1. The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombs Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b;</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3271/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Matthew Miller</td>
<td>I wish to oppose plans to erect a Travellers site on the site of Coombe Lodge Flower Nurseries on Conduit Lane, South Croydon for 3 reasons. Firstly, it will have a detrimental effect on trade to businesses nearby such as Coombe Lodge, the Coach House &amp; Chateau Napoleon. Secondly, it will have a detrimental effect on an attractive part of the borough which has a mixture of nice properties and beautiful woodlands. Thirdly, New Addington would be a far better site.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please do not destroy your area of responsibility. DM2 will lead to more flooding - it's already happened in Purley through too much development. DM40.4 the Government want us to be fitting and this is the only public swimming pool in the area. DM44.2 Coombe Wood Gardens - a beautiful area for your voters both north and south of the borough the green belt is precious to everyone. DM28 If you don't want to destroy local businesses you must allow people to park their cars. More homes will just mean more cars.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

With reference to the Local Plan which has been proposed, please note my objection to the following policies:

- Garden Grabbing > Policy DM2
- Purley Skyscraper authorisation > Policy DM40.1
- Purley Pool > Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30
- Purley Parking > Policy 40.4, Table 11.3.
- Sanderstead "Lidl" Site > Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306
- Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane, next to Coombe Wood Gardens > Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661
- Loss of Green Belt – (1) Coombe Playing Fields, (2) Croham Hurst, (3) Sanderstead Plantation > The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662
- Lack of Parking in new developments > Policy DM28
- More Protection; Less "Intensification" > Policy DM31.4

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661, policy number DM44; and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502, policy number DM43. pear tree farm and pear tree farm cottage on featherbed lane, site reference number 755, policy number DM32. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites e.g. the site off the Purley Way or by smaller developments on the Croydon Airport site which is currently wasteland. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards. The current road traffic on Coombe Road is heavy and this will only serve to add to the congestion.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr Terrence McCarthy Object I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502; and Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference number 755. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites e.g. the site off the Purley Way or by smaller developments on the Croydon Airport site which is currently wasteland. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards. The current road traffic on Coombe Road is heavy and this will only serve to add to the congestion.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Terry Lewin Object I object to the use of the site as a traveller site.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr William Harland Object I am writing to object to: 1. The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; ...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness -</th>
<th>DM44.2</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Matthew Dickson</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is absolutely crazy to allow or encourage development on green belt land and/or green spaces in such a built-up area as Croydon; people need green spaces for numerous leisure and recreation activities. From a general health point of view people need to be able to play sport or go for a walk. After the Paris summit isn't it obvious that action is needed to arrest the damaging consequences of climate change. Green spaces absorb carbon dioxide, they are the green lungs of towns and cities. Allowing woods and tress to be destroyed is environmental vandalism and flies in the face of climate change science.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Kearnon</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly object to the Council's proposals for gypsy/traveller sites at Coombe Farm (Ref 502) and Coombe Lodge Nurseries (Ref 661). Both these sites are in the Green Belt and the proposals are contrary to Government policy (Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller sites) which states &quot;Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development&quot;. The sites are also unsuitable as they are not near any public services and would completely change the character of the area in an extremely detrimental way. If more space must be provided, why not expand the existing site off the Purley Way?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Matthew Blanshard</td>
<td>Soundness -</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am writing to strongly object to proposals to changes in Shirley regarding changing the classification of green areas from MOL so it can be built on along with proposals to create traveller sites near Coombe gardens or the farm. Shirley has always been a beautiful place with lots of green land, please don't ruin it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
3294/01/002/DM44.2/O Mr Barry O'Neal  
Object DM44.2 661  
I object in the strongest possible way to the plans outlined for this development in my local area, Shirley and Addiscombe. In particular, I understand the Council has identified two locations on the edge of Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites. I object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". The Council's approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough, I think they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change  
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

3312/01/006/DM44.2/O Mr Richard Brandwood  
Object DM44.2 661  
In my years of dog walking at Lloyd Park, there has been a number of occasions where travellers have set up site for weeks at a time. They seem to have no respect for the park and leave rubbish and mess all around. Plus they do not clean up after their animals which is a hazard for my young children who often use the park. Another concern of mine is the impact which travellers will have on the ratings of local schools and also the decrease in house prices. It is exciting times for Croydon with the new building developments, including Westfield - much needed for the reputation of Croydon after the riots and fires of 4 years ago. I strongly urge you not to approve the proposals for the traveller sites at Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries. It will result in good families and people who care about the community moving away from Croydon.

Change  
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

3314/01/002/DM44.2/O Mrs Dawn White  
Object DM44.2 661  
In my years of dog walking at Lloyd Park, there has been a number of occasions where travellers have set up site for weeks at a time. They seem to have no respect for the park and leave rubbish and mess all around. Plus they do not clean up after their animals which is a hazard for my young children who often use the park. Another concern of mine is the impact which travellers will have on the ratings of local schools and also the decrease in house prices. It is exciting times for Croydon with the new building developments, including Westfield - much needed for the reputation of Croydon after the riots and fires of 4 years ago. I strongly urge you not to approve the proposals for the traveller sites at Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries. It will result in good families and people who care about the community moving away from Croydon.

Change  
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
6) Gypsy/traveller site Policy DM44.2 Table 11.17 site 661 p179 green belt site. The Government's Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller sites published in August states that Green Belt sites are inappropriate for this type of permanent or temporary development, and I wholly agree with this.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr Ron Thomas
Object Soundness - Justified
Policy DM44.2 Table 11.17 Site 661 (p179) What a hair brained idea! Can you imagine the harm this would do to the countryside and the tram system.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Finally, the Council has identified two locations on the edge of Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites:

• Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, which is identified as suitable for 15-20 pitches (pages 449-450, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 502); and

• Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, which is identified as suitable for 15-25 pitches (pages 468-469, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 661).

I vigorously object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As you have to be aware, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

“Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

The Council’s approach is blatantly in breach of that policy. Both sites are a considerable distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question – there must be more suitable sites which are closer to local amenities (there is nothing in the way of shops or even a bus-stop at these sites, necessitating extra vehicular traffic on an already busy road at best or pedestrians attempting to cross at a very dangerous point with blind bends and junctions at worst). There have to be sites which are not in Green Belt land, perhaps even sites which already exist and could be expanded (such as the one on Purley Way).
Mr Roger Williams

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM44.2

661

Happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but will be objecting to building on precious open space.

Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.

If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Ms Maura Keane

Object

DM44.2

661

I appreciate that we all need somewhere to live. However, I have had severe problems with gypsies in the past (criminal damage with police involved and, separately quite a lot of fly tipping. As the 3 areas are generally quite attractive, I am loathe to have them destroying the ambiance: they certainly have a reputation for doing so (and of not paying Council tax, so I have been told recently).

Conduit Lane, near the award winning Coombe Woods would be too busy for others to park and enjoy the amenity, albeit the site is away from Coombe Road. The school would also create traffic in the Lane and on the very busy Coombe Road at specific times but, maybe, this would be a pleasant site for the children.

Similarly, the site in Oaks Road would be spilt.

Coming to Featherbed Lane: sadly, the place is already an eyesore. If planning permission carries with it a responsibility to improve the look of the place from Featherbed Lane, great. However, I doubt it can. What is needed here is a tidy up, not an increase in the mess. I suspect the Council has a duty to provide a site. If so, Featherbed Lane

DM44.2

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 661</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is a greenbelt site, and I am strongly opposed to this proposal as it is not appropriate to put a traveller site here. Many local residents, myself included, frequently visit Coombe Wood and Gardens, as well as the very popular Coach House Café. Having a Traveller site within striking distance of these beautiful green spaces will undoubtedly stop people visiting. Additionally, and based on my previous experience with Travellers, they fly tip and pollute sites they use. I doubt that this will be any different if the site is permanently allocated to them. Another reason for my objection is that I frequently walk with my dog along the famous Vanguard Way, which passes through Conduit Lane. I would not feel safe to do this were the Travellers allocated the site, and I imagine that it would put many other walkers and horse-riders off using this path. I also wonder if this historic route will be passable given proposed changes. Policy E of &quot;Planning Policy for Traveller Sites&quot;, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: &quot;Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development&quot;.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am writing to register my objections for the following proposed sites for Gypsy and Travellers Sites:

- Coombe Farm, Oaks Road - Reference 502
- Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane - Reference 661

The Policies laid out on the Mayor of London - London Assembly website, and Policy 7.17 clearly states that the Mayor’s office truly supports the protection of Metropolitan Open Land, and indeed states that “The strongest protection should be given to London’s MOL and inappropriate development refused. The Policy lays out what needs to be established to designate an area as MOL, but does not make it clear how a Council can re-designate an area. I therefore object to any permanent Traveller site being constructed on MOL, and especially if the area is simply going to be re-designated without any consultation with the local residents and businesses.

I object strongly that Croydon Council can re-designate Metropolitan Open Land or Green Belt land to suit their needs to accommodate a permanent pitch. I cannot see any Planning justification to change the designation, nor for the intrusion into the lives of the residents of Oaks Road and surrounding area. This will massively affect the urban attractiveness of the area and have both emotional and financial repercussions on many lives.

Policy 7.18 relating to Protection of Open Spaces clearly states that open spaces in London must be protected, and any loss must be resisted. I cannot believe the Council would want to go against both of these policies laid down by The London Assembly.

I am a member of Shirley Park Golf Club, which not only provides sport and social activities to over 700 members in the local vicinity, but also provides an important ecological role in the area. The proposed site of Coombe Farm as a site for Gypsies and Travellers has come as a shock to everyone in the area, as borne out by the recent press coverage and attendance at the Consultation Meetings.

The history of unauthorised “pitches” in this area over the past few years has left a bitter resentment,
especially in view of the residual mess and threatening behaviour that has always accompanied their trespass. On each occasion that Gypsies/Travellers have been in the area, the club members here have been threatened with physical and verbal abuse. This behaviour is totally unacceptable and despite the subsequent eviction of the Travellers on each occasion, the residual psychological effect on tax payers and constituents’ lives cannot be trivialised.

I personally have experienced dreadful behaviour from the travellers. They have damaged the greens, used the golf bunkers as toilets, damaged course furniture & stolen equipment.

We also have a large Junior Section and children play the course during holidays as well as weekends. They are often unaccompanied and the parents need to know they are in a safe environment. This would certainly not be the case in the parents’ minds if there was any chance of aggressive behaviour, as previously experienced, towards these children. I am certain that you would not wish to be responsible for putting children in any sort of potentially dangerous situation.

Surely these detailed real issues must be taken into account when determining any permanent site. I understand that the proposed sites are not within the required distance to both schooling and medical needs, therefore I also object on that basis. The land is in private ownership at Coombe Farm, and any funds spent on “compulsory or otherwise” purchase could surely be spent more wisely on behalf of the population of Croydon. No doubt Central Grants will be available, but Council owned land in an area that will not radically impact on established residents’ lives would be a sensible and prudent choice.
Finally, and by no means least, I am extremely concerned by the possible establishment of Gypsy/Traveller sites in general and specifically on Conduit Lane. Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 (p179). The council plans to create a Gypsy/Traveller site here. This is a greenbelt site, and it is not appropriate to put a traveller site here. Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. Apart from the loss of yet more green belt I believe this would be folly of the highest order at so many levels it simply does not bear thinking about. This proposal should absolutely not be allowed to go forward.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr Richard Jeffries  

Object DM44.2 661  

I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

I additionally comment that: 

The proposals are detrimental to the Amenities of Adjoining Owners Development is on Green Belt and would therefore require a change of land use 

The proposed Sites should be on Brownfield or Industrial Land not Green Belt 

There is an imbalance, with all sites being proposed in the South of Croydon Existing sites could/ should be expanded 

If a new site is to be developed for the travelling community, I would express a preference is for Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane. This already virtually developed to the point where there would be no further detriment if the site were to be developed. However, there is no proposal as to where the existing activity would be relocated to. 

The Pear Tree Cottage/ Farm site, provides ample space for all or most to the 39 additional pitches. Any remaining pitches could be located at other, brownfield, sites within the borough. 

If the nurseries site is to be redeveloped, it would be far better for this to be used for the relocation of a school, thus freeing up land elsewhere in the borough for housing. 

The travelling community are by definition mobile whereas the proposed development(s) are permanent and in built form. This is contradictory and may suggest that the council is considering further redevelopment at some future point. If so, the council should either be open about this or unequivocally deny it. 

Other Sites that the Council should reconsider instead of both Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm are the following: 

518 - Land adjacent to 103 Goodenough Way, The Admirals Walk, Old Coulsdon 536 - Land of former Croydon Airport runway, south of Imperial Way, Waddon 552 - Land adjacent to Ashburton playing fields at rear of 2-88
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3351/01/005/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Haslam</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object The use as gypsy/traveller sites of Coombe Farm (502) and Conduit Lane (661) These are in the Green Belt and Government Policy (Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”) classifies traveller sites in the Green Belt as “inappropriate development”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3353/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Rosamund Edwards</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3354/01/010/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Dr Bob Wenn</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the use of any land in the Green Belt as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3356/01/008/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Rishi Gohil</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Justified

Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.

If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr Dan Camalich

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM44.2 661

I am writing in order to object to the use of Green Land, especially in and around Croydon, for use as any kind of residential use, or any other kind of development for that matter. Such new developments, for Travellers or any kind of development, would be better made on non-green land, or in any suitable properties which are currently unused. Green land should be cherished and preserved because it takes a long time to become like that and there is less and less of it these days. The only real exception to that rule might be playgrounds for kids, but, even then, sensitivity to wild life, habitats and a location’s general “greeness” should always be employed.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Karen Muldoon

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM44.2 661

I am very concerned about the plans to introduce traveller sites near Oaks road. Roads are already narrow and congested in this area. At peak times there are always queues in Oaks Rd and Coombe lane so I don’t believe adding the large entourage of vehicles used by travellers will be particularly helpful. We experience the mess left behind by travellers every year and this continually concerns me. I am not sure what happens at Coombe Farm but there is already a rubbish site building there on the edge close to Lloyds park. I know there have been campaigns for some time about this and it has not been closely monitored. I imagine this would also be the case if it became a traveller site. It seems to make far more sense that traveller sites be in open, easily accessible areas - not tucked away sites like Coombe farm.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: 02/001</th>
<th>Name: Mr Amit Patel</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2</th>
<th>661</th>
<th>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date: 01/001</td>
<td>Name: Ann Eady</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>Please note our objection to this area becoming a travellers site as we have had experience of gypsies in the area causing severe rubbish problems due to not recycling and not caring for the environment as well as increasing the crime rates in the area due to Police proven burglaries. Their children were entered into local schools of current locals could not get in to and then they also became very disruptive in the classroom. We have been Croydon residents all our lives and have always paid our council tax to achieve a better place to live.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: 01/003</td>
<td>Name: Alison Larmand</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>Please be advised that I would like to enter an objection to Croydon Council's plans to de designate several land spaces in order to enable the positioning of three gypsy/traveler sites in the green belt and also the development of homes on some of the green spaces. The proposed locations for traveller sites brings great concern as to what impact this will have on the area as the locations are not really close to any public services. I believe there is also some question about whether the areas being proposed for the traveller sites can be used for this purpose due to a Government policy that states traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. As a resident of Shirley for the past 7 years I would be extremely disappointed to see any of these proposed developments come to fruition. Whilst I welcome the development of new homes I think Croydon Council should look for alternative locations instead of green land. I do hope to hear from your office in due course as to what the future may hold for our lovely green spaces that provide fresh air and outdoor enjoyment for our family and many others.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Page 661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3373/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mrs Kim Vella</td>
<td>Croydon Council</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>I have very strong objections to the two sites below being used as (1) permanent gypsy/traveller sites and (2) Loss of greenbelt areas. (listed below) Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane, next to Coombe Wood Gardens Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 (p179). The council plans to create a Gypsy/Traveller site. This is a greenbelt site, and it is not appropriate to put a traveller site here. Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3376/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Thomas Riding</td>
<td></td>
<td>I highly dislike the idea of a gypsy traveller site being proposed anywhere near my property, after spending millions of pounds renovating Croydon and applying for city status it would be an awful idea to entertain such an idea. How can you freely give up space that would gain no revenue and be wrecked within a few months, how about you build shelters for the homeless or use the money and space for greater purposes? It makes me want to move away from Croydon, it's homeowners like us that work hard and have mortgages that have put the money into the council to be able to do such a thing.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Consistent with National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Fox</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Third, the Council has identified two locations on the edge of Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites:

- Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, which is identified as suitable for 15-20 pitches (pages 449-450, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 502); and
- Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, which is identified as suitable for 15-25 pitches (pages 468-469, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 661).

I will be objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

"Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development".

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

| Change | This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 661</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Tim Cattell</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The purpose of Green Belt legislation has always been to preserve areas of amenity land for the benefit of local people, and other potential users, against any form of building development. I therefore consider it totally unacceptable, indeed absolutely incredible, that the Council would even consider designating areas of the Green Belt for potential gypsy/traveller sites as the Plan proposes for Coombe Farm, Coombe Lodge Nurseries and 2 sites on Featherbed Lane. The Coombe Lodge Nurseries site is especially inappropriate as it is very adjacent to Coombe Gardens, an important local amenity, and to the land along Conduit Land that has strong conservation value.
Mr Adrian Cowie

Object DM44.2

I object very strongly to the council's proposals to create Traveller sites on Green Belt Land. I believe the Green Belt is a resource which should be protected at all cost. Our countryside is a precious resource which provides recreation for walkers, cyclists, horse riders and separates urban sprawl. It should be held in trust for the enjoyment of future generations. Once it is gone, it is gone forever! Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. The site is also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is). This area is one, which I regularly walk & cycle. Any development, such as the one above, would completely ruin the surrounding countryside. The proposals go against the government policies on Green Belt. Before any development of Green Belt, Brownfield sites should be used.

Ms A Pavon-Lopez

Object DM44.2

Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, which is identified as suitable for 15-25 pitches (pages 468-469, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 661). Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Ms A Cheetham

Object

DM44.2

661

I would like to object to the proposed plans to set up gypsy and traveller sites for the following reasons:

* It is an inappropriate use of Green Belt Land - this classification of land has been created to protect green areas, not to develop on them.
* Should have proposed Brownfield or Industrial Land NOT green belt
* Might set a dangerous precedent for more Green Belt land to be developed on
* It will be potentially detrimental to the amenities of adjoining owners - for example, the business of The Coach House Café.
* Sites that are located on the Green Belt, considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites and against Government Policy ("Planning policy for Traveller Sites", DCLG, August 2015)
* Lack of relevant Amenities close at hand
* Insufficient Local Infrastructure to accommodate the plans
* Why are 2 proposed sites so close to each other?
* Why are sites all based in South Croydon - not balanced proposal
* Wouldn’t it make more sense to expand existing permanent sites in Lathams Way off Beddington Farm Road

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Ms A Cheetham

Object

DM44.2

661

Other sites the council should reconsider instead of both Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm are:

- Heath Clark playing fields, Stafford Rd, Waddon
- Timebridge Community Centre, Field Way, New Addington
- Land adjacent to 153 Goodenough Way, Old Coulsdon
- Wandale Road, car park, Wandale Rd, Croydon
- Croydon Land of former Croydon Airport runway, south of Imperial Way, Waddon
- Land adjacent to Ashburton playing fields at rear of 2-88 Colerdige Rd, Addiscombe
- By Pavilion Playing Fields, Purley Way
- Land south Of Threehalfpenny Woods, Kent Gate Way, Birdle Way
- Land west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, Elmside, Addington
- Cane Hill-south part, Hollymeak Road, Portnalls Rd, Coulsdon

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr Barnaby Powell

Object DM44.2 661

I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 as a gypsy and traveller site. These sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b, with Policy SP7.2 and the protection of the green grid or with 6.15 Strategic Objective 10 relating to the green grid.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Rev B Warren

Object DM44.2 661

Both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b, with Policy SP7.2 and the protection of the green grid or with 6.15 Strategic Objective 10 relating to the green grid.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr Amer Hameed

Object DM44.2 661

SP2.7 makes no mention of impact on the surroundings of the site and nearby residents. Accordingly, an additional criterion should be added: Must be entirely acceptable in relation to its impact on nearby public spaces and residents and businesses in the area. If this were included the proposals Ref 502, Coombe Farm, and Ref 661, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, would immediately be seen to be inappropriate. Coombe Lodge Nursery is by the lovely gardens of Coombe Wood with its popular tea room and wooded area. Coombe Farm is green belt land in Lloyd Park, left to the people of Croydon by the Lloyd family and where families enjoy the open space, kids play in the play area, joggers, dog walkers and of other walkers exercise, spots are played, families snack in the cafe and everyone feels reasonably safe.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
The grounds for my objection are:

1. The area has already suffered from illegal camps on several occasions.
2. The illegal camps have deposited substantial rubbish, including human waste, on each occasion.
3. The camps have been noisy and disruptive, and thefts have occurred from my garden shed whilst the travellers were in occupation.
4. This area is Metropolitan Open Land and/or Green Belt and as such is protected from the proposed development. Such proposals are against planning policy at both local and national level.
5. Coombe Farm is a listed building and the proposed development would be entirely detrimental to its setting even if not actually within its curtilage.
6. Coombe Farm is within the panoramic view of Addington Hills which is subject to local planning policies.
7. All land in the area is subject to covenants over the freehold titles set by the Garwood family which prohibit the proposed development.
8. There is little or no public transport provision, no shopping or schools within any reasonable distance of the sites. These are major requirements for any traveller settlement proposal in government guidance and policy.
9. Why are there no brownfield sites proposed which would be far more suitable, comply with planning policies and offer the amenities which are required to support the community of travellers.
10. What are the findings of an Equality Impact Assessment - which must have been carried out - comparing the alleged benefits to the travelling community and the residents of the area. Have similar assessments been carried out and published on suitable brownfield sites.
11. Why has Heathfield Ward been selected as the location for two proposed sites when it is on the fringes of Croydon with little amenity provision suitable to support the traveller sites.
12. The Local Plan sets no description of the council's statutory duties towards travellers. Do these proposals exceed the statutory responsibility and, if so, what are the council's reasons since none has been provided in the plan or in any consultations. Given the funding cuts leading to threatened reductions in services to residents and tax payers, has the council carried out any consultations or sought the views of residents as to the priority to be given to the provision of travellers' sites?
13. The council admits that the sites will not deter other illegal
encampments. What measures have been considered to protect vulnerable sites in the area from incursion by travellers if the site are full? The area has a population of protected wildlife including deer, badgers, owls as well as an abundance of other wildlife. No measures are proposed to minimise the effect of the proposed developments nor any mitigation measures.

15 Traffic in the area is already substantial. The junctions at both ends of Oaks Road are congested at peak times and are dangerous for pedestrians at all times. The proposed sites will increase the existing problems.

16 Little or no consideration has been given in the plan to the protection of local amenity and the local environment quite apart from the other deviations from or contravention of local and national planning policy.

17 It is clear from the plan that the council has ignored many alternative and more suitable sites which do comply with local and national planning policies and do not infringe on Green Belt Land. The proposals are illogical, counter to any tenets of sustainable development and appear to be prejudiced against a single ward - as no other options for location of the sites have been explored or have been dismissed without reason.

3414/01/008/DM44.2/O Mr Chris McInerney
Object Soundness - Justified DM44.2 661
Objectioning to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

DM44.2 661
Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

3415/01/008/DM44.2/O Ms C Soroczynski
Object DM44.2 661
Please note my objections to planning Policy DM44.2 , Table 11.14, site 661

DM44.2 661
Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Similarly a site for travellers with amenities which would prevent them from invading current green spaces is a good idea, but where to put it needs to be sensibly planned and the current proposal in my view is not adequate.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Gypsy/traveller sites should not be built on existing Green Belt land. This is totally inappropriate, as Green Belt is designed to remain undeveloped.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<p>| 3424/01/002/DM44.2/O | Ms Deborah Holman | Object Soundness - Justified | DM44.2 661 | Coombe Lodge nurseries off conduit Lane (ref. no. 661) | As a local resident I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as travellers/gypsy sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, reference number 502 Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, reference number 661 1. This site is also Green Belt and as such, according to Government Policy is deemed inappropriate for development. 2. The council have gone to great expense to protect the site from mobile travellers and this seems to have been a great waste of tax payers money if they now allow a permanent site. 3. Several businesses which make a big contribution to the local economy and also provide much needed amenity to the public will be detrimentally affected by the site. 4. Coombe Park which is a beautiful landscaped park containing many memorials to the war dead will be completely overwhelmed by the enormous traveller development for up to 25 mobile homes right next door. The huge amount of traffic going along conduit Lane make access to the park from the parking bays much more dangerous. This will affect the young and elderly alike as they use these parking bays. 5. The size of the site will totally overwhelm the nearest settlement of residents on coombe Road, Oaks Road and Coombe Lane These two sites are totally unsuitable for Traveller/Gypsy sites and will be contravening National Guidelines on the use of Green Belt Land. This proposal has not been thought through in its effects on local residents and the needs of the Traveller/Gypsy community who will be abandoned on sites with no close amenities and very poor and unsafe access to their homes. | Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found. |
| 3428/01/007/DM44.2/O | Mr Daniel Nuthall | Object DM44.2 661 | Also the proposal of a Gypsy site does not sit well with me at all. Firstly both the proposed sites ref 502 &amp; ref 661 are in a green belt, a clear breach of policy. The site at Stroud Green is also liable to flooding together with the land being owned by Thames Water and who's offices are a listed building. | Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Soundness - Effective DM44.2 661</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 661, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit lane. Transition Town have expressed an interest in restoring this site to a proper nursery facility, utilising the existing greenhouses for the growing of food, which would be a sustainable and appropriate activity within this green belt site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Change | This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found. |
All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites", published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites. I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr & Mrs McAvoy Object  

We object to the use of the following locations in Green Belt areas as travellers/gypsy sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road (15-20 pitches); Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane (15-20 pitches); Pear Tree Farm on Featherbed Lane (15-20 pitches). National guidelines clearly state 'Travellers Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development'. The Council's proposals, therefore, clearly breach such guidelines. Also, we question the Council's assertion that it needs to quadruple the number of travellers/gypsy sites in the Borough. Apart from this major objection, the above sites identified for such use would have poor access via narrow roads/lanes for large vehicles; consequent impact upon local traffic congestion with movements of large vehicles; no safe paved walking routes to schools, shops, doctors, etc.; additional requirement for services and facilities for hygienic occupation; increased pressure on local schools, medical facilities, waste disposal, etc.; impact upon local facilities and amenities of current residents.

Change  

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr D Lane Object  

I object to the site being used for gypsy and traveller accommodation. As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is);
Ms D Richardson

Object

DM 44.2
661

Just outlying in objections to this proposal. We have had issues with travellers camping out in Lloyd Park and other areas around Croydon. They cause destruction, leave rubbish and building materials behind. They are very difficult individuals who have no respect for where they live. They don’t pay taxes and have no morals in what they do.

I have seen travellers in Lloyds park, millers lane and coombe farm over the past 10 years or so. I’ve seen their rubbish, and vandalism so much so it’s us the council tax payers who has to pay for the clearing up of rubbish and fixing the vandalism.

Mr E King OBE

Object

Soundness - Justified
DM 44.2
661

Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.

If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr & Mrs Shaw-Smith

We strongly object to the disturbing proposals of Croydon Council to quadruple the area of gypsy sites in the Croydon area, in particular to sites regarding Reference numbers 502, 661 and 755. Green Belt areas are invaluable and should be protected as per previous acknowledgements (c.f. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August).

Also Croydon already has a bigger than average share of “problematic and challenging” social make-up than the rest of the country, and as such quadrupling gypsy sites in the borough seems a gross overreaction to pressure to ‘meet targets’. Policies and planning should focus on the development of an area rather than on enforcing undesirable land uses on the existing hard working population.

Existing traveller sites are appalling examples of living conditions, and building small blocks of flats in current sites could house a number of travellers either living there already or wishing to move to the borough.

DM44.2
661

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr & Mrs Shaw-Smith

We strongly object to the disturbing proposals of Croydon Council to quadruple the area of gypsy sites in the Croydon area, in particular to sites regarding Reference numbers 502, 661 and 755. Green Belt areas are invaluable and should be protected as per previous acknowledgements (c.f. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August).

Also Croydon already has a bigger than average share of “problematic and challenging” social make-up than the rest of the country, and as such quadrupling gypsy sites in the borough seems a gross overreaction to pressure to ‘meet targets’. Policies and planning should focus on the development of an area rather than on enforcing undesirable land uses on the existing hard working population.

Existing traveller sites are appalling examples of living conditions, and building small blocks of flats in current sites could house a number of travellers either living there already or wishing to move to the borough.

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
| Object | DM44.2 661 | I wish to log my objection to the borough-wide planned changes Croydon Council are proposing to make in their Local Plans for 2016-2036. These proposals are 750 new homes in Shirley Oaks and 35 new homes on the Shrublands Estate. Also the proposed work to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Coombe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Coombe Road. | Change | This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found. |
| Object | DM44.2 661 | I object to the proposal to create three gypsy/traveller sites reference numbers 502/661/755. All sites are in the Green Belt which makes them an inappropriate development. In addition they are some distance from schools, public services etc. | No change | This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found. |
| Object | DM44.2 661 | I strongly object to the following proposals which will have a negative impact on either green belt land or the character of an area.  
• Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, which is identified as suitable for 15-25 pitches (pages 468-469, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 661). | Change | This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found. |
<p>| Object | DM44.2 661 | I am writing to object to:  The use of of Coombe Farm (ref 502) and Coombe Lodge Nurseries (ref 661) as gypsy/travellers site | Change | This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found. |
| Object | DM44.2 661 | We do not need to turn every bit of green land into concert for housing, parking or money making schemes. I do NOT want to allow Croydon Council to offer Green belt areas near Coombe Wood Garden to Gypsy site who leave litter and mess everywhere and cost our area money to clear up. Did you not see the mess they left behind on the site in Brighton Road towards Purley? Those people have lost the Gypsy code of caring for their environment. Why allow them to damage our environment simply because they stop caring. | Change | This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3465/01/003/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Hobbs</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am writing to you to object to the use of a site off Oaks Road as a traveller site (Coombe farm). Reference number 502 and the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries, off Conduit Lane as a further travellers site. Reference number 661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3474/01/006/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Dennis King</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanderstead Residents' Association</td>
<td>Soundness - Consistent with National Policy E, Planning Policy for Traveller Sites published by the Government and also backed by the London Plan states that they are inappropriate development. On what basis therefore do Croydon consider they are better advised than more experienced authorities. They are high cost implications for Croydon should they proceed with this policy.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3479/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Wendy Becker</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am writing to you to object to the use of a site off Oaks Road as a traveller site (Coombe farm). Reference number 502 and the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries, off Conduit Lane as a further travellers site. Reference number 661

The three locations earmarked for gypsy and traveller sites are all located on green belt land.

Conduit Lane
Coombe Farm off Oaks Road and Pear Tree Farm
Featherbed Lane

Policy E, Planning Policy for Traveller Sites published by the Government and also backed by the London Plan states that they are inappropriate development.

On what basis therefore do Croydon consider they are better advised than more experienced authorities. They are high cost implications for Croydon should they proceed with this policy.

I am writing to add my objection to the proposal of traveller sites at Conduit Lane. I moved to the area 10 years ago because we are surrounded by green belt land, which would be totally inappropriate use of such dwellings. I feel very strongly that the land stay green and that we continue to protect our countryside. Please add my name to any list of objections - I will stand strong in this proposed as will my surrounding neighbours.

I am writing to add my objection to the proposal of traveller sites at Conduit Lane. I moved to the area 10 years ago because we are surrounded by green belt land, which would be totally inappropriate use of such dwellings. I feel very strongly that the land stay green and that we continue to protect our countryside. Please add my name to any list of objections - I will stand strong in this proposal as will my surrounding neighbours.
I have heard of Croydon Councils proposals for Traveller sites within the borough. I understand that "favoured sites" are Conduit Lane, Coombe Farm and Featherbed Lane. As a resident of Croydon, I am extremely concerned that this green belt area is being considered for use as residence. Addington hills and Coombe woods are an area of outstanding beauty and home to the largest area of heathland in London. Locating Traveller's encampments sites right on the doorstep of this green belt area would undoubtedly have dire consequences for flora, fauna, the natural habitat and wildlife as a whole, leading to irreversible damage. Please could Croydon Council reconsider this issue and please consider not going ahead with this proposal. The consequences to the natural environment and the delicate socio-ecological balance that currently exists would be damaged permanently with travellers' communities housed in a wildlife locality. There are better options to house people in Croydon and right in the middle of a green belt area which the residents of Croydon hold a lot of regard and pride for is not one of them. I would strongly advocate considering urban areas of the borough which are fit for housing - such proposals must not be made or favoured without a thorough ecological and environmental impact assessment and evaluation. I am very concerned with this proposal also because Croydon Council is meant to work in partnership with the British Trust for Conservation (BTCV) and a regional office is located on the woodland premises. Scraping this proposal is the right thing to do and the right thing for Croydon.

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Object DM44.2

The proposal to develop Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane as a residential development for a Gypsy and travelers site does not fall within the Strategic Objectives because:-

Objective 2: This development will not Foster an environment where existing enterprise can prosper, but will reduce enterprise.

Objective 4: This development will not reduce social, economic and environmental deprivation. It will not reduce unemployment, improve skills and education and improve environmental conditions, the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Objective 5: This development is not high quality and will not enhance the borough’s natural environment but will reduce the natural environment by turning a farm into a travelers housing site.

Objective 7: This development will reduce the area as a safe, healthy and cohesive community.

Objective 10: This development will reduce the quality and accessibility of green space and nature. This development will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The development will change the outlook and community within the South Croydon area and future generation will suffer because of this. This proposed development of a travelers site within the Coombe Road area is not within keeping of the current development within this area. Shirley comprises of large semi and detached houses with large green areas. This development is in no way in keeping with out housing in the area.

Changing a green area to an area of residential housing will cause harm and reduce the outlook of the area and is not in keeping with the surrounding area. Building a travelers site will increase noise levels and ruin the character of the area and this development would overwhelm this green area. Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. This development would diminish the striking view of the area of Addington Hills and Coombe Farm area.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr Alnoor Visram  

Object DM44.2 661

SP2.7 makes no mention of impacts on the surroundings of the site and nearby residents. Accordingly, an additional criterion should be added “f. Must be entirely acceptable in relation to its impact on nearby public spaces and residents and businesses in the area”. If this were included the proposals ref 502, Coombe Farm, and Ref. 661, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, would immediately be seen to be inappropriate.

Coombe Lodge Nursery is by the lovely gardens of Coombe Wood with its popular tea room and wooded area. Coombe Farm is green belt land in Lloyd Park, left to the people of Croydon by the Lloyd family and where families enjoy the open space, kids play in the play area, joggers, dog walkers and of other walkers exercise, spots are played, families snack in the café and everyone feels reasonably safe.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr G von Gerard  

Object DM44.2 661

I wish to register my objection to the proposed locations for traveller sites, namely Coombe Farm (Ref 502) and Coombe Lodge Nurseries (Ref 661) in the Local Plan proposals. These sites are in the Green Belt and, as the Government’s policy (Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites) states, Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Objections raised to the use of the following locations as Gypsy/Traveller sites:
- Coombe Farm off Oaks Road Reference Number 502
- Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane Reference Number 661

1. How has the London Borough of Croydon involved its Community in the planning of the Coombe Farm and Coombe Gardens Traveller Sites? What opportunity was given by Croydon Council for the local residents to put forward their own ideas and participate in the development of the Sites? See - London Borough of Croydon’s “Statement of Community Involvement - October 2012” (https://www.croydon.gov.uk/sites/default/files/articles/downloads/involvement-oct12.pdf) Reference 2.11 & 2.12 - these Guidance Rules have been ignored

2. There is no pavement access to either of the proposed sites therefore most travel to and from these sites to local amenities, (shops/doctors/schools) would be by vehicle – causing even greater traffic problems to the Coombe and Oaks Road junction.

3. Residents call for an independent (i.e non-Labour) lead enquiry into the full extent Dr Anwar Ansari (owner of Coombe Farm, a proposed traveller site) has been able to influence Croydon Council specifically & Labour Government more broadly through financial bribery?

4. Under the freedom of information act, can you please confirm how planning applications Dr Anwar Ansari or a member of his family have submitted to Croydon Council and how many have been accepted/approved ( including those with conditions).

5. The restrictive Covenants for Coombe Farm, (defined as 80 Oaks Road) which are for “thesettlers and their successors in title” states “No part of the Property shall be used for any offensive noisy, dangerous pursuit or occupation or for any purpose which shall or may grow to be in any way a nuisance damage grievance or annoyance to neighbouring properties or the neighbourhood.”

Quote from the 2011 Localism Act; “Through the Localism Act, the Government has abolished the Standards Board regime. Instead, local authorities will draw up their own codes, and it will become a criminal offence for councillors to deliberately withhold or misrepresent a financial interest.”

Tens of thousands of pounds including cash equivalent goods &
services (e.g. supply of rent-free premises for council business, travel expenses and campaign donations) have been disclosed but misrepresented as donations. These are in fact bribes in return for planning leniency (see press article.)


4. Under the freedom of information act, can you please confirm how planning applications Dr Anwar Ansari or a member of his family have submitted to Croydon Council and how many have been accepted/approved (including those with conditions).

5. The restrictive Covenants for Coombe Farm, (defined as 80 Oaks Road) which are for "the Settlers and their successors in title" stated "No part of the Property shall be used for any offensive noisy, dangerous pursuit or occupation or for any purpose which shall or may grow to be in any way a nuisance damage grievance or annoyance to neighbouring properties or the neighbourhood."

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3495/01/006/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Ian Harris</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3496/01/007/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Ian Leggatt</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

I would also ask:
Why are the two sites in very close proximity to one another being proposed?
What is the rationale for creating an imbalance across the borough with all sites being proposed in the South of Croydon?
Why not expand the existing Permanent Gypsy Site in Lathams Way off Beddington Farm Road?
If one has to select one of the proposed sites, the preference is for Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site is in Green Belt and to create a Traveller site here constitutes "inappropriate Development" in contravention of Policy E of the Government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. I object to the proposal.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr Ian Engelback

I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane (reference number 661). These locations are designated Green Belt and close to sites of Nature Conservation Interest, allocation of such land to gypsy/traveller sites is in contradiction to established government policy as laid out in Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (Policy E).

Mr Terry Coleman

My objections to the proposed traveller site - plan ref: 661.
1) Close proximity to Coombe Wood Gardens and also the access point to the Vanguard Way nature trail.
2) Close proximity to three prestigious eating establishments: Chateau, Coach House Café and Coombe Lodge (which is also an hotel)
3) The proposed site is not suitable for residential purpose, there is no proper access Road.

Mrs Jolanta Berry

It has come to my attention, that the Council is currently considering to change the designation of areas of Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land, in particular, that of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane.

I am most surprised and disappointed, that people within the Council who have been employed to represent and implement the views and wishes of local residents, are pursuing such ideas.

I am very strongly objecting to the idea, and ask you to withdraw the proposals. They will have a detrimental effect on the quality of life for the local residents, and will forever change the character of the area for the worse.

I would ask you to withdraw any plans to change the current status, and to confirm in writing, that my objection and representation has been received, and will be given a due attention. As I understand, a large majority of residents are opposing the idea and expect that you will respect their wishes and views.
Jennifer Worstall
Object

I urge the Council to re-consider allowing traveller sites in the former Croydon nursery in Coombe Woods and at Coombe farm in Lloyd Park – both unsuitable sites, as they are not near amenities such as shops/schools etc which travellers may need to access. The A23 offers a better location for these traveller sites and has better road access too.

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Katrina Neal
Object

I must virulently object against the proposal for gypsy traveller sites on Coombe Lodge Nurseries - Ref 661. This is because I have been a victim of travellers and their general anti social behavior/culture/damage/threatening behaviour in the past...most recently when they illegally took over property in Wickham Road (the old La Rijoca site) in 48 hours you cannot believe the damage they did and how awful it was...I will object to anything that is EVER planned to house them near anywhere I live.

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Jenny Hayden
Object

Ref nos 502, and 661

I strongly object to the use of either of these sites for gypsy/traveller sites. They are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a conservation site. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller sites, published by the Government in August, states unequivocally "Traveller sites, temporary or permanent, in the Green Belt are inappropriate." The Council's approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both of these sites are some distance from public services. There is an existing site off the Purley Way, could this site not be increased? The public services in this area are far better than by the other proposed sites.

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
As a local affected resident, I am registering my comments and objections to the proposals as documented in the Croydon Local Plans CLP1.1 and CLP2.

6 Proposed Policy DM43 Creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites at Coombe Farm, off Oaks Road, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, off Conduit Lane and Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage, Featherbed Lane
As a local affected resident, I am registering my comments and objections to the proposals as documented in the Croydon Local Plans CLP1.1 and CLP2.

Policy DM43, reference Site 502 Coombe Farm reference Site 661 Coombe Lodge Nurseries and reference Site 755 Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage. I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and Coombe Farm is on a site of an Archaeological Priority Zone and contains an area of Nature Conservation Importance. Such development is in breach of Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that “Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites by 2017, and 39 by 2036 is extremely excessive and will have a significant adverse impact on the borough.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Both my wife and I formally wish to object to the councils proposals for development to the green belt at Coombe Lodge Nurseries and especially for the creation of Travellers sites to them.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

With reference to the recently published ‘Croydon Local Plan’, as a resident of the past 25 years I give my views as follows:

Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 (p175). Objection this is classed as Greenfield belt, refer to Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I wish to voice my concerns regarding the following:

I totally object to any reduction of green space in the borough of Croydon in favour of development. I agree wholeheartedly with Garvin Barwell MP and wish to oppose any such plans. In particular, the idea of a travellers site at the suggested sites is preposterous.

There have been problems in this borough with 'travellers' for many years. To the extent that defences, barriers built up grass mounds, have been created to keep out such illegal encampments. Whilst what the Council are proposing is to legalise such sites, I have witnessed the conditions these area have been left in when travellers have moved on, piles of rubbish including human waste and damaged the area! This has been a massive expense to the council over the years. Areas around Coombe Gardens and Lloyd park are much loved and used recreational areas for the people of Croydon and surrounding areas. A gypsy encampment would be a disaster!

If there is an obligation for the council to provide facilities for travellers, any such area should be very carefully assessed and considered, taking into account all the attributes of the area and how such a camp would affect it. In this instance the suggested areas are totally inappropriate.

DM44.2
661

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Object DM44.2 661

I object to the proposed sites of Coombe Lodge Nurseries 661, and Coombe Farm 502, being used as sites for gypsies and travellers because:

1. It will be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining owners.
2. It is inappropriate use of Green Belt Land. Sites that are located on the Green Belt are considered to be inappropriate for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and against Government Policy, “Planning policy for Traveller Sites,” DCLG, August 2015.
3. There is a total lack of amenities close at hand.
4. There is insufficient Local Infrastructure to accommodate the plans.
5. The selection of Proposed Sites should have a bias towards Brownfield or Industrial Land, not Green Belt.
6. Imbalance across the borough with all Sites being Proposed in the South of Croydon.
7. Why not expand of the existing Site in Lathams Way, off Beddington Farm Road.
8. If one has to select one of the proposed Sites, the preference would be for Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane.

Other Sites that the council should consider are:

1. 16 Heath Clark playing fields, Stafford Road, Waddon.
2. 120 Timebridge Community Centre, Field Way, New Addington.
4. 522 Wandile Road surface car parks, Wandile Road, Croydon Opportunity Way.
5. 536 Land of former Croydon Airport Runway, south of Imperial Way, Waddon.
6. 552 Land adjacent to Ashburton playing fields, at rear of 2 - 88 Coleridge Road, Addiscombe.
9. 636 Land west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, Elmside, Addington.
10. 767 Cane Hill - south part, Holmmeaok Road / Portnalls Road Coulsdon

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3530/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Webb</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3539/01/003/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mary Norman</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3545/01/008/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Linda Bevin</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Conduit Lane</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I wish to object to the gypsy and traveller site on Conduit Lane. For centuries parks and green spaces have been an important part of urban living where people can walk and relax. It would be a sad day if these open spaces were lost for ever. We have enjoyed open places and do not want to see them lost for future generations when with a bit of imagination brownfield sites could be considered ahead of the green belt. Future generations will not thank us for destroying their heritage, and character of their local community. We are aware of the need for housing but here in Sanderstead we have already seen a lot of development in recent years, and its character slowly being eroded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Conduit Lane</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Conduit Lane</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to plans to de-designate the metropolitan open land on either side of Shirley Oaks Road and all around Shirley Oaks Village as it is Green Belt and precious open land. I also object to gypsy/travellers site Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane (Ref No. 661)), as they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a site of Nature Conservation interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Travellers Sites published by the Government clearly states: ‘Travellers sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The Council is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/travellers sites in the borough - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purely Way where the existing site is).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Conduit Lane</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Conduit Lane</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Conduit Lane is a greenbelt site, and it is not appropriate to build a traveller’s site here. Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”, published by the Government, says: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Conduit Lane</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. The use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:

- Coombe Farm off Oaks Road; reference number 502; and
- Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane; reference number 661.

These are both in the Green Belt, where Policy E of Planning for Traveller Sites clearly says that “travellers sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

This is also likely to have a negative effect on the Site of nature conservation interest that one of the sites would border, and both sites are a distance from public services. It is also likely to create increased traffic problems in an area that is not best suited for such sites.

Consideration should be given to the refurbishment of the existing sites, or where this is not possible, alternative and more appropriate sites.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I have been a Croydon resident for many years (over 47), and have watched Croydon wax and wane. In all those years, Croydon has often been regarded as rather down at heel and a bit of a joke; it has been misrepresented in the media too many times in my view. Croydon remains a vital communications hub, which seems only recently to have been recognised. Given all the development in and around East Croydon station, your plan for these improvements is beginning to take shape. As we all know, London Victoria in 20 minutes, London Bridge in 20 minutes; not to mention the east/west Tramlink which has become so popular that TfL decided to grab it! Croydon's communications should be more widely acknowledged. You were elected on a ticket to not only improve Croydon for ALL its residents but also to preserve its assets such as the green belt and areas of special scientific interest. Imagine my dismay and great disappointment when I discovered in your proposal that you considered it perfectly legitimate to build on green belt – absolutely at odds with your manifesto. AND that you are prepared to ignore your promises in preserving Croydon's assets to the very people who elected you. How can the electorate trust you in the future, especially at the next council election, if you blatantly disregard your election pledges and set about to destroy the green spaces enjoyed by many of Croydon's residents? All green belt is part of Croydon's assets, it represents the lungs of Croydon, benefiting all and in many cases providing a haven for migratory birds as they stop-over en route and indeed other wildlife whose habitat is likely to be destroyed/diminished if the green belt is built on. Altering the status of green belt or areas of special scientific interest enabling it to be built on does NOT alter the fact that once built on it will never revert to green belt and therefore will be lost (to Croydon and its electorate), forever. I would urge you to reconsider your proposals to destroy part of the green belt and to maintain the status of the open spaces as is. Croydon occupies a vast area and I am certain you could find suitable alternatives for the travellers which met their needs of access to public transport and retail amenities without destroying the green belt or areas of special scientific interest if you tried hard enough. I am sure you are aware that Government policy states "Traveller sites temporary or permanent in the Greenbelt are..."
inappropriate development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3551/01/003/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Halliday</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>POLICY: Sites Proposed for Gypsy and Traveller Sites: Site Ref: Number 661, Site Ref: Number 502 REASONS FOR OBJECTING: 1. Increased Traffic Congestion 2. Detrimental to Amenities of Local Residents 3. Lack of Amenities in Area 4. Not suited for Green Belt Land 5. Preservation of Green Belt is of Vital Importance 6. Lack of Sufficient Police Services 7. Insufficient Local Infrastructure to Accommodate such a Development 8. Proximity of Many Schools, Infant Nurseries and Restaurants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3552/01/003/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Miss Lisa K Hall</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I write to object to: • The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites on the basis that both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b: • Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; • Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3559/01/006/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Michael Southwell</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>Regarding the draft local plan I make the following objection- DM44.2 To suggest a traveller site next to popular Council gardens in Coombe rd will affect considerably the enjoyment of the gardens by local residents. The proposed site is used at present for producing plants for Council gardens. This seems utterly senseless and will lead to a loss of jobs locally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3561/01/013/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Linda Hione</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane, next to Coombe Wood Gardens Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 (p179). The council plans to create a Gypsy/Traveller site here. This is a greenbelt site, and it is not appropriate to put a traveller site here as “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but will be objecting to building on precious open space.

Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.

If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr Mike Jones

Why build gypsy encampments? They are travellers and should be encouraged to continue travelling. If such land is available then it should be for social or normal housing

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr & Mrs Adams

It is entirely inappropriate to consider creating Gypsy/Traveller sites in these locations. Not only are these greenbelt sites, they are also very close to residential areas and several schools. In August, the Government published "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites" in which Policy E states: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development".

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr Peter Newsham

I am a resident of Shirley and I wish to register my objection in the strongest possible terms to proposed developments in Shirley and to add my voice to that of my MP, Mr Gavin Barwell, whose views on this matter I echo.

The proposed Travellers’ site, ref. 661, contravenes present legislation because they are in the Green Belt and are therefore classed in Government documents as ‘Inappropriate development’. Does the Council propose to break the law as well as ride roughshod over massive public objection to this plan?

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr Peter West  
Object  
DM44.2  
661  
I object to this site as we need space and sensible development that compliments the environment.

Mrs Margaret Lawless  
Object  
DM44.2  
661  
I list below the relevant policy references to which I object. Table 11.17 site 662 (p179)

Mr Nick Barnes  
Object  
Soundness - Justified  
DM44.2  
661  
Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up to the four storeys along Wickham Road.

Nicola Shipp  
Object  
DM44.2  
661  
As a resident of Croydon all my life, I wish to register my opposition to the following “plans”... DM44.2 SITE 661 – Coombe Woods Gardens, the site would be ruined if Travellers were allowed to have a permanent site in this lovely location. I have experienced the disgusting mess left behind by “Travellers” during my journey to work in Commerce Way, Croydon and the proposed Lidl site on the old BMW SITE, South Croydon.
I wish to object to some of the proposals in the Croydon Local Plan as follows:

I object to the proposal (policy DM44.2 Table 11.17) to create a Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane next to Coombe Wood Gardens (site 661) and/or Coombe Farm (site 502). Policy E of "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites" published by the Government in August states that "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". This would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Previous scenes from Traveller sites demonstrate that they end up as dump; not the sort of image we want to portray for Croydon.

I object to the proposed loss of Green Belt status for

1. Coombe Playing Fields - (site ref 662) and object to the proposal for development in Policy DM44.2 Table 11.17
2. Croham Hurst - this is a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation
3. Sanderstead Plantation

The de-designation of these sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

I object to the proposed loss of Local Area of Special Character protection for many roads such as West Hill, Campden and Spencer Roads, the Woodcote Estates and Hartley Farm. Loss of protection will open up these roads to inappropriate development. Roads, such as Oakwood Avenue in Purley should also be included as new Local Heritage Areas.

I object to the possible "Garden Grabbing" that policy DM2 will make much easier. National and London policy classifies gardens as green field, but the proposed new policy DM2 says that the Council will allow building on gardens. We need to keep our green spaces.

I also object to the proposed retail development of the old "Good Companions Pub" site in Hamsey Green, which the proposed policy DM4 1.3 table 11.14 (site 306) would allow. A retail outlet in such a location would cause traffic chaos. It will be far better to develop it as a residential site (with ample parking) and in character with other housing in the area - not a block of flats.
On the question of parking, I note that some new developments do not seem to cater for this. Green Dragon House being a typical example. All new developments should provide for ample parking for residents and their families.

Please take the above comments into account when assessing the proposed Croydon Local Plan.

Yours faithfully

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3697/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Ms J Colvert</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>I think it is important to state a case against the proposal to create a gypsy/traveller site on Conduit Lane which is at present, and has been for centuries, an unspoilt amenity for all who live in the borough. Our national government has the right idea i.e. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development, so why is our local government even considering going against this policy? Certainly in this instance, the character of the area would be noticeably changed and adversely affect the lives of many, whilst not being a particularly convenient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3699/01/046/DM44.2/C</td>
<td>Cllr J Cummings</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site 661, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit lane. Transition Town have expressed an interest in restoring this site to a proper nursery facility, utilising the existing greenhouses for the growing of food, which would be a sustainable and appropriate activity within this green belt site.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. I am concerned that all three sites are also some considerable walking distance away from GP practices, shops, schools, public transport and other local services which would be contrary to the Council’s Health and Wellbeing Strategy.

Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs with their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsies and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms J Doran</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>As a supplier to Oaks Farm I am objecting to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries as a Gypsy and Traveller site. The site is in Green Belt and is contrary to national policy that says that Gypsy and Traveller sites are inappropriate development in Green Belt. Coombe Park is a beautiful landscape park and contains many memorials to the war dead and would be completely overwhelmed by this enormous traveller development of up to 75 mobile homes. The huge amount of traffic going along Conduit Lane will make access to the park from the parking bays on the other side of the road much more difficult and dangerous. The size of the site will completely overwhelm the nearest settlement of residents on Coombe Road, Oaks Road and Oaks Lane. Local schools are oversubscribed and too far away. Several businesses which make a big contribution to the local economy and also provide much needed amenity to the public will be detrimentally affected by the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms J Fasham</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>I object to the use of these locations as traveller sites, as they are both in green belt land and one of them borders a site of Nature Conservation interest, this is clearly in breach of policy E. Both sites are some distance from Public Services and the road here could not cope with more traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs J Horton</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>I wish to log my objection to the borough-wide planned changes Croydon Council are proposing to make in their Local Plans for 2016-2036. These proposals are 750 new homes in Shirley Oaks and 35 new homes on the Shrublands Estate. Also the proposed work to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Coombe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Coombe Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3705/01/003/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr J Lemanski</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3708/01/007/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mrs J McDonald</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3712/01/008/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Nick Peiris</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3715/01/008/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Jenny Tighe</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would like you to note my strong objection to the granting of any Planning Application relating to the following Policy Ref. DM44.2, Table 11.17, Site 661.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

The council plans to create a Gypsy/Traveller site here. This is a greenbelt site, and it is not appropriate to put a traveller site here. Policy E of (Planning Policy for Traveller Sites), published by the Government in August, says very clearly: (Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development).

Flouts existing Government guidelines published in August 2015.

I would also like to object to the following applications for traveller sites. Application numbers: 502, 661 and 755. All three are in green belt land and therefore inappropriate developments and should not be allowed to go ahead.
Mr J Wilkinson  
Jamar  
Object

I would like to object to these proposals in particular as they seriously impinge on The Green Belt. They would be inappropriate development and not comply with relevant Policy. They are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Where I live in The Ballards Farm Area there is a significant number of development proposals annually - mainly back garden development - all with negative implications for the valuable Green Belt. Croydon needs more not less. “Protecting the borough’s open space and the (sic) distinctive heritage and character, alongside the necessary infrastructure to mitigate the impact of growth” is in everyone’s long term interest.

Mrs J Middleton  
Object

I object to the site for use for a gypsy and traveller site.

Mr Mike Marcroft  
Object

Please do not allow the above to settle on Green Belt land. There must be other sites in the Borough that can be made available. Our Green Belt land is precious to us all.

Sarah McNamara  
Object

I would just like to express my concern about Croydon Council’s plans to build in these three Green Belt areas. I understand and appreciate the need for more homes across the borough but could you, again, consider using all the empty homes and office spaces instead of filling up beautiful and plentiful land?

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3734/01/06/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Mott</td>
<td>I object to this site allocation.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3735/01/011/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Tim Duce</td>
<td>I object to the building of gypsy traveller sites on Green Belt, especially as one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. Nature Conservation is indeed a very low priority to the travellers that I have seen. I voluntarily clear up the dumping at Addington Hills and have witnessed the appalling environmental destruction wreaked by visiting travellers. Cleaning up after their visits is a very costly exercise, so putting travellers close by a Conservation Site would be extremely foolhardy. Over the next few years, it would cost council tax payers a fortune.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I wish to register the strongest possible objection to the specific proposals in the Croydon Local Plan proposing a school or gypsy site at Conduit Lane, and a Gypsy site at Coombe Farm.

Regarding Conduit Lane, clearly, Niccolo Machiavelli would have been proud of the tactic of proposing a gypsy site or a school site. Presumably, the thought was that people are gullible enough to believe that these are either/or proposals!! They are certainly as different as chalk and cheese. I consider both options to be unhelpful, inappropriate and out of keeping with the current use of the area. I am also generally surprised that they are considered viable options worthy of serious consideration as they appear random in nature and devoid of any real local knowledge.

Regarding both gypsy site proposals, neither are in keeping with the existing 'texture' of the areas. They add nothing to the quality of life of local residents (quite the contrary) and generally they are so out of keeping with the current general use enjoyed by those neighbourhoods that one is left wondering how they even made it into a plan? Were the proposals drawn up by someone completely ignorant of the area?

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

SP2.7 makes no mention of impact on the surroundings of the site and nearby residents. Accordingly, an additional criterion should be added f. Must be entirely acceptable in relation to its impact on nearby public spaces and residents and businesses in the area. If this were included the proposals Ref 661, Coombe Lodge Nursery, would immediately be seen to be inappropriate. Coombe Lodge Nursery is by the lovely gardens of Coombe Wood with its popular tea room and wooded area. I consider both Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nursery as wholly inappropriate places to locate gypsies and travellers.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Diane Simpson

Object Soundness - Justified

DM44.2

Happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but will be objecting to building on precious open space.

Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.

If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Juliet Stevenson

Object Soundness - Justified

DM44.2

I am objecting the the proposed sites - Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Coombe Farm, Pear Tree Farm - on the following grounds:

It is an inappropriate use of Green Belt land and the proposals are contrary to the Government policy (Policy E of the Planning Policy for Traveller sites) which states that "Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development".

Selection of proposed sites should have a bias towards Brownfield or Industrial land not Green Belt

It is detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining owners

There is a lack of relevant amenities close at hand

There is a lack of local infrastructure to accommodate the plans and additional traffic

All the proposed sites are in the south of the borough with two being very close together

There is already an existing permanent site in Lathams Way which could be expanded.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 661</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr Michael Eldridge</strong></td>
<td>I am making representations against the proposed Travellers' sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane, South Coombe Road, South Croydon, CR0 5RQ (Site reference number: 661) and at Coombe Farm, Oaks Road, Shirley, CR0 5HL (Site reference number:502). Both these proposed sites are within the Green Belt and the proposals are contrary to Government policy (Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites) which states that 'Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.' In addition the areas in question form a particularly precious 'green lung' not far from the centre of Croydon and any development would in my view be deleterious to this amenity. I cannot suggest alternative suggested sites but would prefer one that is not within Green Belt/Metropolitan Open land, of which I understand there are several in the Borough of Croydon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mrs Anne Turner</strong></td>
<td>I would like to put in writing my objections to the following local plans: I am listing the relevant Policy Numbers: 6. DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661Conduit Lane - travellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moyra Ruffell</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am emailing you to express my concerns about Croydon Council's Plans to build Gypsy/Traveller sites in Green Belt areas. I understand that there is a great need for housing in the Croydon area and that the number of homeless people in Croydon is high. However, I need assurance that in providing this need we do not destroy our few remaining green spaces as these are vital to the well-being of our environment and people's health. When I received the information about these proposals from my MP and local residents' association I had been away from home and so have not studied these plans in depth. However, with the information I have I cannot visualize how these proposals would work without destroying the character of the Shirley area and the destruction of our few remaining green areas. In order for me to agree to these proposals I would not only require the assurance that these environmental issues were taken into account but the homes that are planned for were affordable to those who are in need of a home, and that they were of good quality, energy efficient homes. Finally, having lived in Shirley for many years I have seen the increase in traffic which has brought about an increase in air pollution which is detrimental to our health. This is another important factor that has to be borne in mind when increasing the density of the population of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Change | This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 661</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Myra Rand</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I fully oppose the proposals to build on green land, especially for Traveller sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Change | This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found. |
Subject: Object Soundness

I am objecting the following proposed sites:

- Coombe Lodge Nurseries (Site Reference Number 661)
- Coombe Farm (Site Reference Number 502)

The reasons for my objection are on the following grounds:

It is an inappropriate use of Green Belt land and the proposals are contrary to the Government policy (Policy E of the Planning Policy for Traveller sites) which states that “Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”

Selection of proposed sites should have a bias towards Brownfield or Industrial land not Green Belt

It is detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining owners

There is a lack of relevant amenities close at hand

There is a lack of local infrastructure to accommodate the plans and additional traffic

All the proposed sites are in the south of the borough with these two in particular being very close together

There is already an existing permanent site in Latham’s Way which could be expanded.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object

I live on Coombe Lane in Croydon and would like to formally object to the proposal to build traveller sites at Coombe Farm (off Oaks Road) and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane. I believe these proposals will change the character of this area which I live in significantly for the worse. I also understand that the proposals are contrary to Government policy (Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites) which states that traveller sites, temporary or permanent, may not be built on Green Belt land.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
1. This site is also in the green belt and according to Government Policy is deemed inappropriate.

2. Coombe Park which is a beautiful landscaped park and contains many memorials to war dead and families loved ones will be completely overwhelmed by this enormous traveller development for up to 75 mobile homes right next door.

3. The huge amount of traffic going along Conduit Lane will make access to the park from the parking bays on the other side of the road much more difficult and dangerous. These parking bays are used by the very young and the very old to give them easy and safe access to this beautiful public park.

4. Again the size of the site will totally overwhelm the nearest settlement of residents on Coombe Road, Oaks Road and Oaks Lane.

5. The closest schools are oversubscribed so would be unable to meet the needs of so many new children to the area.

6. The council has gone to great expense to protect the site from mobile travellers and this seems to have been a great waste of tax payers money if they now allow a permanent site.

7. Several businesses which make a big contribution to the local economy and also provide much needed amenity to the public will be detrimentally affected by the site.

The site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr John Clarke

Object DM44.2

Not in line with Government planning policy on the Green Belt Detail:
- Government planning policy with regards to traveller sites wants to ensure that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development.
- The proposal to create a permanent traveller site on land designated as Green Belt land is contrary to Policy E of the Planning Policy: “Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances.”. There are no very special circumstances.
- The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the “very special circumstances” justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt.
- The local character description is clearly at odds with the proposal.
- The justification acknowledges the Green Belt issue, though insufficiently, but relies on the fact that there are existing structures. These are not in fact substantial “being glasshouses” and could be said to be at least environmentally consistent with the Green Belt. But there is no very special circumstance justification proposed as required by Planning Policies.
- Approving the proposal would set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to be subject to similar development. It is not in the community’s interests to allow the erosion of the green spaces surrounding the community and we object to the impact this site could have on the environment and wildlife. In the light of these issues, it is not appropriate simply to weight Green Belt as one of many factors to be considered, but rather it presents an overarching policy objection that cannot be over-ridden in the way proposed. To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now and we do not believe that The Assessment and selection of sites for Gypsy and Travellers undertaken was credible. Plan makers have not considered the time it will take to commence development on site need for infrastructure improvements-roadsThere is basis for challenging the way in which this potential site has been selected.
- Para 3.1: Green Belt sites included for review of eligible sites “to ensure that all locations for a site considered”, but at the same time this site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
"Exclusion of sites in Croydon Metropolitan Centre and within District Centres and Strategic Industrial Locations and Conservation Areas due to viability, deliverability and impact on heritage considerations." Is this even-handed?

Para 4.1 sets out the criteria and weightings. As indicated above, Green Belt with no built form is given a weighting (-10) which, though high, is not very significant given that there are 29 or 30 criteria and can easily be outweighed by other factors that are less significant in policy terms.

SP2.7 on the Council’s proposals to deliver 39 additional gypsy and traveller sites indicates that land will be allocated in accordance with the proposals, but that any ADDITIONAL sites that are not so allocated should meet some stated criteria, including good access to local shops and essential services and good transport access; these seem to be criteria that were excluded from the proposed allocation, suggesting that any alternative proposals would need to meet stiffer criteria. Is this fair and even-handed?

The bases for site criteria weightings are unclear.

Note that paragraph 4.19 in referring to the need for good access to roads, states that “they often need to move larger vehicles as part of their livelihood and way of life” - this may be an assertion relevant to the assessment of sites and the narrowness of Coombe Lane. The objections may be summarized as:

- inappropriate use of Green Belt land
- lack of relevant amenities close to hand
- adverse effect on neighboring businesses and leisure amenities
- the site has a more appropriate use for a school

| 3764/01/002/DM44.2/0 | Mr & Mrs Chambers | Object DM44.2 661 | The proposed Traveller Sites are totally inappropriate developments for these Green Belt Areas. We strongly object to this part of the Croydon Plan. |

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Object: Soundness - Consistent with National DM44.2 661
Policy DM44.2: this refers to the proposal to allow a gypsy/traveller site, which is not appropriate for the area, and furthermore is against Government policy. We oppose this proposal.

Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object: DM44.2 661
Given what I have recently observed at an illegal Traveller occupation at the former Rioja Tapas bar just outside Shirley I object to the use of areas off Oaks Road and Conduit Lane as Traveller sites. References 502 and 661.

Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object: DM44.2 661
We note that there are alternative proposals to build a school and a gypsy and traveller site in this area. These we have been able to find on the local plan. We see the pressing need for additional secondary school places and would support the building of a secondary school - the need is sufficiently pressing to justify Coombe Lodge Nurseries being used for this purpose. We do not think the loss of the Coombe Road Playing Fields can be justified - there has been too great a loss of playing fields already, and the new school will need playing fields. Great thought will, however, be needed as to access and transport arrangements. These problems are not insuperable, but:
1. the main road and surrounding roads are already at high capacity in rush hours, and
2. there are great dangers to pedestrian and cyclist safety which will require a cycle path, tunnel or bridge or both, connecting the school to the tram and crossing the main road safely to the school, perhaps via the playing fields.

We do not think the loss of Green Belt land can be justified for a gypsy and caravan site. The access to the Nurseries is entirely unsuitable for a gypsy and caravan site.

Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
RE: LAND ON EITHER SIDE OF SHIRLEY OAKS ROAD, SHIRLEY OAKS VILLAGE, POPPY LANE; STROUD GREEN PUMPING STATION; COOMBIE FARM, COOMBIE LODGE NURSERIES off Conduit Lane, land west of Shirley Oaks Road, rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens OBJECTION TO DE-DESIGNATION GREEN BELT; SHIRLEY, NEW ADDINGTON, FOREST HILL

We have lived in the Borough of Croydon for 30 years and value its vibrancy and diversity.

As Croydon ratepayers we object to the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land generally, especially land detailed above, which will change forever Croydon’s character.

We would ask you to encourage policies/development to:

1. Build new housing on brown field sites by all means AND preserve invaluable green space for the benefit of the community of Croydon; 2. Protect green belt land and preserve the green corridors we desperately vital for wildlife and biodiversity; 3. Amend the tall buildings policy and keep the tall building zone where it is suited in the centre of town; 4. Utilise brownfield sites for new low-level housing only where it can be developed alongside new GP surgeries, schools and improved public transport; 5. Traveller sites are not appropriate in the green belt and is a clear breach Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. When travellers camped on Addington Playing Fields in 2012/13 they left rubbish, debris, waste, and deterioration to a local green space. Sadly true of most traveller sites.

"Nowadays people know the price of everything and the value of nothing". Green Belt is vital and precious. Once lost for future generations and will not be replaced by developers.

We understand the need for housing, schools, hospitals and infrastructure. Are the Developers investing these also alongside their building investments?

Please protect our few remaining green spaces on the borough map, by making better use of brown field sites.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3778/01/005/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Wakelam</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661 A further inappropriate development of the Green Belt which would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b, and to which we also object, is the proposed use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3779/01/006/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Andrew Frazer</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661 Policy DM44.2 Gypsy-Traveller site. This should be restricted to sites other than Green Field sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3782/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr David Reid</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661 I am writing to object to: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 for use as a gypsy and traveller site as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b, or with Policy E of &quot;Planning Policy for Traveller Sites&quot; published by Government in August which states &quot;Traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3784/01/003/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Jennifer Aarons</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661 Both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3785/01/01/O/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Jenny Greenland</td>
<td>Object DM44.2</td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the use of either of the two sites in the Shirley locations or Forest Dale as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.” The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Change | This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found. |
Can I remind you of the definition / meaning of GREEN BELT:

The Government formerly set out its policies and principles towards green belts in England and Wales in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: Green Belts, but this planning guidance was superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in March 2012. Planning Authorities are strongly urged to follow the NPPF's detailed advice when considering whether to permit additional development in the green belt. In the green belt there is a general presumption against inappropriate development, unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated to show that the benefits of the development will outweigh the harm caused to the green belt. The NPPF sets out what would constitute appropriate development in the green belt.

According to the NPPF, there are five stated purposes of including land within the green belt:

- To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
- To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
- To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Once an area of land has been defined as green belt, the stated opportunities and benefits include:

- Providing opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population
- Providing opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas
- The retention of attractive landscapes and the enhancement of landscapes, near to where people live
- Improvement of damaged and derelict land around towns
- The securing of nature conservation interests
- The retention of land in agricultural, forestry and related uses.

This is a totally preposterous proposition and I am quite frankly astonished that such a ludicrous idea has been proposed.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.

If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Object 661

Finally, the Council has identified two locations on the edge of Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites:

• Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, which is identified as suitable for 15-20 pitches (pages 449-450, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 502); and
  • Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, which is identified as suitable for 15-25 pitches (pages 468-469, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 661).

I vigorously object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As you have to be aware, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

“Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question – there must be more suitable sites which are closer to local amenities (there is nothing in the way of shops or even a bus-stop at these sites, necessitating extra vehicular traffic on an already busy road at best or pedestrians attempting to cross at a very dangerous point with blind bends and junctions at worst), sites which are not in Green Belt land, perhaps even sites which already exist and could be expanded (such as the one on Purley Way).

Again, I stress that I am not opposed to development as such, and applaud the efforts that the council is making to build on the work of the previous administration and improve Croydon yet further. But these proposals go too far, and in my opinion they go in the wrong direction.
Fourth, the Council has identified two locations on the edge of Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites:
- Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, which is identified as suitable for 15-25 pitches (pages 468-469, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 661).

I object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

I strongly object to this policy and the plan to create a traveller site at this location as it is a greenbelt site and not appropriate for this purpose, as per Policy E of "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites".

With reference to the Local Plan which has been proposed, please note my objection to the following policies:
Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane, next to Coombe Wood Gardens Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661

I am emailing to record my objection to the following policies within the 'Local Plan'.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3797/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Andrews</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>We understand our local Member of Parliament, Mr Gavin Barwell, has produced a comprehensive assessment and objection to the Proposed Croydon Local Plan. We agree and support his objections. In particular the proposed positions of the Gypsy/Travellers' encampments (Refs 502 + 661) would be in suburban residential/Green Belt areas and as such are totally unacceptable. The most suitable positioning could be near Recycling Centres and situated in commercial/factory estates where the Travellers' encampments would not impinge upon residential properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3800/01/002/DM44.2/C</td>
<td>Ann Nussey</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3802/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Beckie Backham</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The council has gone to great expense to protect the site from mobile travellers and this seems to have been a great waste of tax payers money if they now allow a permanent site. Several businesses which make a big contribution to the local economy and also provide much needed amenity to the public will be detrimentally affected by the site.
Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 6 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Comment Site 661, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit lane. Transition Town have expressed an interest in restoring this site to a proper nursery facility, utilising the existing greenhouses for the growing of food, which would be a sustainable and appropriate activity within this green belt site

Site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I object to the use of the following sites as gypsy/traveller sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, which is identified as suitable for 15-20 pitches (pages 449-450, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 502); and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, which is identified as suitable for 15-25 pitches (pages 468-469, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 661). I object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr Ian Leonard  
Object  
DM44.2  
661  
Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, which is identified as suitable for 15-25 pitches (pages 468-469). Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 661). I object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveler sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: Traveler sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveler sites in the borough, which I believe is questionable, they should look elsewhere (for example, off Purley Way where the existing site is).

Joan Sabatini  
Object  
DM44.2  
661  
As this site is classed as a Green Belt site, this proposal goes against the Government Planning Policy for Travellers Sites and is totally inappropriate. I oppose the Council Plans to create a Gypsy/Traveler site in this location.

Mr Peter Spragg  
Object  
DM44.2  
661  
6.Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane, next to Coombe Wood Gardens Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 (p179). The council is planning to create a Gypsy/Traveller site here. This is a greenbelt site, and it is not appropriate to put a traveler site here. Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”, published by the Government in August, states very clearly: “Traveler sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

Mr Brandon Hannan  
Object  
DM44.2  
661  
Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 (p179). The council plans to create a Gypsy/Traveller site here. This is a greenbelt site, and it is not appropriate to put a traveler site here. Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveler sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
The council plans to create a Gypsy/Traveller site here. This is a greenbelt site, and it is not appropriate to put a traveller site here. Policy E of "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites", published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development".

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr Jon Adams

Object Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 (p179). The council plans to create a Gypsy/Traveller site here. This is a greenbelt site, and it is not appropriate to put a traveller site here. Policy E of "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites", published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development".

Mr Jon Taylor

It is with regret that I feel the need to object to the following proposals:-
- Purley skyscraper Policy DM40.1. I feel this proposal is completely out of keeping with the surrounding area and I strongly oppose it.
- Garden acquisition Policy DM2. This will make ‘garden grabs’ far too easy in my opinion, is far too subjective and is therefore a far weaker form of protection.
- Sanderstead Lidl site Policy DM41.3. This proposal will likely cause real problems to traffic in the vicinity and I do not think it is an appropriate site for retail development.
- Loss of Green Belt at Coombe Playing Fields and Croham Hurst Policy DM44.2. I believe that both of these locations should remain Green Belt and that re-designation is inappropriate. It will impact the area badly and in conjunction with other changes steadily change the nature of the area for the worse. The Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane Policy DM44.2. Finally I must strongly object to Council plans to develop a Gypsy/Traveller site here. I feel it is totally inappropriate placing this on Green Belt land and is in direct contravention of the "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites" published by the Government just last August!

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I object to the changing of this lovely open land into a Gypsy and Traveller site or made into residential land. It is vital some green spaces remain in the area.

I could not believe what I was reading on this point; this is a lovely green belt area. I frequently visit Coombe Wood Gardens, in fact I have been visiting it since I was a child. It is a lovely oasis in an increasingly overcrowded Croydon, it is so well maintained and a joy in each different season. I object very strongly to designation of the area next to it as a gypsy and traveler site or school, as it will increase traffic and make the area more noisy and messy. This area MUST stay designated as green belt, it is a jewel in Croydon's crown, and I am appalled that our Council could consider either of these options and I object to this proposal.

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

I object to Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, which is identified as suitable for 15-25 pitches (pages 468-469, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 661). I object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough – which I would question – they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3821/01/02/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Richard Kellaway</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3824/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Stephen Lambert</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3825/01/007/DM44.2/S</td>
<td>Yasmeen Hanifa</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3826/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Ms L Pinkney</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I write in objection to the following Policies and proposals in the draft Croydon Local Plan Ref. No 661 Coombe Lodge Nurseries - I object to the use of these locations as traveller sites, as they are both in green belt land and one of them borders a site of Nature Conservation interest, this is clearly in breach of policy E. Both sites are some distance from Public Services and the road here could not cope with more traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3829/01/004/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Dr L Bowen-Long</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
As a resident in Shirley I am utterly disgusted at the proposal for the gypsy/traveller site being proposed in Coombe Farm & Coombe Lodge Nurseries.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

We want to register our horror at the thought of a travellers site being allowed on this land. We feel that this land would be far better used as a school site or for affordable housing. It is a prime piece of land, which is a brownfield site, ripe for the right sort development and can be sold for a significant sum of money. Some of that money could be used to fund a travellers site in an area where the land value is cheaper. In this way funds will be released to the borough. If it is sold for development for housing, the council will also then reap the benefit of council tax.
I would like to object to object to Policy DM 44 and DM 43 for proposing Gypsy and Traveller sites on the Conduit Lane nursery and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road. Both sites are located on the Green Belt and clearly considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and against Government Policy. There are no very special circumstances that have been advanced by the council to allow the use of this land. It is not in the local community's interest to erode the Green Belt and would set a worrying precedent for future planning applications. This is not deliverable on either sites and they are clearly not a suitable location for development and the council has not taken into account the time it would take to bring the plan to fruition. There is a lot of implications for the local area that don't seem to have been taken into account: the road network is at capacity, local amenities are not ready to take an increase in demand (no space in local primary schools). The council has provided little credibility in the assessments that due diligence had been done regarding the sites: do we need an Environmental Impact Assessment to safeguard the local Coombe Gardens? How much would it cost to mitigate the impact of the sites on this local SAC? Impact on Lloyd Park? These two sites are not sustainable in the fact that they do not seem to meet the Gypsies and travellers needs. There are not enough local amenities for this community (where are the local shops they can walk to? Where are the local doctors they can walk to? What school would the children go to?). The proposed developments also compromise the future of the local area and are therefore not sustainable. There are an awful lot of issues that the council doesn't seem to have taken into account when looking at both sites of Conduit Lane and Oak Farm. These two sites are not too big for what the Travellers community express preference for. The sites are too far for local amenities that they prefer to walk to. The local road network would not be safe for moving larger vehicles. Coombe Lane is incredibly busy all day long and is too narrow to provide safe entrance and exit to larger vehicles. The visibility at the entrance and exit of the sites is not good enough to ensure there will be no accidents. The junction of Coombe Road / Oaks road and Conduit Lane is dangerous enough as it currently is.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
The council doesn't seem to have taken into account that travellers sites are generally mixed-use employment sites and does not address how commercial activities on site would be compatible with surrounding Green belt land and local SNCl. How can the council safeguard these local lands from waste materials and possible hazardous materials?

Mr & Mrs Brymer

Object

Soundness - Justified

DM44.2

661

I write in connection with the proposals for two traveller sites in South Croydon which have been identified by the Labour Council in the local plan. We are extremely concerned by this; these sites are in close proximity to where we live and we have seen the rubbish and human excrement that has been left around the area when they resided in Conduit Lane in recent years. Furthermore, an individual on the site verbally abused a family member when walking past to Coombe Gardens. Conduit Lane is used extensively by families and residents who are enjoying the footpaths and greenery of South Croydon. This is not an appropriate locality for such sites and we should be defending our green spaces from all threats, including traveller sites.

Mr & Mrs Posner

Object

DM44.2

661

I have lived in Croydon for nearly 50 years and am now retired. My husband and I are appalled at the proposed plans for Croydon. We have carefully studied the letter from our MP Mr Gavin Barwell and are totally in agreement with all his suggestions.

Overall, I would question whether our roads and other services would be able to cope with the proposed building ideas. To assume people will use fewer cars in the future is just plain silly. With regard to creating spaces for travellers by Coombe Wood Gardens, a brilliant and prize-winning park is totally irresponsible. The elimination of green areas by so much development would surely be injurious to the health, well-being and enjoyment of the citizens of Croydon.

My husband and I as Council tax payers over many years urge the Council to re-consider their plans in detail.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Development is on Green Belt. The Croydon Plan states: ‘The Council will seek to protect the special character of wooded hillsides and ridges. Development that would adversely affect the character of the area ... will be refused.’ (UDP Policy UD9). We feel very strongly that the character of the wooded hillside would not be maintained as there would not be space to grow trees. This development will simply add a built up area with little thought to conservation or environmental issues. The proposed new house would be visible from two areas of Green Belt: the grounds of Royal Russell School, Croham Hurst and Croham Hurst Golf Course. The Croydon Plan (UDP Policy RO6) states: ‘Development within or conspicuous from the Metropolitan Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land will not be permitted if it would harm their visual amenity.’ Proposed Sites should be on Brownfield or Industrial Land not Green Belt. It is very odd that the proposed two sites are not only in very close proximity to one another but they are also both in South Croydon. This creates an imbalance across the borough with all sites being proposed in the South of Croydon. We are also concerned that DCLG good practice guidance: Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites – A Good Practice Guide, 2008 has not been followed:
- Nothing has been done to encourage community cohesion - this is being forced on local residents and will do nothing to encourage social integration.
- These are semi-rural locations and noise from vehicles will disturb residents.
- Both the proposed sites are on green belt land, as stated above and thus the proposal is NOT in accordance with existing planning policies.
- A traveller site at these locations would in no way be in keeping with the local environment of a green belt area.
- Vehicles of this size would require a suitably large turning space to allow entry and exit from the site. High traffic volumes on Coombe Road and Oaks Road often travelling in excess of the speed limit, combined with the regular movement of large slow vehicles at these locations would introduce a substantial safety risk to road users.
- There is no evidence to suggest that there has been any gypsy family who has historically resided at, or near the proposed sites. There is no evidence of local family support existing in the vicinity of these sites.

We believe that instead of both Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm, the Council should consider the following sites:

- 16 - Heath Clark playing fields, Stafford Road, Waddon
- 120 - Timsbury Community Centre, Field Way, New Addington
- 518 - Land adjacent to 103 Goodenough Way, The Admirals Walk, Old Coulsdon
- 522 - Wandle Road surface car park, Wandle Road, Croydon Opportunity Area
- 536 - Land of former Croydon Airport runway, south of Imperial Way, Waddon
- 552 - Land adjacent to Ashburton playing fields at rear of 2-88 Colneidge Road, Addiscombe
- 553 - By Pavilion Playing Fields, Purley Way, Waddon
- 632 - Land south of Threethalpenny Woods, Kent Gate Way, Bride Way, Addington
- 636 - Land west of Timsbury Community Centre, Lodge Lane, Elmside, Addington
- 797 - Cane Hill-south part, Hollymoak Road / Portnalls Road, Coulsdon

Although a number of these following Sites may be Green Belt / Metropolitan Open Land, this should not preclude them, as they could be re-designated.
Where is the evidence that there is need for a site at these particular locations? This information has not been provided. When will the detailed site plans be made available? If not available at the start of the consultation period then this is surely a serious breech of government planning guidelines.

Object Soundness - Consistent with National DM44.2 661

Ms M de Villiers

I also object to the following policies in relation to Shirley (neighbouring area to where I live):
- Both proposed traveller sites are in the Green Belt and thus inappropriate as they are in breach of the Government Policy E, in relation to Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. They are also far from public services. I suggest the existing site on Purley way is reconsidered.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object Soundness - Consistent with National DM44.2 661

Lee Kirby-Walker

I am writing to object to:
- The use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:
  - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502
  - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object Soundness - Consistent with National DM44.2 661

Cllr M Gatland

I wish to object to the following:
- The use of the following as traveller or gypsy sites Coombe Lodge Nurseries site ref 661 Coombe Farm. Site ref 502. This is inappropriate development on Greenbelt.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Object Sites are located on the Green Belt, considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and against Government Policy ("Planning policy for traveller sites", DCLG, August 2015): the proposal to create a permanent traveller site on land designated as Green Belt land is contrary to Policy E of the Planning Policy. Inappropriate development, harmful to the Green Belt, should only be approved in very special circumstances. There are no very special circumstances that have been, or can be, advanced to allow the use of this land (The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) does NOT constitute exceptional circumstance). Inappropriate development is clearly harmful to the Green Belt. It is not in the surrounding community's interest to ensure the Green Belt to be eroded - approving this application would also set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to be subject to similar planning applications.

Negative impact on the local environment and wildlife. Inappropriate to simply weight Green Belt as one of many factors to be considered in the assessment process, rather it presents a policy objection that cannot be over-ridden in the way proposed.

To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, and offer a suitable location for development now. The site is clearly not a suitable location for development. Plan makers have not considered the time it will take to commence development on site: need for infrastructure improvements (roads), need for local amenities improvement (primary school, doctor) Plan makers have not considered the time and necessity to show due diligence in assessing the sites: need for an Environmental Impact Assessment (this would be a schedule 2 development having significant effects on the environment and needing an EIA) need for a Local Biodiversity Action plan to determine the sensitivity of the location Plan makers have not ensured that the process has credibility and acceptance: the bases for site criteria weightings are unclear. Plan makers will need to provide robust, up to date evidence to support the deliverability of sites, ensuring that their judgements on deliverability are clearly and transparently set out. Plan makers have not taken the cost and time Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present, without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The proposed development does not meets the needs of the present: Gypsies and Travellers needs are not addressed: not enough local amenities, sites are too big, unfit local roads. The proposed development does compromise the future of the local area. Government planning policy is to ensure local planning authorities have due regard to the protection of local amenities and the local environment. It is likely the proposals will have an adverse effect on local businesses Coombe Wood is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCO) (List of Historical Park and Gardens 2008) and borders the proposed Coombe Lodge Nurseries site, and would be negatively impacted by the plans. Croydon Council has already recognised this in its Development Management Policies document. The Borough Character Appraisal of 2015, the local area is listed as having special character. The proposed development is not sensitive to, and does not respect, this.
needed to mitigate the impact of the development on the sites. Croydon Council has already recognised in its Development Management Policies document that the Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) which borders the Coombe Lodge Nurseries Site, Coombe Wood (List of Historical Park and Gardens 2008) would be negatively impacted by the proposed development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>DM44.2</th>
<th>661</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3849/01/007/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Maureen Messett</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>I sincerely hope that my objections will be noted. I have lived in this borough for many many years and I hate seeing it gradually destroyed. Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3852/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr M Mulderry</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>I object to this site allocation. Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3855/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mrs Gill Willis</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>I cannot believe that this proposal has even made it into print. What possible benefits could the local community gain from such a move. This is a beautiful Park area where local families spend their leisure time all year. We have already had a taste of what would happen when the travellers recently parked illegally in Conduit Lane. I was walking past their lines of vans with the residents sitting on the steps watching us. As we proceeded further up the lane, we had to walk through their excrement and toilet paper. On another occasion, we could not pass because they were playing in the lane en masse and to have walked through would not have been possible. This is a community with nothing in common with the local residents who will use the Park. There can be no hope of integration. I would like to hear the rationale behind this proposal. Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Nicholas Barnes

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM44.2

661

Having read both local plans for the Shirley area, I strongly object to all aspects in both plans, this includes the 750 new homes on Shirley Oaks Village, 35 new homes in Shrublands, the two gypsy sites at Combe Fram and Conduit Nursery and the development for up the four storeys along Wickham Road.

None of these plans will benefit Shirley and I object to them all.

Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr Neil Walker

Object: DM44.2

661

This is a greenbelt site and not appropriate for such development.

Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr M Blount

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM44.2

661

I have considered details of the proposed Croydon Local Plan and have the following objections on the basis that they will:

detract from the local areas,

- dramatically change the local areas,

- dramatically change the character of local areas,

- have a significant adverse effect on an already overloaded infrastructure, including roads, public transport, public open space, environment and emergency, health and support services.

5. I object to the three proposed provision of Traveller sites at Conduit Lane, Coombe Farm and Featherbed Lane.

Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Pauline Morgan

Object: DM44.2

661

Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 (p179). The council plans to create a Gypsy/Traveller site here. This is a greenbelt site, and it is not appropriate for this purpose.

Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Object DM44.2 661</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3865/01/004/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Ms M Kaczanowski</td>
<td>Below is a list of our objections: 3. Policy DM 44.2, site 661 Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane, next to Coombe Wood Gardens - we strongly object to a site to be placed on a green belt. This will certainly have a negative environmental impact on this one and surrounding sites. Such a development will very negatively impact on character of the local area and will ultimately lead to its downgrading.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3868/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Angi Pyart</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3870/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Ms Fraser &amp; Ann MacDonald</td>
<td>We understand that there are plans to change the designation of areas of Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land - in particular two areas identified as locations for gypsy/traveller sites at Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane. Such plans would fundamentally change the character of the area for the worst. We wish to register our objections to these plans since the proposals are contrary to Government policy (Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller sites) which states that Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Soundness</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane is Green Belt land</td>
<td>Not in line with Government planning policy on the Green Belt</td>
<td>Government planning policy with regards to traveller sites wants to ensure that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detail:</td>
<td>• The proposal to create a permanent traveller site on land designated as Green Belt land is contrary to Policy E of the Planning Policy: &quot;Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances.&quot;. There are no very special circumstances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the &quot;very special circumstances&quot; justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt.</td>
<td>• Approving the proposal would set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to be subject to similar development. It is not in the community's interests to allow the erosion of the green spaces surrounding the community and we object to the impact this site could have on the environment and wildlife.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The local character description is clearly at odds with the proposal.</td>
<td>In the light of these issues, it is not appropriate simply to weight Green Belt as one of many factors to be considered, but rather it presents an overarching policy objection that cannot be over-ridden in the way proposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The justification acknowledges the Green Belt issue, though insufficiently, but relies on the fact that there are existing structures. These are not in fact substantial – being glasshouses – and could be said to be at least environmentally consistent with the Green Belt. But there is no very special circumstance justification proposed as required by Planning Policies.</td>
<td>The decision making process is contrary to Government guidance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Approving the proposal would set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to be subject to similar development.</td>
<td>To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now.
and we do not believe that The Assessment and selection of sites for Gypsy and Travellers undertaken was credible.

Plan makers have not considered the time it will take to commence development on site need for infrastructure improvements – roads
There is basis for challenging the way in which this potential site has been selected.
1 Para 3.1 – Green Belt sites included for review of eligible sites “to ensure that all locations for a site considered”, but at the same time “Exclusion of sites in Croydon Metropolitan Centre and within District Centres and Strategic Industrial Locations and Conservation Areas due to viability, deliverability and impact on heritage considerations”. Is this even-handed?

4 Para 4.1 sets out the criteria and weightings. As indicated above, Green Belt with no built form is given a weighting (-10) which, though high, is not very significant given that there are 29 or 30 criteria and can easily be outweighed by other factors that are less significant in policy terms. Furthermore, Coombe Nurseries has been weighted -5 for Green Belt, in recognition of the fact that there are some structures on the site, AND has been given 5 for the fact that (in the assessor’s view) such structures as there are can be converted to traveller use (if the buildings had to be demolished, on a green field site, this would have attracted -5).

1 SP2.7 on the Council’s proposals to deliver 39 additional gypsy and traveller sites indicates that land will be allocated in accordance with the proposals, but that any ADDITIONAL sites that are not so allocated should meet some stated criteria, including good access to local shops and essential services and good transport access; these seem to be criteria that were excluded from the proposed allocation, suggesting that any alternative proposals would need to meet stiffer criteria. Is this fair and even-handed?

2 The bases for site criteria weightings are unclear.

Inadequate Road Access which is an issue made particularly acute because of the current traffic issues in the area

10.14 Based on survey responses, most Gypsies and Travellers living in the Croydon area would prefer small,
family sized sites. Stakeholder comments suggested that smaller sites have fewer inter-family tensions and are therefore easier to manage.

10.18 The settled community neighbouring the sites should also be involved in the consultation from an early stage. There may be scope for expanding existing sites to meet some of the need. However, the preference is for smaller sites which tend to be easier to manage.

10.19 In terms of identifying broad locations for new sites, there are a number of factors which could be considered including:

- Social
- School catchment areas

10.21 Gypsies and Travellers undertaking the survey also suggested that it is important that new sites are located close to amenities such as shops, schools and health facilities – the current proposal does not meet the needs identified by this criteria.

10.22 CLG (2012) guidance suggests that Local planning authorities should strictly limit new traveller site development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements.

The Croydon Local Plan Note that paragraph 4.19 in referring to the need for good access to roads, states that “they often need to move larger vehicles as part of their livelihood and way of life” – this may be an assertion relevant to the assessment of sites and the narrowness of Coombe Lane.

Mixed-use employment sites restrict commercial activities on site. Use of public transport amongst Gypsies and Travellers has been noted to be low. By providing sites in more accessible locations Pressure on public services, local school and medical facilities other needs of Gypsies/Travellers are not met. Particular concerns for the disabled and elderly, young people. A recent study states that there is a greater incidence of ill-health amongst Gypsies and Travellers. Adequate services would not be provided for Gypsies/Travellers. It is widely recognised by government sources that literacy can be an issue within the Gypsy/Traveller community, - extra pressure on local schools who
are over-subscribed as it is

• Some evidence of periodic overcrowding on site – year round and at peak in winter months - Scotland

• gypsy-traveller.org - The best type of land is a ‘brown field’ site. The site should be close to local amenities; it is very important that the site has a safe entrance and exit. There are very strict Highway regulations about visibility at the entrance/exit to sites to ensure there is no danger of accidents and this is very important.

The objections may be summarized as:

- inappropriate use of Green Belt land
- lack of relevant amenities close to hand
- adverse effect on neighbouring businesses and leisure amenities
- site has a more appropriate use for a school
- critical increase in traffic harming the local area
- proposed site does not meet the criteria as set down in the guidance.

I am writing to object to:

1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites (policy DM44.2, Table 11.17):

   Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661;
   Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502;

Both sites are on Green Belt land, in contravention of Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”, published by the Government in August, and in addition are in areas devoid of local amenities especially primary schooling.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object

Gypsy/traveller site on Conduit Lane, next to Coombe Wood Gardens. Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”, published by the Government in August, says: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object/Change</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3876/01/01/DM44.2/O Edwina Morris</td>
<td>Object DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I object to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane Ref: 661 as a gypsy/traveller site. Both of sites 502 &amp; 661 are in the Green Belt and one of them borders on a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, August 2015, states “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.” Both sites are also some distance away from local public services, such as health and education, and from shops and other community facilities. All of the above proposals contravene the Croydon Local Plan’s Strategic Objective 10: Improve the quality and accessibility of green space and nature, whilst protecting and enhancing biodiversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3877/01/001/DM44.2/O Mrs Robin Ward</td>
<td>Object DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 as gypsy and Traveller sites as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b: Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3876/01/001/DM44.2/O Imran Mahmood</td>
<td>Object DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation. Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3880/01/002/DM44.2/O Emma Bean</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Justified DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b; Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3881/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mrs Julia White</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 as gypsy and traveller site as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3882/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Wendy Moulton</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3883/01/004/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mrs Marilyn Arbisman</td>
<td>Policy DM 44 - Creating a Gypsy/Travellers site in Conduit Lane would create an absolute blight on this lovely area. I cannot imagine anything more unlikely to put there, please, please don't. Also under this Policy the projected loss of Green Belt around Coombe Playing Fields and Croham Hurst is very worrying, this is one of the last remaining green areas of Croydon, and we should treasure them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object in the strongest possible way to the plans outlined for this development in my local area, Shirley and Addiscombe. In particular, I understand the Council has identified two locations on the edge of Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites:

• Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, which is identified as suitable for 15-25 pitches (pages 468-469, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 661).

I object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

“Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough, I think they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3885/01/008/DM44.2/O Mrs Barbara Cumming</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I understand that Council has identified two new locations on the edge of Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites: - Coomb/Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, which is identified as suitable for 15-25 pitches. I object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the green belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3890/01/002/DM44.2/O Kathy Coughlan</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3892/01/007/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Ms M Bailey</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3893/01/012/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Jan Payne</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr & Mrs Croxford & Leese  
Object  
DM44.2 661  
We wish to object to the proposal to establish traveller sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries (site ref no. 661) and Coombe Farm (site reference 502). Such use of these sites would, we feel, be inappropriate in the Green Belt, and contrary to Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b, and not consistent with Policy E of the Government’s “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”. The road hazards that would be associated with such use would require additional expenditure by the Council to resolve.

Mr Veldeman  
Object  
DM44.2 661  
Totally unacceptable that this is even being considered. Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. This is a greenbelt site, and it is not appropriate to put a traveller site here and existing residents of the area should be considered first.

Cllr M Neal  
Object  
DM44.2 661  
Site 661, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit lane. Transition Town have expressed an interest in restoring this site to a proper nursery facility, utilising the existing greenhouses for the growing of food, which would be a sustainable and appropriate activity within this green belt site;
The sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites', published by the Government in August, states very clearly that 'Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development'. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the 'Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers'. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of 'extensive political…consultation'. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

DM44.2

661

The sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites', published by the Government in August, states very clearly that 'Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development'. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the 'Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers'. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of 'extensive political…consultation'. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

DM44.2

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Ms E Rudduck

Object

DM44.2
661

I object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller site on Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane ref 661

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
1. Central Government is currently reviewing the approach to providing gypsy/traveller sites and so any proposals in the local plan should be subject to future government guidance.

2. Both sites are in the Green Belt and are contrary to Government policy which says that temporary or permanent gypsy/traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

3. Gypsy/traveller sites in both locations are completely out of character with the immediate surroundings - parkland, private schools, hotel, playing fields, golf course, middle/high value housing.

4. Access to public transport is poor - no buses and 15 minutes to the nearest tram stop.

5. Local doctors are difficult to get into.

6. There are no government schools nearby.

7. There are no shops within reasonable distance - closest are in Croydon town centre.

8. The evaluation system used to select the two sites is highly questionable and relies on LBC views of the relative importance of each criteria and then the points given. This form of weighted scoring is useful in giving guidance but not in delivering precise conclusions. It appears as if the wishes of the gypsy/travellers have been given more importance than those of local people. It would be interesting to see which sites were selected if more weight had been given to local interests and therefore how robust the evaluation system is to changes in how the criteria are viewed and scored.

9. Both sites will inevitably have a negative impact on property values.

10. Both sites pose a perceived increased security risk in the area.

11. Re site 661 the local plan in its justification says "the gypsy and traveller site will provide no greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt than the existing buildings". Impact does not only apply to the visual impact. Even on this narrow criteria it is hard to envisage the development from gypsy/traveller sites having a similar impact as the existing use which is periodic during the day and very much related to nature. Using the site for gypsy/travellers would mean a much higher overall impact on the local area - regular access, high activity, and a use out of character with the surrounding area, particularly the Site of Nature Conservation Interest.

12. Re site 502 the comment re "no greater impact" also applies.
The proximity to a school and existing housing means that this would have a significant impact on the character of the area in terms of increased traffic flow on a very quiet road and increased activity and noise in a very quiet area.

Mr & Mrs Golbourn  
Object DM44.2 661  
I am writing to object to the proposed use of Coombe Farm off Oaks Road (reference number 502) and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane (reference number 661) as gypsy/traveller sites. I believe that both of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. We should not encroach on the Green Belt. Surely there must be brownfield sites that could be used instead.

Mr & Mrs Kingdom OBE, JP  
Object DM44.2 661  
My wife and I were distressed to learn that Croydon Council is considering opening a site for gypsies and travellers in Conduit Lane. Our main concern is using a Green Belt site for these dwellings particularly when other schemes have been turned down in the past. In addition we are concerned about the loss and inconvenience caused to a beautiful which is very much enjoyed by the people who visit. Finally there may be a loss or inconvenience to catering sites viz the Chateau Restaurant, the café in the grounds of the gardens and finally Coombe Lodge and the Premium Hotel all well used amenities in the area and sources of employment. We do wish to be branded NIMBYs but we are sure there are more appropriate sites in Croydon to fulfill these proposals and obligations.

Mr & Mrs Blissett  
Object DM44.2 661  
We oppose the proposal to create a travellers facility in this location.

Mr & Mrs Foggo  
Object DM44.2 661  
We are writing to object to the use of the locations (Coombe farm ref 502 and Coombe lodge nurseries drew 661) as gypsy/travellers sites. It would drastically change the area’s local character (policyDM35.1). We are very concerned by these plans and it is our opinion that these areas don’t suit for travellers sites at all.
Mr & Mrs Willis

Object

I strongly object to these proposals as they would both be in the Green Belt and one of them borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". Therefore the Council's approach is clearly in breach of that policy. The Council should instead consider expanding the existing site off the Purley Way.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Ms L Chatfield

Object

I am writing my objections development on the following sites as a resident as well as in my capacity as Warden of Croydon Ecology Centre. The sites are in areas that are essential foraging grounds for wildlife, including badgers, which are a protected species. I believe that they are also all on Green Belt Land. I realise that local authorities are being given new powers that allows them to build on parts of Green Belt Land, but I sincerely believe that this will be a terrible mistake, for which future generations will not thank us. These sites are also part of one of the very few large stretches of open green spaces so close the the centre of Croydon, which makes an huge difference to the air quality in our town and to the visual aspect thereof. There is ample evidence to prove that these green urban spaces are essential for the mental well-being of crowded cities. All the open green spaces are there for the benefit of all Croydon's residents and those visiting our Borough, by building on them you are taking away this right from people all over the Borough. Please think again and make use of brown field sites instead. By using brown field sites you have the opportunity improve those sites with well planned and laid out housing and amenities. Coombe Lodge Nurseries would be better kept for the day when Croydon Council start to use it again as a nursery. This would save so much money, instead of paying out large sums annually on bedding plants. It could also be used as an extension to Coombe Woods Park. Part of it could be used as Saffron Farm and community garden or new allotments.

DM44.2

661

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
The Council is clearly in breach of "Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites", published by the Government in August 2015 stating "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". Local Development Framework policy states: "There are some policy differences in national planning guidance that reflect the nature of the use, for example sites for Gypsies and Travellers can be found in the countryside. However, Green Belt policy also applies and Gypsy and Traveller sites in the Green Belt are normally inappropriate development. Alternatives should be explored. The size of the proposed sites Coombe Farm is 15-20 pitches and Coombe Nurseries 15-25, both exceed the governments' guidelines - Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites- Good Practice Guide states sites should not exceed 15 pitches. The Gypsy, Traveller representatives have stated in Government guidelines that sites should not be located too close together due to conflict issues within their social community. Coombe Farm and Coombe Nurseries are situated within yards of each other and are, therefore, unsuitable. It is also worth noting that the existing permanent site at Latham’s Way was originally sanctioned for 15 pitches but has enlarged by a further 4 pitches to 19. The Local Residents are fearful of further site expansion and the option of a temporary site provision added to the permanent proposed sites at Coombe Farm and Coombe Nurseries which have already exceeded the recommended volume. Can the Council define the time period on temporary / emergency stopping places/sites, is the 28 days limit on the total use of this land over a yearly period or is it 28 days per Gypsy and Travellers passing through? If the latter is true then the Local Residents could see this land being occupied on a continuous basis although not by the same people so cohesion with the Local Community will be further restricted. Please can the Council be clear and state if the sites will be managed directly by the Council or by a Private Management company? Will the ownership of both sites be under the same Company? Why have the Council contradicted the GLG guide lines and weighted Privacy highly on the scoring methodology for Travellers and Gypsy sites as this sways the scoring on Coombe Farm unfairly but does not take into consideration Local Residents Privacy rights? This site is change.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
already owned by the Council so no purchase costs involved. It has a lower risk of the site being exposed to unauthorised encampments due to its enclosed boundaries. Access to the site will be problematic with increased traffic danger to an outdated crossing will still apply. The detrimental affect on Local Businesses also applies. I believe all Local Businesses have lodged their objections due to the nature of their countryside selling point. The Nursery site could be a great revenue earner for the Council.

Allotments are a rare opportunity for Londoners. The existing greenhouses could be rented out to encourage the building of local communities, encouraging educational and healthy activities. This would be a huge advantage for the people who live in small flats to grow their own produce. I could see this spot being ideal for small growers to sell directly to Croydon residents. This will then attract and boost the existing businesses, bringing more people to enjoy the public gardens, Lloyd Park and the woods of the beautiful Addington Hills. With the intense regeneration program now being realised within central Croydon- residential flats converted from empty office blocks, increase of commercial premises such as the planned Westfield development, it is hugely important that Croydon Council recognises the future need to keep the integrity of this amazing nature conservation area, its adjoining Green Belt land which leads onto Lloyd Park. This space is for the enjoyment of all Croydon's population and a great tourist attraction who can enjoy the precious natural wildlife environment situated within the M25. This will need to become more apparent as Croydon is embraced into Central London, keeping the integrity of this unspoilt area will provide a unique attraction to Londoners and Croydon residents seeking country walks and open space. We must fight to continue to sustain the precious natural wildlife for everyone to benefit. The area is accessible to many as it's already serviced by a fantastic variety of public transport links to and from many parts of London.
This site is also in a green belt area and for reasons as described above this proposal would be in contravention of national guidelines.

Again the Council has gone to great expense to protect this area, removing travellers from this site and using Council Tax income to do so.

The only public transport near this location is the tram which is oversubscribed during peak times. There are no shops, schools or public amenities such as medical centres within walking distance and minimal public footpaths on either side of the road.

Adjacent to both of these sites are a beautiful landscaped park and an area of outstanding beauty, home to many species of wild life with unparalleled open green spaces sorely lacking in other parts of South East London.

We understand that there is an existing travellers site in the Purley Way that is underused and feel that the energy would be better expended in improving the facilities at this site, which is far better services by public transport et.

We strongly object to the plans for a permanent travellers sit at both of the above locations for the reasons given.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gipsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3939/01/003/DM44.2/O Seema Jain</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>Incorrect calculation in selection criteria for site 661 and 502. If site is in Green Belt/MGL built form then it is marked as Amber/Orange which means a score of -5, +5 has been used which increase the rating by 10 points. Error in calculating site access for 661: There are cars parked on that road and the entrance is through a very busy main road. The site cannot have a rating of +5. It should be -2. That is a difference of 7 rating points.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3939/01/004/DM44.2/O Seema Jain</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3940/01/005/DM44.2/O Shirley Shephard</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 (p179). The council plans to create a Gypsy/Traveller site here. This is a greenbelt site, and it is not appropriate to put a traveller site here. Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3941/01/006/DM44.2/O Mr Frances Sell</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3941/01/006/DM44.2/O Mr Frances Sell</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>This is a green belt site and is not suitable for a traveller purpose. Government statements have stated greenbelt is not suitable for this purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3941/01/006/DM44.2/O Mr Frances Sell</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". The Council's approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

We object to Policy DM44 table 11, 17 site 661 on page 179 - traveller sites temporary or otherwise are inappropriate in the green belt

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr & Mrs Isaac

Object DM44.2 661

We are writing to object to the above proposals. We have grown up in South Croydon and have been regular visitors to Coombe Wood and gardens, and now with our young daughter. This green belt refuge in dense suburban Croydon would suffer great from any development in Conduit Lane. A traveller site would be inappropriate and adversely affect the character of this special environment. We understand that there are always competing demands and needs for the council to meet in the borough but please recognise the amenity value of precious green areas in Croydon, that would be lost to future generations by insensitive development.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mrs Haywood

Object DM44.2 661

1. This site is in the Green belt and according to Government Policy is deemed inappropriate.

2. The council has gone to great expense to protect the site from mobile travellers and this seems to have been a great waste of taxpayers money if they now allow a permanent site.

3. Several business which make a big contribution to the local economy and also provide much needed amenity to the public will be detrimentally affected by the site.

4. Coombe park which is a beautiful landscape park and contains many memorials to war dead and families loved ones will be completely overwhelmed by this enormous traveller development for up to 75 mobile homes right next door. The huge amount of traffic going along Conduit Lane will make access to the park from the parking bays on the other side of the road much more difficult and dangerous.

5. Again the size of the site will totally overwhelm the nearest settlement of residents, and i am one of them, I only bought my home a year ago, and if there had been a traveller development there then i would have not purchased the property. And I don't want to have to move from this area. From when travellers that got access to the field opposite Lloyds park a few months ago and the state they left the field in was awful. South croydon is such a lovely area to live in, very quiet with beautiful parks and this should not be ruined. And from point 2 what would have been the point of spending all the money to keep them away then giving them place that we have trying to protect would be such a waste.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mrs P Lamb

I wish to appeal against the proposed Traveller Sites in Coombe Farm, off Oaks Road, and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane. As a resident of Oaks Road for over 20 years, I find this proposal extremely poorly planned. This is a Green Belt area, of which I believe, building is not permitted. Also, an area of Nature Conservation Interest. We have had the misfortune several times over the years, of travellers stopping in this area. We have had to put up with noise, litter, and general bad behaviour, including theft from our property. Since Labour have come into power at the council, the litter collection has been severely depleted, leaving our beautiful road a mess. I fear the unwanted traveller sites would only make things worse. Has anyone checked that the entrance to the site from Oaks Road is extremely narrow, and NOT suitable for large caravans to enter or leave? Also, the transport links from that area are poor. I suggest this is political, as the sites chosen are in a Conservative held part of the borough. Please look again at your proposals, and not attempt to damage one of the few remaining green and pleasant parts of this borough.

Mrs R Jennings

Policy DM44.2 - Gypsy traveller site on green belt - not appropriate - Policy E of Government Planning Policy for traveller sites states that traveller sites, temporary to permanent are not permitted.

Mr & Mrs N Patel

The site is in a Green belt area and according to Government policy is deemed inappropriate. The council has gone to great expense to protect the site from travellers and it would be a waste of taxpayers money if a permanent site was allowed. The size of the site will overwhelm the nearest residents.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Coombe Lodge Nurseries, ref. 661;

This site would also constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b;

Several businesses which make a big contribution to the local economy and also provide much needed amenity to the public will be detrimentally affected by the site. We have heard from local residents that some gypsies have been threatening staff in a small café near the site. They will not objecting now for fear of reprisal. We have three young children and would not take them to Lloyd Park or Coombe Woods if this traveller site was allowed to go ahead. Many local residents we have spoken would do the same, for the safety of their children. We have a friend living near a gypsy site and they are constantly causing trouble in parks and residents are continually being threatened with physical and verbal abuse. This behaviour is totally unacceptable.

Gypsies and Travellers often express their preference to be within walking distance of shops/ health centres/ schools/ local amenities. The proposed sites are not close to any of these. The proposed sites go against Gypsies and Travellers preferences and against environment and climate initiatives by promoting the use of their own vehicles for daily life.

Coombe Wood is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) (List of Historical Park and Gardens 2008) and borders the proposed Coombe Lodge Nurseries site, and would be negatively impacted by the plans.

Coombe Woods is a beautiful park and this massive traveller development would cause a huge amount of traffic going along Conduit Lane, Coombe Road and Oaks Road. This would make parking on the Conduit Lane and the other side of the road more difficult and very dangerous. These parking bays are used by families and the very old to give them easy access to the park.

Also, the size of the site would totally overwhelm the nearest settlement of residents on Coombe Road, Oaks Road and Oaks Lane.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

02 September 2016
Ms S Ikpa Object DM44.2
661
I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661, policy number DM44: and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502, policy number DM31.4. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites eg the site off the Purley Way. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards.

Ms Olive Anne Bowyer Object DM44.2
661
Ref. 502. Proposed sites for gypsy/travellers in Green belt land. Government policy published in August says very clearly “travellers sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.” This is in breach of this policy. Coombe farm and Ref. 755 Featherbed Lane (Pear Tree Farm Cottage near to Hutchingsons Nature Reserve) are all Green Belt.

Mr & Mrs Smith Object DM44.2
661
We are strongly against the planning ideas you have over green spaces. Please add these six against to planning ideas with references below DM40.1 DM52 40.4 DM44.2 DM28 DM31.4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3986/01/003/DM44.2</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Crane</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>We are life long residents of Croydon. With reference to the local plan we would like to object to the following proposals: • DM40.1 - A skyscraper in Purley is total out of character for the town. Purley needs development but this is not the way to go about it. • DM40.4 - Purley Pool - whilst not objecting to this area being redeveloped it should include a swimming pool. Our children learnt to swim here and it is an important facility to the community. For instance our Father uses it regularly. It has been vital to maintaining his health and he would not be able to travel to more distant pools. • DM44.2 - It is not appropriate to have a travellers site on green belt land. We believe it is important to protect all Green Belt land from development. • DM31.4 - We are opposed to the intensification of these areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3989/01/003/DM44.2</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Thomas</td>
<td>Object Soundness - Consistent with National</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>Please can I object to the Labour Councils plans to build Gypsy/Traveller Sites in the Green Belt. Why is this Council determined to concrete over the leafy / green areas of Croydon ? We do not need Traveller encampments anywhere near Pear Tree Farm or in Featherbed Lane. There are enough brownfield sites in the Borough for these camps to be built.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3995/01/002/DM44.2</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Jarrett</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>We strongly object to any alteration of properties on Forestdale which would prove to be unsightly also the proposed sites on Featherbed Lane and Conduit Lane. We are a green belt area!!! Please let it stay that way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3997/01/009/DM44.2/O Mr P Fitzpatrick

Object Soundness - Justified DM44.2 661

I am formally objecting to:

3. the use of the following locations as gypsy / traveller sights:

   Coombe Farm off Oaks Road REFERENCE NUMBER 502;
   Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane REFERENCE NUMBER 661; and
   Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane REFERENCE NUMBER 755;

As the Council acknowledges all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders on a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites", published by the Government in August says very clearly

"Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate Development"

The Council's approach is clearly in breach of the policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Healthfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Healthfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy / traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

3998/01/004/DM44.2/O Mr P Skuse

Object DM44.2 661

I personally object to some of the proposals - The Local Plan Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 (p179). The council plans to create a Gypsy/Traveller site here on a greenbelt site which is extremely inappropriate especially as it would be impossible to prevent any spoiling of Coombe Wood garden and woodland by occupants of such a site. The garden and associated land are a delight which should not risk further vandal damage!

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 661</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4002/01/005/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Turner</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>We are writing to object to the following sites for housing and traveller sites. Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4007/01/003/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr R Horton</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I wish to log my objection to the two large gypsy/travellers site in Coombe Farm and the Conduit Nursery of Coombe Road. Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4010/01/008/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr R Morley-Smith</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified. Happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but will be objecting to building on precious open space. Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4014/01/004/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr R Swatton</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>Policy DM42 (note: policy reference is incorrect in representation). Table11.17 To endeavour to establish Gypsy/Travellers site on this land contravenes Government policy for Greenbelt sites. And due to it’s nature this site is totally inappropriate for this area and will have a significant impact on local residents. Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conduit Lane and Coombe Farm sites are on greenbelt land. Government policy states "Traveller sites temporary or permanent in the Greenbelt are inappropriate developments". As well as damaging the local environment, there are not sufficient local amenities to cope with two traveller sites in close proximity.

I would like to object to the use of the following sites:
- Coombe Lodge Nurseries, site reference 661
- Coombe Farm site reference 502
Both these sites are Green Belt. Also the whole character of the area would change. The doctors surgeries are already overcrowded as are dentists and hospitals. The schools in the area are at bursting point. I use the trams and they are also overcrowded especially during the rush hour.

If the Green belt site is de-designated this could be the start of many more. There are other sites in Croydon that are not Green Belt. Why can't existing sites be expanded?

I hope you take my views into consideration as everybody that I know in the area is of the same view.

Yours faithfully,

I would like to lodge my objection to the use of this location as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest.

Proposed Gypsy/Traveller sites proposed for Addiscombe and East Croydon, Addington, Forresdale and Addington and Shirley - This sounds like a dreadful idea. I strongly object to the above proposal – This is a dreadful idea and surely anyone with any love or concern for Croydon would also object strongly.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020/01/02/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Smith</td>
<td>I wish to object to the proposed Permanent Gypsy &amp; Traveller sites in Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane, Coombe Road, South Croydon – ref 661 &amp; Coombe Farm, Oaks Road, Shirley – ref 502</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020/01/10/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Ewin</td>
<td>Objection to Croydon Council's proposal to provide sites for travellers &amp; the building of houses, etc on green land in Shirley &amp; other areas.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020/02/01/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Ms S Amin</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of the location of site 661 as a gypsy and traveller site. The site would constitute in appropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms S Bailey</td>
<td>I register an objection to both of these proposals on the following grounds. Both are acknowledged to be in the Green Belt and the proposal is contrary to Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites which was published by the government in August 2015, which says &quot;Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development&quot;. One of the sites adjoins a Site of Nature Conservation Interest, which would suffer detrimentally as a result of this proposed development and the impact on such a site should be a criteria when assessing potential locations. A lack of suitable criteria, not to have an unacceptable adverse impact on biodiversity, have been used when looking at potential locations which has resulted in the rather perverse selection of two sites in the Green Belt. It seems turning green belt in to a gypsy / traveller site can only have an impact on biodiversity. Additional criteria should also be utilised, including: - Not in the Green Belt. - Does not impact upon important open spaces such as a Sites of Nature Conservation Interest / Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty / SSSI's or other protected locations. - Residential properties or other recreational areas, such as parks and gardens, will not be impacted by the &quot;setting&quot;of gypsy / traveller sites. - Existing services (water, sewerage, highways) and other public services are already in place and easy to access. Suitable alternatives have not been considered. Even a cursory drive around the area of the existing gypsy / traveller site will reveal much more suitable locations in close proximity to existing facilities.</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr S Dhanda</td>
<td>The use of land to provide pitches at Coombe Farm, Oaks Road or Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane is entirely out of keeping with the character of those areas. Why ruin such beautiful areas so close to central Croydon for future generations? Once gone, that land will be gone forever. We should treasure areas such as these and put them to a much more appropriate use in keeping with the use of similar surrounding land. Housing/Residential/Pitches are not good uses of this land. The only real alternative if there has to be one is at Pear Tree Farm, Featherbed Lane where there already exists a large scale housing development and appropriate facilities including schools, transport and infrastructure nearby.</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/001</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/002</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/003</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>SP2.7 makes no mention of impact on the surroundings of the site and nearby residents. Accordingly, an additional criterion should be added: Must be entirely acceptable in relation to its impact on nearby public spaces and residents and businesses. If this were included the proposals Ref 502, Coombe Farm, and Ref 661, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, would immediately be seen to be inappropriate. Coombe Lodge Nursery is by the lovely gardens of Coombe Wood with its popular tea room and wooded area. Coombe Farm is green belt land in Lloyd Park, left to the people of Croydon by the Lloyd family and where families enjoy the open space, kids play in the play area, joggers, dog walkers and of other walkers exercise, spots are played, families snack in the cafe and everyone feels reasonably safe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a resident in the area, I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:

a) Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661
b) Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502

as above sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7A and SP2.7B;

The de-designation of: Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation; Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

These proposals are clearly harmful for the Green Belt and would have a negative impact on the environment and wildlife in Coombe Wood, Shirley Hills and Lloyd Park. It would create a precedent for further erosion of our valuable local amenity. Coombe Road and Coombe Lane are already very busy roads and one of the main arteries into the town centre. The additional traffic emanating from these two sites, without significant road improvements, would exacerbate the traffic congestion, not to mention the additional pressure on the already stretched local services such as schooling and general practitioners. The access roads to these proposed sites are clearly unsuitable for the larger vehicles that this community use as part of their livelihood and way of life. The junctions at Coombe Road, Oaks Road and Conduit Lane are already dangerous for vehicles and this area has the potential with this proposal to become a major accident black spot without significant very costly improvements to the local road network.

Object

DM44.2

As a resident in the area, I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:

a) Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661
b) Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502

as above sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7A and SP2.7B;

The de-designation of: Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation; Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

These proposals are clearly harmful for the Green Belt and would have a negative impact on the environment and wildlife in Coombe Wood, Shirley Hills and Lloyd Park. It would create a precedent for further erosion of our valuable local amenity. Coombe Road and Coombe Lane are already very busy roads and one of the main arteries into the town centre. The additional traffic emanating from these two sites, without significant road improvements, would exacerbate the traffic congestion, not to mention the additional pressure on the already stretched local services such as schooling and general practitioners. The access roads to these proposed sites are clearly unsuitable for the larger vehicles that this community use as part of their livelihood and way of life. The junctions at Coombe Road, Oaks Road and Conduit Lane are already dangerous for vehicles and this area has the potential with this proposal to become a major accident black spot without significant very costly improvements to the local road network.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object

DM44.2

I strongly object to this policy and the plan to create a traveller site at this location as it is a greenbelt site and not appropriate for this purpose, as per Policy E of (Planning Policy for Traveller Sites).

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Object DM44.2 This is a greenbelt site and is therefore not suitable for a gypsy site.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object DM44.2 Happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but will be objecting to building on precious open space. Objecting to the use of either of those locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object DM44.2 Reasons for objecting:
1) It will be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining owners
2) It is an inappropriate use of Green Belt land
3) Sites that are located on the Green Belt are considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and are against government policy (Planning policy for Traveller Sites, DCLG August 2015)
4) There are a lack of appropriate amenities close at hand
5) There is insufficient local infrastructure to accommodate the plans
6) Selection of proposed sites should have a bias towards brownfield or industrial land, not Green Belt
7) the existing permanent site in Lathams Way off Bedding Farm Road could be expanded

Alternative suggestions for sites:
Site reference no: 661: Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane, Coombe Road, South Croydon CR0 5RQ

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
### Ms S Rhys-Davies

**Object DM44.2 661** Reasons for objecting:
1. It will be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining owners
2. It is an inappropriate use of Green Belt land
3. Sites that are located on the Green Belt are considered to be inappropriate development for Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) and are against government policy (Planning policy for Traveller Sites, DCLG August 2015)
4. There are a lack of appropriate amenities close at hand
5. There is insufficient local infrastructure to accommodate the plans
6. Selection of proposed sites should have a bias towards brownfield or industrial land, not Green Belt
7. the existing permanent site in Latham’s Way off Bedding Farm Road could be expanded

### Mr S Maniar

**Object DM44.2 661** I object as it would be: 1) Detrimental to the amenities of adjoining owners, 2) Insufficient local infrastructure to accommodate the plan, 3) Inappropriate use of green belt land. Alternative suggested sites: 1) 536: Land of Former Croydon Airport runway, South of Imperial Way, Waddon - 2) 767-Cane Hill-south Part, Hollymead Road, Purley - 3) 787-Portwallis Road, Coulsdon.

### Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I would like to register my strong objection to the Council’s proposals for the consideration of Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge Nurseries as gypsy/traveller as stated in the above documents and reference numbers. The sites are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s proposals would be in breach of that policy. In addition to this policy breach, these sites are surrounded by parks which are regularly enjoyed by many local residents (including myself) for their natural beauty and relaxing environments. Their positive contributions to our well-being cannot be underestimated and will be significantly impacted by your proposals. It is therefore hard to imagine why such sites have even been considered at all, or in preference to other sites in the Council’s document ‘Assessment and selection of sites for Gypsy and Travellers August 2015’. The scoring method applied is rather confusing. For example, the GB/MOL criteria in the table in section 4.1 has the possible scores of -10, -5 or +10, yet the two references above have been given a GB/MOL score of 5, which is detrimental to their overall score. I would be grateful if the Council could reconsider its plans. Please explain regarding the issues raised around the above objections.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I am grateful to the Council for consulting on the detailed policies and proposals that will make up the Croydon Local Plan. There is much in the document that I agree with, but some of the proposals would, in my opinion, change the character of parts of Croydon very much for the worse. I hope you will forgive me if I focus on these areas of contention. I am therefore writing to formally object to:

1. de-designation of the Metropolitan Open Land around Shirley Oaks Village;

2. the use of the following five sites for housing:
   • land at Poppy Lane reference number 128;
   • Stroud Green Pumping Station, 140 Primrose Lane reference number 504;
   • land to the east of Shirley Oaks Road and to the rear of Beech House and Ash House reference number 541;
   • land to the west of Shirley Oaks Road reference number 542; and
   • land to the rear of 5-13 Honeysuckle Gardens reference number 548.

If the Council will not keep them as Metropolitan Open Land, these five sites should at least be designated as Local Green Spaces. Building housing on them would mean the loss of a vital green corridor between Shirley Oaks and the surrounding areas, changing the character of this part of Shirley. As far as I can see, these are the only bits of Metropolitan Open Land in the whole borough which the Council is proposing to de-designate and allow housing to be built on. Why has Shirley Oaks been singled out in this way?

3. the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:
   • Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502;
   • Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; and
   • Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 750.

As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site...
of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

“Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.”

The Council's approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is);

4. Focussed intensification associated with gradual change of an area's local character under Policy DM31.4 of the Shirley Road Shopping Parade, Shirley local centre and Forestdale. Shirley Road Shopping Parade is surely worthy of protecting rather than replacing with medium-rise blocks? Shirley local centre is defined not just as a stretch of the Wickham Road (where some intensification may be appropriate) but Ridgemount Avenue, Wickham Avenue, Peregrine Gardens, West Way Gardens, the northern section of Hartland Way and the western parts of Bennetts Way and Devonshire Way. Replacing the largely semi-detached buildings in these residential roads with medium-rise blocks would completely change the character of Shirley. Replacing the largely terraced housing and small blocks of flats in Forestdale with medium-sized blocks would completely change that area too;

5. Policy DM2 on development on garden land, which is too subjective and therefore too weak. There should be a much stronger presumption against development on garden land; and

6. Policy DM28, which should allow higher levels of parking in developments of low public transport accessibility. Restricting parking spaces in such areas doesn't lead to fewer people owning their own car; it just leads to greater competition for existing spaces.
Mr Matt Knight  
Object DM44.2  
661  
I object to the use of the site as a traveller site.  
Change  
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr & Mrs Shah  
4051/01/009/DM44.2/O  
661  
We would like to notify you of our objection to the proposed traveller sites at Coombe Farm off Oaks Road and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, as described in your consultation on the detailed policies and proposals for The Croydon Local Plan.  
We understand that there are plans to change the designation of areas of Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. Specifically, we understand that the Council have identified two locations in the Shirley area for gypsy/traveller sites at Coombe Farm off Oaks Road and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane.  
We wish to object to the Council's proposals as both these sites are in the Green Belt and the proposals are contrary to Government policy (Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites) which states "Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". Clearly the Council's approach is in breach of this policy.  
It is also our understanding that one of these proposed locations for gypsy/traveller sites borders a Site for Nature Conservation Interest. Also both these proposed sites are some distance away from public services.  
It is our view that the proposals will change the character of our area very much for the worse.  
In the circumstances, these proposals should not be approved.

Mr & Mrs Shah  
4054/01/004/DM44.2/C  
661  
We would like to notify you of our objection to the proposed traveller sites at Coombe Farm off Oaks Road and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, as described in your consultation on the detailed policies and proposals for The Croydon Local Plan.  
We understand that there are plans to change the designation of areas of Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. Specifically, we understand that the Council have identified two locations in the Shirley area for gypsy/traveller sites at Coombe Farm off Oaks Road and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane.  
We wish to object to the Council's proposals as both these sites are in the Green Belt and the proposals are contrary to Government policy (Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites) which states "Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". Clearly the Council's approach is in breach of this policy.  
It is also our understanding that one of these proposed locations for gypsy/traveller sites borders a Site for Nature Conservation Interest. Also both these proposed sites are some distance away from public services.  
It is our view that the proposals will change the character of our area very much for the worse.  
In the circumstances, these proposals should not be approved.
Mr & Mrs Shah

Object DM44.2 661

We would like to notify you of our objection to the proposed traveller sites at Coombe Farm off Oaks Road and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, as described in your consultation on the detailed policies and proposals for The Croydon Local Plan.

We understand that there are plans to change the designation of areas of Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. Specifically, we understand that the Council have identified two locations in the Shirley area for gypsy/traveller sites at Coombe Farm off Oaks Road and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane.

We wish to object to the Council’s proposals as both these sites are in the Green Belt and the proposals are contrary to Government policy (Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites) which states “Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. Clearly the Council’s approach is in breach of this policy.

It is also our understanding that one of these proposed locations for gypsy/traveller sites borders a Site for Nature Conservation Interest. Also both these proposed sites are some distance away from public services.

It is our view that the proposals will change the character of our area very much for the worse.

In the circumstances, these proposals should not be approved.

Mr & Mrs Ferguson

Object DM44.2 661

We are writing to object to: 1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; because both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b:

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4062/01/12/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Keith &amp; Susan Hobbs</td>
<td>Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveler Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croydon). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4063/01/07/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Whitehead</td>
<td>We also wish to object to the plans for traveller sites around the Coombe Lane and Oaks Road areas. We have seen first hand what travellers have done to an area of land. In a matter of two days we had piles of rubble, plastic and human waste on the open land to the rear of us. The residents of Shirley Oaks were forced to pay for the cleanup, on two separate occasions. Groups have repeated this mess in numerous places around Shirley over the last few years and have no respect for the area, so why should we create space for them at our expense.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4064/01/07/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Gregory Boyce</td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development". The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661, policy number DM44 as a gypsy and traveller site

This site is in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites eg the site off the Purley Way.

In addition sites 661 and 502 does not have easy access to local schools, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into these sites is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
### Comments From Local Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object Description</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Marilyn Loader</td>
<td>Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Kenneth Lim</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann McEvaddy</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 as gypsy and traveller site as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b;</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Tross</td>
<td>Given the existing levels of brownfield sites in the area, these should be exhausted before encroaching on areas that would significantly alter the character of the area.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4072/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Dr Abia Afsar-Siddiqui</td>
<td>Object DM44.2 661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4072/01/007/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Dr Abia Afsar-Siddiqui</td>
<td>Object DM44.2 661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4073/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Graham Lyon</td>
<td>Object DM44.2 661</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object: DM44.2

Reasons for Objecting:
- The development would cause a detrimental effect to the Amenities of Adjoining Owners in the local area.
- The proposed development is on Green Belt.
- Surely a sensible site should be on Brownfield or Industrial Land as in an ever increasing urbanised area where developments and buildings are being built at an alarming rate we are losing all green space.
- To use the Sites would require a Change of Land Use.
- Why on earth are two of the proposed sites in such close proximity from one another in an area the size of the borough of Croydon?
- There is a complete imbalance across the borough with all Sites being Proposed in the South of Croydon.
- Potential increased crime in our local area (this was highlighted only last week when the South Croydon area (Brighton Road and surrounding areas) came to a stand still and hit national press with the eviction of travellers found to have firearms. The local School I worked in had to lock its gates and not allow students into the surrounding area until the conflict had been dealt with) my young families security and happiness are paramount, hence the reason I chose South Croydon to live in and paid the large additional house price to ensure my family were free from this sort of activity.
- My preference would be to simply expand the existing permanent Gypsy Site in Lathams Way off Beddington Farm Road, would this not provide a simple and cost effective option for the council and far less issues to a huge number of tax paying, law abiding citizens in the Croydon Borough???? If the council is unwilling to do this then from the proposals then Pear Tree Farm & Pear Tree Farm Cottage, Featherbed Lane should be one of the selected sites.

Change:
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object: DM44.2

Reasons for Objecting:
- The alternative suggested site that would have far less impact on the local area and it residents (not all being on Green Belt either????? in my opinion would be:
  - 16 - Heath Clark playing fields, Stafford Road, Waddon
  - 120 - Timebridge Community Centre, Field Way, New Addington
  - 518 - Land adjacent to 103 Goodenough Way, The Admirals Walk, Old Coulsdon
  - 522 - Wandle Road surface car park, Wandile Road, Croydon Opportunity Area
  - 536 - Land of former Croydon Airport runway, south of Imperial Way, Waddon
  - 552 - Land adjacent to Ashburton playing fields at rear of 2-88 Cenridge Road, Addiscombe
  - 553 - By Pavilion Playing Fields, Purley Way, Waddon
  - 652 - Land south of Threehalffenny Woods, Kent Gate Way, Bridle Way, Addington
  - 636 - Land west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, Elmside, Addington
  - 76 - Crane Hill south part, Hollymead Road / Portnalls Road, Coulson

Change:
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr & Mrs Belsey

Object

DM44.2
661

The area where the travellers site is being suggested is Greenbelt. We must not build on Greenbelt sites, as these are areas for relaxation, wildlife and nature. Again this will result in a decrease in wildlife and more flooding.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Melissa Chu

Object

DM44.2
661

I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661, policy number DM44; and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502; policy number DM43; Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference number 755, policy number DM32. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites eg the site off the Purley Way. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Natwarlal Patel

Object

DM44.2
661

I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr & Mrs Hyde

Object DM44.2

We object to:

the proposed de-designation of Croham Hurst and Coombe Road playing fields as Green Belt.

the proposed use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries (site 661) and Coombe Farm (site 502) as gypsy & traveller sites.

These linked areas, which connect with Lloyd Park & Shirley Hills, contribute hugely to the amenity of the borough. This public continuum is precious to many from across Croydon and beyond. Development and traveller sites would change the character of the amenity, particularly the Conduit Lane footpath.

Mr & Mrs Millward

Object DM44.2

I just want to register our strong protest at the proposal to have a gipsy camp (no matter what size) at Conduit Lane (or anywhere else in the area for that matter).

Philip Jupp

Object DM44.2

I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

Mr Reuben Gata-Aura

Object DM44.2

object to the use of following locations as gypsy or traveller sites:

- Coombe Farm off Oaks Road - Ref 502
- Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane - Ref 661

Mrs Shelley Chatter-Singh

Object DM44.2

DM44.2 Gypsy/traveller site. Whilst this group should be offered a fixed site, this proposal is not a good solution and the chosen site is inappropriate and will adversely affect local business and the environment.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
| Object | DM44.2 | Change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Moore</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>the Council has identified two locations on the edge of Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, which is identified as suitable for 15-25 pitches (pages 468-469). Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 661). “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughan Pomeroy</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>I realise that proper provision for Travellers is required to stop, Hopefully, the abuse of the open spaces unofficially and illegally, I do not understand how Conduit Line could be an appropriate location for such a site and suggest that one of the many brownfield sites around Croydon could be selected in preference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:
- Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502;
- Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; and
- Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 755;

As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

“Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is);

I particularly object to Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit Lane (ref 661) on the edge of Shirley which the Council has identified for Gypsy/Traveller sites. Both of these sites are in the Green Belt and therefore inappropriate for development in my opinion.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr T Doe

Object

DM44.2

661

Proximity to Coombe Woods and a proposed Secondary School in Coombe Road Playing Field and a busy pub/restaurant is totally inappropriate for such use. The result will be a blight on the local area that will affect house prices negatively. We have lived in Melville Avenue since 2011 and on two occasions during this time travellers have set up camp in the Combe Road playing field directly behind our property. In the summer of this year, they parked a generator lorry right up against the hedge next to our garden which ran throughout the night on several occasions and had a noisy party with music and a large bonfire just the other side of this hedge, directly under a large Ash tree at the bottom of our garden. Despite several calls to the council on different occasions we were unable to obtain any help to mitigate the noise and nuisance, despite the fact this was happening on council-owned land, and we were clearing up bottles and other rubbish from our garden for several days after their eventual departure. The local police were also unable to help. Our recent experience is that the council is completely unable or unwilling to enforce any of the normal rules of behaviour to protect its taxpayers where travellers are concerned and how will this be different if travellers are given a site they can visit whenever they wish? The proposed site will be next to a school if that part of the plan goes ahead and will be adjacent to Coombe Woods, which attracts many families and senior citizens. There are no local amenities to serve the site and transport links are limited to the tram with stops some distance from the site. This is not a simple NIMBY response based on unfounded prejudice, but a very real worry based on our recent experience of travellers in this area. If the political aim behind this is to assimilate travellers into mainstream society, then any proposed site needs to be close to amenities. This proposal would exacerbate the traffic congestion that is already apparent in this area as the site is some way from any shops or other services. I cannot believe that anyone would seriously consider that locating a traveller site between a school (if that proposal goes ahead, and which we will have no objection to), busy local gardens with café and a busy restaurant/pub was a good idea.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Objecter</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4104/01/08/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Terrence &amp; Jacqueline Spriggs</td>
<td>Happy for the Council to replace under-used garages with much-needed homes, but will be objecting to building on precious open space. Objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4105/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mrs Wendy Crayford</td>
<td>Objects to site 661 being identified as a gypsy/traveller site for the following reasons: - Inappropriate use of Green Belt Land - Lack of relevant amenities close to hand - Lack of supportive infrastructure - Adverse effect on neighbouring businesses and leisure amenities - Site has a more appropriate use for a school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4106/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr T King</td>
<td>We both strongly object to council plans as below 1 Plans to create a Travellers site on Conduit Lane Policy DM 44 2 Table 11-17 site661 we object on the grounds that it is in a Green Belt area and not appropriate to put a travellers site here</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4107/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mrs Winifred Good</td>
<td>I do not consider Coombe Lodge Nurseries an appropriate site to house travellers. It is on Green Belt Land which should not be encroached upon. Surely there are Brownfield sites in the borough more appropriate for a settlement of this sort. It is in a part of Croydon where families enjoy country style outings in the beauty and tranquility of the adjacent Coombe Gardens and it would be detrimental to the amenities there and to other adjacent owners. If Conduit Lane is to be used as an access road it could cause chaos as there is limited parking in this lane for the Gardens and it can be very busy at weekends. If access is to be by another route into Coombe Road this would surely create a traffic hazard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
4108/01/006/DM44.2/O The Chudasama Family

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM44.2

Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 (p179) - This is a greenbelt site, and it is not appropriate to put a traveller site here. Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites”, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

4109/01/003/DM44.2/O Mr & Mrs Chang

Object: DM44.2

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

4110/01/003/DM44.2/O Mr V Bhuwanee

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM44.2

I would like to object to the proposed travellers sites for the following reasons which I believe are material grounds to refuse these plans:

• The Council has an obligation to consider all potential sites across the borough. It also needs to demonstrate this, and provide information that details what sites were considered (both private and publicly) together with full assessments on these sites. This I cannot see has been done.

• The suggested sites are in close proximity to each other in a huge borough. This cannot be correct.

• The noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
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The use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:

I object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road; reference number 502; and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane; reference number 661.

These are both in the Green Belt, where Policy E of Planning for Traveller Sites clearly says that travellers sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

This is also likely to have a negative effect on the Site of nature conservation interest that one of the sites would border, and both sites are a distance from public services. It is also likely to create increased traffic problems in an area that is not best suited for such sites.

Consideration should be given to the refurbishment of the existing sites, or where this is not possible, alternative and more appropriate sites.

Ms W Mikiel

I have been made aware of the proposals for Site References 661, 502 and 755 for use as traveller sites.

I object on the grounds that these are Green Belt sites covered by Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and are therefore unsuitable for traveller camps. I use both sites near Coombe Lodge fairly regularly and was frightened by loose and dangerous dogs when the site was being used illegally by travellers, and I noticed that the woods were being used as a toilet. The amenities of that area would be lost to everyone else if these proposals were to proceed.

Mr & Mrs Kaczanowski

Below is a list of our objections:

3. Policy DM 44.2, site 661 Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane, next to Coombe Wood Gardens - we strongly object to a site to be placed on a green belt. This will certainly have a negative environmental impact on this one and surrounding sites. Such a development will very negatively impact on character of the local area and will ultimately lead to its downgrading.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4116/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Mitton</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 as gypsy and traveller site as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4117/01/039/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Cllr S Brew</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4117/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Cllr S Brew</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4117/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Cllr S Brew</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a local Resident in the Croham Ward of South Croydon the subject area is well known to me and my family, and in my opinion its use as proposed, or indeed for any kind of development, is wholly inappropriate, and accordingly I object. I have carefully reviewed the documentation prepared by the Council, and specifically looked at the Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers. Whilst the document is very comprehensive, I am unclear as to whether or not it is a universally adopted one that is used for the whole Country, and in any event question the methodology with its use of selective criteria and the RAG scoring which is very subjective. I noticed that the scoring for the subject site includes a positive 5 under the criteria heading of Green Belt/Metropolitan Open Land. This appears incorrect, and if I am reading and interpreting the document accurately then this score should be a negative -5. Assuming this is an error then it distorts the resultant figure by ten. Given this error, are there indeed others aswell? I also noted in the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment prepared by Croydon Council that it highlights a substantially higher level of additional pitches required in the first five years (2013-2018) where 27 pitches are stated, whereas in the subsequent five year periods only 7 or 8 pitches are scheduled for each of the three periods through to 2033. I would suggest that these lower figures in the latter years are unrealistic and in all probability are likely to rise. If so, then the pressure to enlarge the overall area of the subject site will increase, and it will of course be easier for the Council to try and justify it and probably win the argument because of the established use and precedent. Therefore, the size of the subject site and/or another one in the locality, will in all probability substantially increase. Fundamentally, this location is ‘Green Belt’ land and notwithstanding that it has some development and land use, the proposed use, or indeed for any kind of development, is wrong and in my opinion would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. It is also my understanding that under Central Government policy if such land is designated as ‘Green Belt’, then it should enjoy the protection from all forms of development and not favour any particular group or person within the community unless there are special circumstances. In this case there are no such special circumstances. If any private
business person or organisation wanted to create a caravan and/or static home site in this location it would not receive Planning Permission - this is the 'test' for such a proposal, and we should not have differing sets of rules for the Council and the Public. In addition to the above I also note a list of other salient points as to why in my opinion the use of the subject land as proposed is inappropriate:
- Notwithstanding some nominal use of the area for local business, housing, and school/education purposes, the general locality is one of woodland, playing fields, parkland, and rural space. Any kind of use for more intense housing, and possibly associated businesses as well, for any sector of the community whether it be caravans, static homes, prefabricated houses, or traditional housing would be inappropriate.- This area of Coombe is of some historical significance with several notable houses of architectural merit. Notwithstanding that some of the area and buildings have changed and indeed increased over the more recent decades, it still retains a relatively rural and spacious charm which should be respected and retained for current and future generations.- More intense housing for any sector of the community will increase noise and light pollution and would be inappropriate.- Local nature and wildlife is present in this area and as such should not be subjected to pressure from an increased resident population. Lloyd Park, Coombe Park, and the woods of Addington Hills which border and/or are in close proximity to the subject development site are of high public interest and could be negatively impacted by the proposals.- The access road from Oaks Road that will form the route to the subject site is relatively narrow and already used by other residents and those accessing the playing fields. This road would need to be up-graded at considerable expense if the proposal were to proceed.- Vehicle access onto Oaks Road is restricted with reduced visibility as well as being in very close proximity of the tram/road crossing.- Notwithstanding the presence of the local Tramlink service, public transport is otherwise very limited and as such will force new residents to use private vehicles and thus cause more environmental pollution in an otherwise rural locality.- Local amenities and facilities such as shops, health centres, possibly suitable schools are essentially non-existent and will force the residents to
use private vehicles unnecessarily.
- The proposed subject site is relatively large, and if approved, would potentially house a significant number of people and which may be further exacerbated by the possible location of another similar site in relatively close proximity. My understanding is that gypsy and traveller families actually prefer smaller sites.
- Development of this subject site with new and extended infrastructure in the form of services, sewage, power, fencing, roads, and hardstanding is likely to be very expensive, and indeed disruptive in providing.

Other locations, some thus far dismissed but there may be others, will almost certainly offer better use of the limited public funds available. Partial infrastructure may well be already in place or more readily available in these other locations and help to lessen the burden on the public purse. Also, in comprehensively reviewing other locations, it may be possible to address suitable brownfield sites that in all but easy situations private developers ignore and disregard, but which nevertheless remain a serious blight on the landscape of the Borough.

4121/01/004/DM44.2/O Janet Norris Object

I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane 661 as a gypsy/traveller site.

DM44.2
661

4125/01/046/DM44.2/C Councillor M Fisher Comment

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Site 661, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, Conduit lane. Transition Town have expressed an interest in restoring this site to a proper nursery facility, utilising the existing greenhouses for the growing of food, which would be a sustainable and appropriate activity within this green belt site.

DM44.2
661

02 September 2016
All three sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Furthermore, Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’, published by the Government in August, states very clearly that ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The provision relating to travellers/gypsies in the Housing and Planning Bill will also remove sections 225 and 226 of the Housing Act 2004 which placed a duty on housing authorities to carry out an assessment of the accommodation needs of this group when reviewing housing conditions and needs within their areas (a process required by section 8 of the Housing Act 1985). Section 8 will also be amended to make it clear that the duty covers consideration of the needs of people residing in, or resorting to the district for, caravan sites and houseboat mooring sites.

I am also concerned by the evidence base for these selections, namely the ‘Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gipsy and Travellers’. This assessment contains a vast number of very subjective criteria against which to judge site suitability and has been the subject of ‘extensive political consultation’. This political consultation has only taken place with the Labour Administration and has not been conducted on a cross party basis. This begs the question as to what undue political influence may have been placed on the particular criteria which have been used and indeed the selection of the preferred sites. There is also some question as to why the same scoring system has not been used for each set of criteria, rather than subjectively giving weight to certain criteria. Furthermore, the scoring for individual sites has not been carried out in accordance with the table shown at 4.1. A number of sites have been marked incorrectly, for example, site 661 has been scored at 5 for Greenbelt/MOL, when the score should be -5. This begs the question as to how many other inaccuracies are in the document.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Object
DM44.2
Whilst I agree that we desperately need new housing, it should be built on brownfield sites not our remaining precious green spaces! I understand the Council has identified two locations on the edge of Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, which is identified as suitable for 15-20 pitches (pages 449-450), Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 502); and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, which is identified as suitable for 15-25 pitches (pages 468-469), Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 661). I object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr Edward Swan
Object
DM44.2
661
I understand the Council has identified two locations on the edge of Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites:

- Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, which is identified as suitable for 15-25 pitches (pages 468-469, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 661).

I object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:

- Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Janet Harding
Object
DM44.2
661
I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane as gypsy / traveller site

Janet Harding
Object
DM44.2
661
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Ms P Hirschmann

DM44.2 661

Object

Not in line with Government planning policy on the Green Belt

Detail:

• Government planning policy with regards to traveller sites wants to ensure that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development.

• The proposal to create a permanent traveller site on land designated as Green Belt land is contrary to Policy E of the Planning Policy: "Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances." There are no very special circumstances.

• The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the "very special circumstances" justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt.

• The local character description is clearly at odds with the proposal.

• The justification acknowledges the Green Belt issue, though insufficiently, but relies on the fact that there are existing structures. These are not in fact substantial – being glasshouses – and could be said to be at least environmentally consistent with the Green Belt. But there is no very special circumstance justification proposed as required by Planning Policies.

• Approving the proposal would set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to be subject to similar development. It is not in the community's interests to allow the erosion of the green spaces surrounding the community and we object to the impact this site could have on the environment and wildlife. In the light of these issues, it is not appropriate simply to weight Green Belt as one of many factors to be considered, but rather it presents an overarching policy objection that cannot be over-ridden in the way proposed.

The objections may be summarized as:

- inappropriate use of Green Belt land
- lack of relevant amenities close to hand
- adverse effect on neighboring businesses and leisure amenities
- site has a more appropriate use for a school

The decision making process is contrary to Government guidance

Mrs S Rudduck

DM44.2 661

Object

I object to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane Ref: 661 as a gypsy/traveller site.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Ms S Rao
I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, (site reference 661 Policy DM44)

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mrs S Chandanana
Build a school please. School is a viable option as there no schools in our area. The plan makers have missed a big point that existing infrastructure cannot cope with the influx of additional population at such a fast pace. Also it has to be planned over few years. It should never ben on a green belt attached to a green belt sites as it is disastrous for the environment. There are quite a few brownfield sites in Croydon should be explored. What are the criteria behind selecting two sites within 1 mile of each other? The plan makers do not know the grass root situation. They have just assumed things without actually knowing the facts. This is a grave situation. There are quite a few public and independent schools in the nearby area. Building a new school will support Selsdon and nearby citizens. Besides we do not have a Grammar school in Croydon. So, it would be ideal if we build a grammar school in Croydon on one of the proposed sites. Existing infrastructure just cannot cope with additional population in Croydon:
- We have to wait at least 4-5 days to get appointment at doctors- many times do not get appointment
- We have to wait at least 15 minutes to get a turn to play swing/slides for my son in any local park. The parks are so crowded during summer. Already children are getting very less exercise. If 40 families come over with more than 80 children then it would be extremely over crowded.
- There are not eough schools in the area. We should build more schools
- There is very limited green space in Croydon. Government policy states that you cannot build temporary or permanent sites on Green Belt. Putting the travellers sites near green belt will endanger.
- Conduit lane is a no drive zone. Increased traffic due to a planned school and travellers sites will cause traffic chaos.
- We need green belts for good health of the citizens. Steps like these would encourage the encroachment of green belts
Mr S Illingworth

There has been a history of unauthorised "pitches" in this area over the past few years, in particular on the field adjacent to the practice area and 5th hole on the golf course. On each occasion these pitches have been accompanied by residual mess, threatening behaviour and mindless theft of golf club property. Each time that Gypess/Travellers have been in the area, they have trespassed onto the golf course while club members are playing, threatening those members with physical and verbal abuse on numerous occasions. This behaviour is totally unacceptable and very demoralising, and should either of these pitches go ahead I am sure that it will have a serious detrimental affect on both the club and its members.

Mrs S Deshpande

Object Soundness - Consistent with National

I am writing to object to:

1. The use of the following locations as a gypsy and traveller site:
   - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661
   - as the site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

   There is also an error in the calculation for the Green Belt score in the selection criteria. The site should be scored -5 for being in Green Belt and not +5.

   There is an error in calculating the site access for this site. There are cars parked on the road and the entrance is through a very busy main road. The site cannot have a rating of +5. It should be -2.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I will oppose the gypsy site on the following grounds:

1. Mis-calculation of the score while selecting the site:
   If a site is Green Belt/MOL-built form then it is marked as (Amber/Orange), which means a score of -5.
   If you go to page number 9 of the document in the link below, you can find that Amber is scored as +5 as opposed to -5.
   Also, the score for the site access should be -2 as there are issues with the site access. This brings the overall score down to 12. Please check the other scores too before finalising this site. This site is clearly not suitable for building on the gypsy site as it is a green belt site.

2. I will be objecting to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly:
   "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development." The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Criteria of selection:
The plan makers have missed a big point that existing infrastructure cannot cope with the influx of additional population at such a fast pace. Also, it has to be planned over few years. It should never be on a green belt/attached to green belt sites as it is disastrous for the environment. There are quite a few brown field sites in Croydon. Those should be explored.

My answer: School is a viable option. Building a new school will support the Selsdon and nearby citizens. Besides we do not have a Grammar school in Croydon. So, it would be ideal if we build a grammar school in Croydon on one of the proposed sites.

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
knowing the facts. This is a grave situation.

Building a new school will support the school and nearby citizens. Besides we do not have a Grammar school in Croydon. So, it would be ideal if we build a grammar school in croydon on one of the proposed sites. Existing infrastructure just cannot cope with additional population in Croydon:

1. We have to wait for at least 4-5 days to get appointment at doctors – many times we do not get appointment
2. We have to wait for at least 15 minutes to get a turn to play swing/slide for my son in any local park. The parks are so crowded during summer. Already children are getting very less exercise. If 40 families come over with more than 80 children then it would be extremely overcrowded.
3. There are not enough schools in the area. We should build more schools
4. There is very limited green space in Croydon. Government policy states that you cannot build temporary or permanent sites on green belt. Putting the travellers site near green belt will endanger the
5. Conduit lane is a no drive through zone. Increased traffic due to a planned school and travellers sites will cause traffic chaos.
6. We need green belts for good health of the citizens. Steps like these would encourage the encroachment of green belts.
| Mr & Mrs Andrews | 4145/01/008/DM44.2/O | Object | Soundness - Justified | DM44.2 661 | I am grateful to the Council for consulting on the detailed policies and proposals that will make up the Croydon Local Plan. There is much in the document that I agree with, but some of the proposals would, in my opinion, change the character of parts of Croydon very much for the worse. I hope you will forgive me if I focus on these areas of contention. I am therefore writing to formally object to:

3. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:
   • Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502;
   • Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; and
   • Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane reference number 755;

As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest.

Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the government in August, says very clearly:

"Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development."

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough – which I would question – they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

| DM44.2 661 | Change | This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

| Mr & Mrs Carpenter | 4146/01/008/DM44.2/O | Object | DM44.2 661 | We object on the basis that both sites are on Green Belt land and one is adjacent to a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. This proposed siting appears to be contrary to the Government’s published policy which says that such sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

| Change | This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

---

02 September 2016
4148/01/002/DM44.2/O Mr & Mrs Dennis

Object: Soundness - Justified

DM44.2 661

Under no circumstances do we agree with a Gypsy and Traveller site at this location.

Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

4152/01/002/DM44.2/O Mr & Mrs Munnery

Object: National guidelines clearly state ‘Travellers Sites temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. The Council’s proposals, therefore, clearly breach such guidelines. Also, we question the Council’s assertion that it needs to quadruple the number of travellers/gypsy sites in the Borough. Apart from this major objection, the above sites identified for such use would have: - poor access via narrow roads/lanes for large vehicles; - consequent impact upon local traffic congestion with movements of large vehicles; - no safe paved walking routes to schools, shops, doctors, etc.; - additional requirement for services and facilities for hygienic occupation; - increased pressure on local schools, medical facilities, waste disposal, etc.; - impact upon local facilities and amenities of current residents. Also, we understand that the proposed pitches would accommodate considerably more caravans and associated vehicles than can be controlled by planning restrictions.

Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

4153/01/002/DM44.2/O Mr Gary Dean

Object: am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b;

Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Gibson</td>
<td>Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Male</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
The GTANA report (2013) does not consider why there is a requirement to provide such facilities and refers to the CLG’s document Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (March 2014) which states that Local Authorities should in producing their local plans, consider joint development plans that set targets on a cross authority basis. This proposal seems to have been produced in isolation from other neighbouring councils even though the above clearly indicates that nearby councils such as Sevenoaks, Tandridge and Bromley have higher demand. Proposals in the Housing and Planning Bill 2015-2016 are to remove the statutory requirement on local authorities to assess the specific accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers - the emphasis being that when authorities are carrying out a review of housing needs that it considers the needs of all the people residing in their district, without any reference to Gypsies and Travellers. We hope this means that Croydon Council will consider our needs and the needs of our neighbours and local services and businesses as weighty as those of Gypsy and Travelling people. We understand that there is a lot of opposition to the proposed sites from people currently residing in the district due to the threat to the Green Belt, increased traffic and increased pressure on local services. Surely such low scores within the "Assessment and Selection of Sites for Gypsy and Travellers" (August 2015) should have resulted in an acceptance that none of the sites are really particularly suitable and that the council will need to liaise with other council if determined to make provision. All three sites are in Green Belt land - Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites - traveller sites (temporary and permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. Further concern for the impact upon Green Belt is highlighted in the GTANA Stakeholder consultation. The sites are contrary to the Strategic Policies (April 2013) in terms of access from roads and proximity to bus routes; and access to essential services including health and education facilities.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr Trevor Watkins

Object

I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661, policy number DM44: and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502, policy number DM43: and Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference number 755, policy number DM32. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites eg the site off the Purley Way. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards.

4161/01/003/DM44.2/O

Mr & Mrs Whitehead & Abbott

Object

We write to express our objections to the above proposals. We have lived in South Croydon since the late 1980’s and have been regular visitors to Coombe Wood and gardens, often walking to them up Conduit Lane from Croham Road. This area is a uniquely rural and beautiful enclave so close to central Croydon. It is well loved and visited by many residents and of great heritage and conservation value to Croydon. To have a traveller site on Conduit Lane would be very detrimental to this lovely place. It is a very confined area and such a development would urbanise and also introduce a high volume of vehicle use. The character of this special place would be lost forever.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
4166/01/003/DM44.2/O Carol Holmes Object DM44.2 661 I am writing to you to object to use of Green Belt Land for gypsy/traveller sites (reference numbers 502, 661) Coombe Farm off Oaks Road (reference number 502) and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane (reference number 661) are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. These proposals are in breach of policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, which says that Traveller Sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. Alternative sites should be found.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

4167/01/002/DM44.2/O Mr A Majeed Object Soundness - Justified DM44.2 661 The proposed Gypsy and Traveller site is contrary to government policy as it is in Green Belt. In addition, based on past experience of unauthorised encampments I think there would be a threat to the safety, security and well-being of my family.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

4168/01/003/DM44.2/O Catherine Martin Object DM44.2 661 I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

4174/01/007/DM44.2/O Mr B Williams Object DM44.2 661 I object to the site being allocated for a gypsy and traveller site. It is in the Green Belt and one of the sites borders a Site of nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Travellers Sites published by the government in August says very clearly: "Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate developments". The Council's approach is clearly in breach of this policy.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr Brian Mole  
Object DM44.2 661  
This site is also in the green belt and according to Government Policy is deemed inappropriate. Coombe Park which is a beautiful landscaped park and contains many memorials to war dead and families loved ones will be completely overwhelmed by this enormous traveller development for up to 75 mobile homes right next door. The huge amount of traffic going along Conduit Lane will make access to the park from the parking bays on the other side of the road much more difficult and dangerous. These parking bays are used by the very young and the very old to give them easy and safe access to this beautiful public park. Again the size of the site will totally overwhelm the nearest settlement of residents on Coombe Road, Oaks Road and Oaks Lane. The closest schools are oversubscribed so would be unable to meet the needs of so many new children to the area. The council has gone to great expense to protect the site from mobile travellers and this seems to have been a great waste of tax payers money if they now allow a permanent site. Several businesses which make a big contribution to the local economy and also provide much needed amenity to the public will be detrimentally affected by the site.  

Change  
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Krutika Patel  
Object DM44.2 661  
I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.  

Change  
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

LB King  
Object DM44.2 661  
Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane)  

Change  
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
4188/01/001/DM44.2/O N K Shaikh
Object DM44.2 661 I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.
Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

4189/01/007/DM44.2/O Mr Roger Bolton
Object DM44.2 661 I am writing to object to:
1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:
   Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661;
   Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502;
   as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.
Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

4190/01/001/DM44.2/O Mr Ronald West
Object DM44.2 661 I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 as gypsy and traveller site as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b:
Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

4191/01/001/DM44.2/O S R Patel
Object DM44.2 661 I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.
Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

4192/01/002/DM44.2/O Mrs Annette Merry
Object DM44.2 661 I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b;
Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4193/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Claire Green</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 as gypsy and traveller site as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4199/01/006/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr F Partovi</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries for a traveller's site Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4200/01/009/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr G Furmanski</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td></td>
<td>I object to 4. the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites a) Ref No. 502 — Coombe Farm off Oaks Road b) Ref No. 661 — Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4203/01/011/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr J Beaven</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am writing to submit my objection to: 5. The use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites: - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, reference number 502; and - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, reference number 661. Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4206/01/006/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Dr K Parke</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 861 (Conduit Lane) Change: This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Such development is in breach of Policy Eat Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that ‘Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’.

All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites now, and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough. If the number of Gypsy/Traveller sites really needs to be increased by this amount then a more appropriate location would be around the existing site at Purley Way. The positioning of a Gypsy/Traveller site adjacent to the car park for Coombe Woods, between the Chateau Restaurant and the Hotel/restaurant, would probably deter me from using any of these attractions.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I have restricted my objections to those plans that primarily affect the area of Shirley I which I live, but the same objections apply to other proposals in other parts of the borough.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 661</th>
<th>Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B Busa</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 661</th>
<th>Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhavil Vyas</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr & Mrs DB Good

**Object**

Proposed Policy DM3 Creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites at Coombe Farm, off Oaks Road, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, off Conduit Lane

I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Such development is in breach of Policy Eat Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that ‘Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites now, and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough. If the number of Gypsy/Traveller sites really needs to be increased by this amount then a more appropriate location would be around the existing site at Purley Way. The positioning of a Gypsy/Traveller site adjacent to the car park for Coombe Woods, between the Chateau Restaurant and the Hotel/restaurant, is totally undesirable. As users of the restaurants, gardens, park and golf course it would be hard to imagine we will wish to visit these attractions if it is blighted in this way. As members of Shirley Park Golf Club we have experienced threatening behaviour, trespass, verbal abuse and stunning residual mess travellers create. The golf club provides social and sporting activity for some 700 members and many visitors including junior players who play during school holidays and weekends. Their safe environment will be endangered. We understand that the proposed sites fail to meet criteria with regard to schooling and medical needs and it seems obvious that these proposals need to be scrapped as soon as possible.

Mr J Turvey

**Object**

I am writing to object to:

1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

**Change**

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4218/02/002/DM44.2/O Mr &amp; Ms Morgan &amp; Mason</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 661</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- This site is also in the green belt and according to National Government guidelines is therefore deemed inappropriate use for travellers' gypsy sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The council has previously gone to great expense to protect the site from mobile travellers and this seems to have been a great waste of taxpayers' money if they now allow a permanent site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Several local businesses which make a big contribution to the local economy and also provide much needed amenity to the public will be detrimentally affected by the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Coombe Park, which is beautifully landscaped park, will be completely overwhelmed by this site of up to 75 mobile homes right next door. The increased traffic going along Conduit Lane will make access to the park from the parking bays more difficult and dangerous.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We understand the proposed sites are not within the required distance to both schooling and medical needs, therefore am objecting on that basis also. The land is in private ownership at Coombe Farm, and any funds spent on &quot;compulsory or otherwise purchase&quot; could surely be better spent on behalf of the population of Croydon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4218/01/002/DM44.2/O Mr &amp; Ms Morgan &amp; Mason</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 661</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane (site reference number 661) - As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).”

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661, policy number DM44; and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502, policy number DM43; Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference number 755, policy number DM32. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites eg the site off the Purley Way. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

4223/01/008/DM44.2/O Mrs Mary Lane

Object

DM44.2

661

Change

4228/01/003/DM44.2/O Sheila Newman

Object

DM44.2

661

Change

02 September 2016
Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane (ref. no. 661)
1. This is located in a Green Belt area. Under National Guidelines, Travellers/Gypsy sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. This means that planning permission should not be granted.
2. The presence of the site will totally overwhelm the nearest settlement of residents on Coombe Road, Oaks Road and Oaks Lane. Residents in these areas greatly value the peaceful and friendly environment they have nurtured in the local neighbourhood over many years and this will be greatly damaged and threatened by the proposed Traveller site.
3. Several businesses which make a big contribution to the local economy and also provide much needed amenity to the public will be detrimentally affected by the site such as the Coach House Café, Coombe Lodge Beefeater, The Chateau. This will additionally have a significant adverse impact on the people employed by the businesses and numerous suppliers that service these local businesses.
4. The proposed Traveller site is in very close proximity to the award winning Coombe Wood Gardens which attracts visitors and families all year round to enjoy the beautiful gardens and the local wildlife. The presence of the Traveller site would have a severely negative impact on the quiet, tranquil and serene characteristic of the area and drive away visitors from the gardens.
5. Previously the Council has gone to great expense to protect the site from mobile Travellers and this seems to have been a great waste of taxpayers’ money if they now allow a permanent site.
6. Coombe Park is a beautiful landscaped park and contains many memorials to war dead and families’ loved ones. It will be completely overwhelmed by this enormous Traveller development for up to 75 mobile homes right next door. The huge amount of traffic going along Conduit Lane will make access to the park from the parking bays on the other side of the road much more difficult and dangerous. These parking bays are used by the very young and the very old to give them easy and safe access to this beautiful public park.
7. This is a peaceful area used by the local community and visitors for walking routes, running and leisure activities. The location of a Traveller or Gypsy site here would
destroy the tranquil nature of the area and drive away visitors upon which the local businesses rely.

The history of unauthorised "pitches" in this area over the past few years has left a bitter resentment, especially in view of the residual mess and threatening behaviour that has always accompanied their trespass. On each occasion that Gypsies/Travellers have been in the area, the club members here have been threatened with physical and verbal abuse. This behaviour is totally unacceptable and despite the subsequent eviction of the Travellers on each occasion, the residual psychological effect on tax payers and constituents' lives cannot be trivialised. We also have a large Junior Section and children play the course during holidays as well as weekends. They are often unaccompanied and the parents need to know they are in a safe environment. This would certainly not be the case in the parents' minds if there was any chance of aggressive behaviour, as previously experienced, towards these children. I am certain that the Council would not wish to be responsible for putting children in any sort of potentially dangerous situation.

Surely these detailed real issues must be taken into account when determining any permanent site. I understand that the proposed sites are not within the required distance to both schooling and medical needs, therefore I also object on this basis. The land is in private ownership at Coombe Farm. Any funds spent on "compulsory or otherwise" purchase clearly could be spent more wisely on behalf of the population of Croydon. No doubt Central Grants will be available, but Council owned land in an area that will not radically impact on established residents' lives would be a sensible and prudent choice.
Object 5. Proposed Policy DM43 Creation of Gypsy Traveller sites at Coombe Farm, off Oaks Road, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, off Conduit Lane and Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage Featherbed Lane.

I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Such development is in breach of Policy Eat Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that ‘Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites now, and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough. If the number of Gypsy/Traveller sites really needs to be increased by this amount then a more appropriate location would be around the existing site at Purley Way. The positioning of a Gypsy/Traveller site adjacent to the car park for Coombe Woods, between the Chateau Restaurant and the Hotel/restaurant, would probably deter me from using any of these attractions.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I have restricted my objections to those plans that primarily affect the area of Shirley I which I live, but the same objections apply to other proposals in other parts of the borough.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object Description</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4237/01/001/DM44.2/O Jagdish Patel</td>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4237/01/001/DM44.2/O Jagdish Patel</td>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4239/01/002/DM44.2/O Mr &amp; Mrs Feast</td>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Soundness - Consistent with National DM44.2 661</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4244/01/012/DM44.2/O Mr &amp; Mrs Kellty</td>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; As the Council acknowledges, all three of these sites are in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. All three sites are also some distance from public services and they are all in the same part of the borough (two are in Heathfield ward, one just over the border in Croham). Why has Heathfield been singled out in this way? If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4244/01/012/DM44.2/O Mr &amp; Mrs Kellty</td>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

02 September 2016 Page 3341 of 4384
Mr & Mrs Maguire

Object

DM44.2
661

I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation. These are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller sites, published by the Government in August states clearly “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. Both sites are also some distance from public services, schooling and medical needs. Coombe Park, a beautiful landscaped park, containing many war and family memorials will be completely overwhelmed by the enormous traveller development right next door and access to the parking bays will also be compromised. A preferred siting would be off the Purley Way where the existing site could be enlarged.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

---

Mr A Dawe

Object

DM44.2
661

Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane)

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

---

Mr A Rulkalai

Object

DM44.2
661

Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane)

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

---

Mr B Pope

Object

DM44.2
661

I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4265/01/007/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr D Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b; This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4266/01/007/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr D Bigglestone</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b; This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4267/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr D Gooch</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. The use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b; 4. Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane) and 502 (Coombe Farm) If a site is Green Belt (built form) then it is marked as (Amber/Orange), which means a score of -5. +5 has been used which increases the rating by 10 points. 5. Error in calculating site access for 661: There are cars parked on that road and the entrance is through a very busy main road. The site cannot have a rating of +5. It should be -2. That is a difference of 7 rating points. This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr D Nesterovitch

Object DM44.2 661

I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661, policy number DM44: and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502, policy number DM43 Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference number 755, policy number DM32. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites e.g the site off the Purley Way. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards.

Mr D Patel

Object DM44.2 661

I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

Mr H Khandelia

Object DM44.2 661

Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 661 (Conduiit Lane)

Mr I Roberts

Object DM44.2 661

I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4285/01/007/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr J Balcombe</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b; Incorrect calculation in the second criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane) and 502 (Coombe Farm) - if a site is green Belt/MOL - built form then it is marked as (Amber/organic) which means it is a score of -5. &quot;+5&quot; has been used which increases its rating by 10 points. Incorrect calculating site access for 661: there are cars parked on that road and the entrance is through a very busy main road. The site cannot have a rating of &quot;+5&quot;. It should be -2. That's a difference of 7 rating points.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4289/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr J Patel</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4292/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr J Pugh</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Document ID</td>
<td>Object Type</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>4294/01/009/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>S Wallace</td>
<td>Object DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I object to Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, which is identified as suitable for 15-25 pitches (pages 468-469), Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies &amp; Proposals, reference number 661). I object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: &quot;Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development&quot;. The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>4301/01/006/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr K MacKenzie</td>
<td>Object DM44.2 661</td>
<td>Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>4301/01/006/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr K MacKenzie</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>4294/01/009/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>S Wallace</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object  

5. Proposed Policy DM43 Creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites at Coombe Farm, off Oaks Road, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, off Conduit Lane and Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage Featherbed Lane.

I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Such development is in breach of Policy Eat Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that ‘Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites now, and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough. If the number of Gypsy/Traveller sites really needs to be increased by this amount then a more appropriate location would be around the existing site at Purley Way. The positioning of a Gypsy/Traveller site adjacent to the car park for Coombe Woods, between the Chateau Restaurant and the Hotel/restaurant, would probably deter me from using any of these attractions.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I have restricted my objections to those plans that primarily affect the area of Shirley I which I live, but the same objections apply to other proposals in other parts of the borough.

DM44.2  

Change  

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mrs Kathleen Swan

Object

DM44.2 661

I understand the Council has identified two locations on the edge of Shirley for gypsy/traveller sites:

Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, which is identified as suitable for 15-25 pitches (pages 468-469, Changes to the Policies Map arising from proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies Partial Review and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies & Proposals, reference number 661).

I object to the use of either of these locations as gypsy/traveller sites. As the Council acknowledges, they are both in the Green Belt and one of them borders a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August, says very clearly: Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

The Council’s approach is clearly in breach of that policy. Both sites are also some distance from public services. If the Council really needs, as it claims, to quadruple the number of gypsy/traveller sites in the borough - which I would question - they should look elsewhere (for example, off the Purley Way where the existing site is).

Mrs Rita Evans

Object

DM44.2 661

The proposals for two Gypsy and Traveller sites on Green Belt land at the periphery of Shirley is in direct contravention of the Government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites which clearly states that such are 'inappropriate development' in the Green Belt. It has been stated that any such sites must be for true Travellers. Planning Resource highlights that the new Planning Policy document published in August 2015 redefines Traveller to exclude those who no longer travel permanently, thus avoiding the need for static homes which has greatly reduced the number of pitches that Councils are required to provide.

Could this be a long-term strategy to de-designate Green Belt land, then when it is under-used, claim it for housing?

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
J Rayner

Object DM44.2 661

Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, Ref No. 661.

This site is also green belt and according to Government policy is deemed inappropriate. The Council has gone to great expense to protect the site from mobile travellers and this seems to have been a great waste of taxpayers money if they now allow a permanent site. Several businesses which make a bit contribution to the local economy and also provide much needed amenity to the public will be detrimentally affected by the site.

Coombe Park which is a beautiful landscaped park and contains many memorials to the war dead and families loved ones will be completely overwhelmed by this enormous traveller development for up to 75 mobile homes right next door. The huge amount of traffic going along Conduit Lane will make access to the park from the parking bays on the other side of the road much more difficult and dangerous. These parking bays are used by the very young and the very old to give them easy and safe access to this beautiful public park.

Again the site of the site will totally overwhelm the nearest settlement of residents on Coombe Road, Oaks Road and Oaks Lane.

Mr M Buja

Object DM44.2 661

Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for site 661 (Conduiit Lane)

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr M Gooch

Object DM44.2 661

Incorrect calculation in selection criteria for site 661 and 502. If site is in Green Belt/MOL built form then it is marked as Amber/Orange which means a score of -5. +5 has been used which increase the rating by 10 points. Error in calculating site access for 661. There are cars parked on that road and the entrance is through a very busy main road. The site cannot have a rating of +5. It should be -2. That is a difference of 7 rating points.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Object

DM44.2

661

I am writing to object to:

1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:
   Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661;
   Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502;
   as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Incorrect calculation in the second criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane) and 502 (Coombe Farm) - if a site is green Belt/MOL - built form then it is marked as (Ambiguous), which means it is a score of "-5". "+5" has been used which increases its rating by 10 points.

Incorrect calculating site access for 661: there are cars parked on that road and the entrance is through a very busy main road. The site cannot have a rating of "+5". It should be -2. That's a difference of 7 rating points.

I object to 4. the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:

a) Ref No. 502 — Coombe Farm off Oaks Road
b) Ref No. 661 — Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr K Shah

Object DM44.2 661

I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr N Chanuarana

Object DM44.2 661

Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane)

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Ms P Allen

Object DM44.2 661

I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr P Bhanji

Object DM44.2 661

I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502; Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference number 755. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites eg the site off the Purley Way. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Mr P Chapman
Object DM44.2 661
am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b;

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr P Nesbeth
Object DM44.2 661
I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 as gypsy and traveller site as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b;

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr R Indheuser
Object DM44.2 661
Incorrect calculation in selection criteria for site 661 and 502. If site is in Green Belt/MOL built form then it is marked as Amber/Orange which means a score of -5. +5 has been used which increase the rating by 10 points. Error in calculating site access for 661: There are cars parked on that road and the entrance is through a very busy main road. The site cannot have a rating of +5. It should be -2. That is a difference of 7 rating points.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr R Indheuser
Object DM44.2 661
Incorrect calculation in selection criteria for site 661 and 502. If site is in Green Belt/MOL built form then it is marked as Amber/Orange which means a score of -5. +5 has been used which increase the rating by 10 points. Error in calculating site access for 661: There are cars parked on that road and the entrance is through a very busy main road. The site cannot have a rating of +5. It should be -2. That is a difference of 7 rating points.

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr R Spurgeon
Object DM44.2 661
Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane)

Change This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document No</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4342/01/006/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr R Patel</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4344/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr R Venuakrishna</td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4345/01/007/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Messrs Eccles &amp; Hivdess</td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4347/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr S Patel</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4348/01/006/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr V Dawe</td>
<td>Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane)</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Mr W Whitehead</td>
<td>Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane)</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Mrs L Bigglestone</td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Mrs J Dobbs</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, Site 661 as a gypsy and traveller site.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Ms A Khandelia</td>
<td>Incorrect calculation in the selection criteria for 661 (Conduit Lane)</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms B Fontaine
Object DM44.2 661
I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661, policy number DM44: and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502, policy number DM43 Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference number 755, policy number DM32. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy 5P2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites eg the site off the Purley Way. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards.

Ms H Lishmund
Object DM44.2 661
I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

Susana Winter
Object DM44.2 661
Gypsy and Traveller use is not appropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7. There is also an error in the scoring for this site in the evidence base.

Mrs Sarah Moise
Object DM44.2 661
I object to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, Site 661 as a Gypsy and Traveller site. This site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.
We object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Such development is in breach of Policy Eat Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that 'Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development'. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites now, and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough. If the number of Gypsy/Traveller sites really needs to be increased by this amount then a more appropriate location would be around the existing site at Purley Way. The positioning of a Gypsy/Traveller site adjacent to the car park for Coombe Woods, between the Chateau Restaurant and the Hotel/restaurant, would probably deter me from using any of these attractions.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I have restricted my objections to those plans that primarily affect the area of Shirley I which I live, but the same objections apply to other proposals in other parts of the borough.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Object DM44.2 661

5. Proposed Policy DM43 Creation of Gypsy Traveller sites at Coombe Farm, off Oaks Road, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, off Conduit Lane and Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage Featherbed Lane.

I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Such development is in breach of Policy Eat Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that ‘Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites now, and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough. If the number of Gypsy/Traveller sites really needs to be increased by this amount then a more appropriate location would be around the existing site at Purley Way. The positioning of a Gypsy/Traveller site adjacent to the car park for Coombe Woods, between the Chateau Restaurant and the Hotel/restaurant, would probably deter me from using any of these attractions.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I have restricted my objections to those plans that primarily affect the area of Shirley I which I live, but the same objections apply to other proposals in other parts of the borough.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Object 5 Proposed Policy DM43 Creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites at Coombe Farm, off Oaks Road, Coombe Lodge Nurseries, off Conduit Lane and Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage, Featherbed Lane Policy DM43, reference 502 Coombe Farm reference 661 Coombe Lodge Nurseries and reference 755 Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Cottage.

I object to the use of any of these locations for the creation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. All three locations are within the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest. Such development is in breach of Policy B of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, which says that “Traveller Sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. All three sites are also a considerable distance from public services. I believe that the proposal to create three new Gypsy/Traveller sites now, and 39 by 2036 is excessive and will have an adverse effect on the borough. If the number of Gypsy/Traveller sites really needs to be increased by this amount, then a more appropriate location would be around the existing site at Purley Way. The positioning of a Gypsy/Traveller site adjacent to the car park for Coombe Woods, between the Chateau Restaurant and the Hotel/restaurant, would deter me from using any of these local amenities.

For the reasons given above:
1. I do not think that the preferred approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet the Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3.
2. The preferred approach is deliverable, but not acceptable.
3. I do not think that the preferred approach enables sustainable development, because it will compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
4. I recommend that consultation documents of such importance are given much wider publicity.

I have restricted my objections to those plans that primarily affect the area of Shirley in which I live, but the same objections apply to other proposals in other parts of the borough.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4374/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Tracey Plummer</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4375/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mrs J Roberts</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I object to the use of the site for gypsy and traveller accommodation.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4376/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Angela Gill</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 1. The use of the following locations as a gypsy and traveller site: • Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 as the site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4377/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Caroline Taperell</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 1. The use of the following locations as a gypsy and traveller site: • Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 as the site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4378/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Jennifer Carnazzo</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 661</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 552; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms N Nesterovich
Object DM44.2
661
I am a Croydon resident and am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference number 661, policy number DM44; and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference number 502, policy number DM43 Pear Tree Farm and Pear Tree Farm Cottage on Featherbed Lane, site reference number 755, policy number DM32. All three sites are in the Green Belt, with one bordering a site of Nature Conservation. The proposed use of each of these sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b and would not be consistent with Policy E of ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ published by the Government. If additional sites are required in the Borough it would more appropriate to expand existing sites eg the site off the Purley Way. In addition none of the sites has easy access to local school, healthcare, retail and other amenities; the vehicular access into sites 661 and 502 is problematic and egress onto Coombe Lane/Oaks Road at the road junction is likely to create additional road hazards.

Mrs Janet Baine
Object DM44.2
661
I object to the use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane Ref: 661 as a gypsy/traveller site.

Natalie Sayers
Object DM44.2
661
the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites: - Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502; and - Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661;

Kuldip Chana
Object DM44.2
661
am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites at Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661 and Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Location and Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4690/01/007/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Norman</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>I am writing to object to: 1. the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites: Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661; Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 502; as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4695/01/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Richard Herring</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4700/01/007/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Louise Norton</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4716/01/005/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Rachel Marland</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Policy DM44.2 - No, No, No, we should not be losing greenbelt land for a traveller site. No one wants this, greenbelt land should be protected. This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This site is also in the green belt and according to Government policy is deemed inappropriate. The Council has gone to great expense to protect the site from mobile travellers and this seems to have been a great waste of taxpayers’ money if they now allow a permanent site. Several businesses which make a big contribution to the local economy and also provide much needed amenity to the public would be detrimentally affected by the site. Coombe Park which is a beautiful landscaped park and contains many memorials to war dead and families loved ones will be completely overwhelmed by this enormous traveller development for up to 75 mobile homes right next door. The huge amount of traffic going along Conduit Lane will make access to the park from the parking bays on the other side of the road much more difficult and dangerous. These parking bays are used by the very young and the very old to give them easy and safe access to this beautiful public park. Again the size of the site will totally overwhelm the nearest settlement of residents on Coombe Road, Oaks Road and Oaks Lane.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Miss Jenna Manji

Object: Soundness - Consistent with National

DM44.2 661

I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:
- Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502; and
- Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661;

These proposals will have a detrimental effect on the settled community and in no way do they take into consideration the 2008 DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites: Good Practice Guide, point 3.8, which states 'Consideration must be given to the relationship of sites to the surrounding community. The last time travellers settled in that area my nieces and nephews were confronted by gypsy kids and my sister’s property was trespassed by the gypsies who stole her kids' bikes and scooters. So I can voluich for the fact that having gypsies permanently in the area is not good consideration of the relationship of the site to the community already living there. Furthermore, if the Council were not willing to develop the Green Belt land to build more beautiful homes in line with the properties already in the area, how is it possible that there is now a proposal to create gypsy and traveller sites in the area and burden the area and the community there with all that comes with travellers such as anti-social behaviour and loud noise and to top it off destroy the current property prices?

I am strongly opposed to this proposal and feel that the gypsy site in Purley Way should be extended to house the more space needed gypsies and travellers there.

Ann & Alan Gibbs

Object: DM44.2 661

Both of these sites have been identified as potential locations for gypsy/traveller sites. These sites are both within the Green Belt and one borders a site of Nature Conservation Interest and therefore are wholly unsuitable for any form of development. The Government policy on traveller sites explicitly states they are an inappropriate development within the Green Belt. The existing Green Belt should be retained and not be undermined by the local authority.

DM44.2 661

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
This site is also in the green belt and according to Government Policy is deemed inappropriate. The council has gone to great expense to protect the site from mobile travellers and this seems to have been a great waste of taxpayers' money if they now allow a permanent site. Several businesses which make a big contribution to the local economy and also provide much needed amenity to the public will be detrimentally affected by the site. Coombe Park which is a beautiful landscaped park and contains many memorials to war dead and families' loved ones will be completely overwhelmed by this enormous traveller development for up to 75 mobile homes right next door. The huge amount of traffic going along Conduit lane will make access to the park from the parking bays on the other side of the road much more difficult and dangerous. These parking bays are used by the very young and the very old to give them easy and safe access to this beautiful public park. Again the size of the site will totally overwhelm the nearest settlement of residents on Coombe Road, Oaks Road and Oaks Lane.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Mr Ian Fraser

The proposed use of land to create gypsy/traveller sites (reference 502 and 661) is particularly unwelcome. Residents and the council have bitter experience of disruption and the waste left by travellers when they have visited Croydon. Any encouragement of this situation should be avoided, as it will encourage additional travellers to come to our town.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I object to the proposed use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites: at Coombe Farm (off Oaks Road) ref Number 502 and at Coombe Lodge Nurseries (off Conduit Lane) ref Number 661. The areas proposed are completely unsuitable for the proposed purpose being adjacent to the Tram link, Lloyd Park, Golf Course, Recreational Woodland, Ornamental Park, School and Small Businesses. Both proposed the sites are in the Green Belt and one borders a Site of Nature Conservation interest. Government Policy E of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites states that “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.”

We have seen information suggesting that 3 Traveller sites maybe placed around the Forestdale and Shirley Areas, and also plans to Intensify the Housing of Forestdale! We believe the plans for Traveller sites are wholly unfair and building on land which is Green Belt is inappropriate development. Policy E of Planning for Traveller Sites, published by the Government in August indeed states this also. The building of such sites would also be hugely detrimental to house values, and totally unacceptable. We completely object to this so these plans need to be scrapped NOW!

I wish to object to the use of the following sites: The use of Coombe Lodge Nurseries for a gypsy/traveller site. This could only be allowed if other facilities were provided. Does the Council propose to import plants from Holland? (Ref 661).

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
In particular I have grave concerns about the choice of location for the proposed gypsy and traveller sites and also the building of 750 new homes at Shirley Oaks Village. The local schools are already struggling to cope with ever increasing numbers of children, and the journey from Shirley into Croydon can be extremely congested at peak times. The extra traffic generated by the proposals would cause misery in my opinion. The loss of green spaces in the proposed areas of development would also be most detrimental. I would therefore urge Croydon Council to consider and respect the very real concerns and fears of the majority of residents in the Shirley area.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites: Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502; and Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661; I am so upset to hear of these proposals for my family living close by to Coombe Farm. My daughter who lives in Scotland was also living close to gypsies and every single day she had a different problem. They steal, they fight, they make so much noise and they throw their rubbish all over the place and they have rough dogs who bark at everyone. We stopped visiting her because it was too much trouble. This area you are choosing is so nice and quiet, so clean and pretty. Why would you chose to ruin it with traveller sites. This is a most stupid decision and also very thoughtless to the people who live in that area. They will have to build 6 feet high walls all around their homes. Is the council going to pay for the extra security needed? I cannot stress enough how much I am against this proposal.

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy/traveller sites:
• Coombe Farm off Oaks Road reference number 502; and
• Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane reference number 661;
I am strongly against these proposals for a number of reasons. Both the proposed sites are on Green Belt land and as such are inappropriate and harmful to the land. The area is pretty and supports plenty of wildlife which we love discovering with the grandchildren. The effect on the community already settled in that area, which includes my daughter and grandchildren, will be detrimental in many ways. I fear for their safety and security if this proposal were to be passed as the gypsies have tried to settle their before. My grandchildren were bullied and my daughter experienced vandalism to her property and theft from the garden. I cannot begin to imagine what it might be like if the travellers became permanent residents in the Coombe Farm and Coombe Lodge area. It would be disastrous. How can you think of placing a gypsy and traveller site in Conduit Lane, in the green belt, next to the award-winning Coombe Wood Gardens? That place would be ruined within a very short space of time. If gypsies began frequenting the Coombe Wood it would mean that elderly people such as myself would no longer feel safe taking our grandchildren to the gardens and that would be a huge loss for us in so many ways. I urge you to re-think and place the gypsies and travellers in areas that would be better suited to them and would less infringe upon the lives of already settled and happy communities.

Change
This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
Deborah Davis

Object Soundness - Justified DM44.2 661

am writing to object to Reference Numbers 502 and 661—Location of Gypsy and Travellers sites in Coombe Lane and Coombe Lodge Nurseries. The reasons of my objections are as follows:

• They are being built in Green Belt areas.
• The sites are built on single track lanes but in your document you state “In addition Gypsy and Traveller sites need good access to the road network as they often need to move larger vehicles as part of their livelihood and way of life”. Neither has good access especially for larger vehicles, if there are to be 39 pitches with at least 2 families on each pitch and an average of 3 vehicles per family that is 234 vehicles. I don’t think you could park that many vehicles in these sites let alone access on a one vehicle wide road.
• I really do not believe these pitches are within the required distance of schools, doctors, shops.
• I understand that Croydon wishes to increase Travellers sites fourfold yet I have seen no explanation why that number is used.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Gisela & Patrick Pachebat & Maguire

Object DM44.2 661

We are objecting very strongly to a gypsy and traveller site in Condull Lane and at Coombe Farm. Both sites are green belt and should not be used for any other purposes. You should listen to all the objections of all the people living around these sites. We can not understand why the council has to pick sites in South Croydon when other places would be much more suitable.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

P A J Galhia

Object Soundness - Justified DM44.2 661

A proposed Gypsy and Traveller site next to Croydon’s award winning Coombe Wood Gardens and at the end of a bridleway and popular walk beggars belief.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.

Owner of Royal Garden Chinese Bar Restau

Object DM44.2 661

Object to the 1e Travellers site as it would be in be in a Green Belt and in breach of government guidance and there would be no services local to the area.

Change

This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found.
| Object | DM44.2 661 | I object to the following:  
- The use of the site at Coombe Farm for a gypsy traveller site (502)  
- The use of the site at Coombe Lodge for a gypsy traveller site (661) | Change | This site has been found to be unsuitable for any form of residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller pitches, due to the noise from industrial machinery located on an adjacent site. Therefore, the proposed allocation will be deleted and an alternative site found. |

| Object | DM44.2 662 | All area policies should be in line with Sport England’s Land Use Planning Policy Statement ‘Planning for Sport Aims and Objectives’ and Paragraph 74 of the NPPF and Sport England’s Playing Fields Policy. The Coombe Road Playing Fields, Coombe Road site (Ref no 662) in South Croydon includes existing sports facilities. Furthermore, the remainder of the specific sites could also include existing sports facilities (it is unclear as the existing use of these sites is not provided within this document). Planning Policy Objective 1 within Sport England’s Land Use Planning Policy Statement ‘Planning for Sport Aims and Objectives’ aims to prevent the loss of sports facilities and land along with access to natural resources used for sport. Furthermore, it is understood that some of the above sites form part of, or constitute a playing field as defined in The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010 (Statutory Instrument 2010 No.2184). Sport England would be consulted as a statutory consultee on any forthcoming planning applications and they would be considered in light of its Playing Fields Policy. A site allocation and subsequent development on the playing field aspect of these sites (which did not accord with Sport England’s Playing Fields Policy) would contravene paragraph 74 of the NPPF, which includes a strong presumption against building on open space. Sport England objects to the allocation of the land unless the above policies are fulfilled. | Change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. The proposed allocation will be amended to include the retention of playing pitches. |
Object

The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662. The site should remain as Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Object

Soundness - Justified

The Local Plan states that the site "met the criteria for de-designation" from the Green Belt; however, the site is not referenced under Policy SP7. The Council should state clearly what reasons it gives for it no longer meeting criteria for designation as Green Belt.

Change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

It would de-designate Coombe Lodge Playing Fields as Green Belt. The re-designation of this site would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and the protection of the Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
| Object | DM44.2 662 | The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid. | No change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. |

| Object | DM44.2 662 | OBJECT to The use of the following location for a Secondary School: Coombe Road Playing Fields, site reference 662 as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. | No change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. |
The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179). The site should remain as green belt. No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
1797/01/008/DM44.2/O Andrea Telman

Object

DM44.2  
662

I totally disagree to the following planning applications which would spoil the character of our local environment and threaten our green belt. I choose to live in an area that is peaceful and quiet and resent the changes that are being forced upon me. In the spirit of true democracy I wish to make clear my objection to the following developments - Policy DM2 (p18); Policy DM40.1 (p165); Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30 (p165); Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 61 (p168); Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, Site 661 (p171); Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, Site 662 (p179); Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, Site 661 (p179); Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, Site 662 (p179); Policy DM35, Table 11.8, Site 945 (p146); and Policy DM31.4 (p126).

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a train stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

1800/01/007/DM44.2/O Carly Litchfield

Object

DM44.2  
662

The site should remain as green belt. Croham Hurst Woods are being de-designated from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land in Policy SP7 of the Strategic Plan. Sanderstead Plantation is also being downgraded from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land. Objections are raised to all these downgrades.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a train stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1821/01/003/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Hina Shavdia</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>Object to the de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation, Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829/01/010/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Christine Cafferkey</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179)</td>
<td>The site should remain as green belt.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
I object to the reclassification of Coombe Playing Fields, Croham Hurst Woods and Sanderstead Plantation from Greenbelt to Metropolitan Open Land. This is not appropriate. It is essential for the character, ecology and biodiversity of the borough that these green spaces remain fully protected and are recognised for what they are - Green Belt. To downgrade them would be an obvious 'thin end of the wedge' to losing them.

DM44.2

Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662

(p179)

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

No change

DM44.2

662

02 September 2016
I am writing to object to the de-designation of Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid. No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Object DM44.2 662

Loss of Green Belt, (1) Coombe Playing Fields, (2) Croham Hurst, (3) Sanderstead Plantation

The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662. These sites should remain as green belt. Croham Hurst Woods and Sanderstead plantation are being de-designated from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land in Policy SP7 of the Strategic Plan. I object to all these downgrades, as they are both easily accessible areas for exercise and recreation that once gone will never be replaced

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
1892/01/006/DM44.2/O  Dennis Carter  

Object  

DM44.2  

662  

No change  

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

1894/01/007/DM44.2/O  Mr & Mrs Derek & Sue Reeves  

Object  

DM44.2  

662  

No change  

We would make the following objections to the proposed Draft Local Plan which is a poorly disguised attack on the southern part of the Borough. 

Policy DM 44.2, table 11.17, Site 662  

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179). The site should remain as green belt. Croham Hurst Woods are being de-designated from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land in Policy SP7 of the Strategic Plan (p55 of Policies Map). Sanderstead plantation is also being downgraded from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land. All these downgrades should be removed.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews: Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
1982/10/003/DM44.2/O E McNally

Object DM44.2 662

I object to the de-designation of Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

1989/01/004/DM44.2/O S R Samuel

Object DM44.2 662

The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
<th>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990/01/004</td>
<td>Douglas &amp; Linda Onam</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/01/004</td>
<td>J. M Lewis</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Document ID</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation; Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid;</td>
<td>No change There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</td>
<td>No change There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr John Webster

Object

DM44.2
662

I object to the de-designation of:

Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation;

Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662;

as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid;

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Councillor Dudley Mead

London Borough of Croydon

Object

DM44.2
662

I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews:

Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662;

The de-designation of the above site would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews:

- Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662: The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr Nivaj Sawant  
Object  
DM44.2  
662  
I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt. 
No change 
There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Lorraine Pond  
Object  
DM44.2  
662  
Policy DM44.2, table 11.17, site 662 - this site should not be developed. Policy SP7 of the Strategic Plan - this should not be de-designated from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land. Sanderstead plantation should not be downgraded from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land. I object to all these proposals. 
No change 
There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2</th>
<th>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2103/01/04</td>
<td>Miss DC Smith</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2128/02/14</td>
<td>Cllr Steve O'Connell AM</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>I object to the loss of Green Belt. The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>P Graham</td>
<td>I object to Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, Policy DM44.2, site reference 662; as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid;</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Object | DM44.2 662 | P Busby | The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid | No change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. |
2150/01/004/DM44.2/O R. V. Lewis  
Object  
DM44.2  
662  
I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.  
No change  
There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

2160/01/002/DM44.2/S Glen Print  
Support  
DM44.2  
662  
I have no objection to the building of a secondary school on the site of Coombe Wood playing field, as it does bring benefit to future generations.  
Welcome support  
There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>DM44.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2175/01/005/DM44.2/O Mrs Veronica Prigg</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>I wish to object to Policy DM 44.2. Loss of Greenbelt. Proposed development of Coombe playing fields. This is designated Greenbelt so development should not be permitted. Croham Hurst and Sanderstead Plantation both presently Greenbelt redesignated as Metropolitan Open Land -why? Does this make development easier? These are both precious open spaces, with Croham Hurst having SSSI status and as such should be fully protected. I quite appreciate the need for more housing, but one only has to visit Croydon to see the number of vacant/deserted sites that could be developed for housing rather than concreting over beautiful open spaces which can never be replaced. I trust you will consider my very valid objections and fears.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2181/01/008/DM44.2/O Ray &amp; Anne Smith</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>I object to Loss of Green Belt on all three sites at Coombe Playing Fields, Croham Hurst and Sanderstead Plantation and SP7.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2243/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Ben Rispin</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Please note my objection to the following development of land outlined in recent area plans. These open spaces are vital to the quality of life of the area. As someone whose family has been in Sanderstead for three generations I object as I would like to see my children have the same quality of life and access to open space as their parents, grandparents and great grandparents. I object to the Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p175).</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2304/01/004/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mandy Lambert</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object | DM44.2 662 | I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt. | No change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Object | DM44.2 662 | I am writing to object to the de-designation of Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662. | No change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr Noel Vas

Object Soundness - Justified DM44.2 662

I am writing to object to:
The de-designation of:
• Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of the site would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

Adrian Little

Object DM44.2 662

Coombe Playing Fields are also part of the wonderful Lloyd Park Green Space with beautiful views and contiguity to Lloyd Park itself. Any marginal building project on it would detract from the whole area. Even Coombe Lodge is restricted in any alteration or development.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Object to the de-designation of Coombe Playing Fields as the de-designation would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and the protection of the green grid. The building of a secondary school on this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Object
Soundness - Justified
DM44.2
662

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews: Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662. The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

Object
Soundness - Justified
DM44.2
662

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24/02/004/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Ben Plummer</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/02/003/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>N Johnstone</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Coombe Road Playing Fields - de-designation would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Subramanian Rupan

Object DM44.2 662

I object to your proposed development in policy DM 44.2, Table 11.17, Site 662 for the construction of a school at Coombe Playing field for reasons given below:

1. Coombe Playing field is currently falls within Green Belt and should not be degraded for construction of the school. Degrading would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and the protection of the Green Belt;

2. Melville Avenue is a short road and there are 2 schools at present. During school times a lot of traffic use this road. I object to adding more traffic on to Melville Avenue which will make the road unsafe for road users and add more traffic noise and pollution;

3. Coombe Playing fields are important resource for schools which do not have playing fields and should therefore be kept for current and future users.

Ms Cliona Moore

Object DM44.2 662

I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Miss F Matthews

Object

I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Anna Bannon

Object

I am writing to object to the de-designation of Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt. The de-designation would not comply with SP7.2 and the protection of green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
<th>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25/01/004</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Wilkinson</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/07/01/03</td>
<td>A&amp;L Isaac</td>
<td>Re Proposals for Traveller’s Site on Conduit Lane Proposal for School on Coombe Playing Fields</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are writing to object to the above proposals. We have grown up in South Croydon and have been regular visitors to Coombe Wood and gardens, and now with our young daughter. This green belt refuge in dense suburban Croydon would suffer great from any development in Conduit Lane. A traveller site would be inappropriate and adversely affect the character of this special environment.

We understand that there are always competing demands and needs for the council to meet in the borough but please recognise the amenity value of precious green areas in Croydon, that would be lost to future generations by insensitive development.
The WCGS Academy Trust would like to register an interest in the following site in response to Croydon’s Local Plan. (site number 662) The preferred option stated in the Local Plan is for a ‘secondary school’. We would like to register an interest in the ‘preferred option’ which is for a secondary school. The WCGS Academy Trust has received approval from the Department for Education to open a comprehensive Free School with a sports specialism in the South Croydon area to open in September 2018.

Our attached document ‘A proposal for a brand new WCGS Academy Trust Secondary School, Coombe Road Playing Fields – Local Plan ref 662’ forms our representation to Croydon Council for our Free School with enhanced sports facilities to be located on site 662 and should be read in conjunction with this form. This new secondary school provision with enhanced sports facilities will meet the needs of local people and will support the development of younger generations to achieve their best educationally and through engagement in sporting activity. We aim to provide opportunities for all young people to reach their personal best. See our attached document ‘A proposal for a brand new WCGS Academy Trust Secondary School, Coombe Road Playing Fields – Local Plan ref 662’ for further information.

Welcome support

Whilst the Local Plan cannot endorse specific school providers we welcome the support for this site from the WCGS Academy Trust.
To date, the EFA and Cushman & Wakefield have undertaken a detailed search for a site in the area using the following property search criteria:

- Location within Croydon and location relative to the school catchment area;
- Sites available within suitable timescales;
- Likelihood of obtaining planning approval for a Secondary School;
- That the on-going service/maintenance costs offer good value;
- Technical risks associated with any redevelopment;
- Access to external play areas and open space;
- Good pedestrian access for local children to be able to walk to school;
- Local transport links and connections to the site.

We have identified a number of sites through this process which are not considered suitable due to size constraints, site ownership/ availability, conflicting ‘bad neighbor’ adjacent uses, and poor infrastructure linkages.

In summary there are no other suitable, available and deliverable sites in the area at present. WCGS is interested in the site and developing a new secondary school there.

Welcome support whilst the Local Plan cannot endorse specific school providers we welcome the support for this site from the WCGS Academy Trust.
Object

Archbishop Tenison's School

I am also objecting to the proposal to build a secondary school at site reference 662 where I understand that the preferred approach is to allow an Academy Trust from a neighbouring borough, which currently runs a single sex selective / grammar academy, to run the school on this site. My ground for objecting to this is that this is in conflict with SP5.9 which states that the Council will support investment in the improvement and expansion of primary and secondary schools. I attach in Appendix A a short history of the plans for the proposed move of Archbishop Tenison’s school to the Coombe Road site. As you will see in that summary, following the failure to proceed with that proposal, the Council undertook to find an alternative site to relocate and expand Archbishop Tenison’s. In fact it has not yet managed to do this and now has its opportunity to deliver on that undertaking by offering this original nursery site to this school and maintaining the playing fields as they are, which are an important facility for sport not just in this school, but for other existing secondary schools in the Borough. It seems completely wrong to make that important sporting site available for building to an out of borough academy trust with no experience of running a coeducational mixed ability school. It is also worth adding that this approach could free up the current Archbishop Tenison’s site in Park Hill for residential redevelopment close to central Croydon or for community use as a primary school. For obvious reasons we are strongly opposed to Croydon Council inviting a single sex, grammar / selective school from another borough to build a school on this site rather than meeting its objective under SP5.9 of supporting investment in the expansion of existing secondary schools in the borough.

No change

The Local Plan does not endorse specific school providers. It is allocating the site for use as a new secondary school and should the Archbishop Tenison’s School wish to open a new secondary school on this site then this would be in line with the proposed allocation. However, given the need for new school places in the borough the Council would not be in favour of the simple relocation of Archbishop Tenison’s School and the reuse of their current site for residential use as this would potentially leave the borough with a shortfall in secondary school places.

Support

Education Funding Agency

The Education Funding Agency has approved 3 new Free Schools currently looking for sites within Croydon. This site has been identified as being potentially suitable options for the permanent location of the WCGS Federation Free School. We would welcome the opportunity to work with Croydon Council and the respective trust to make these sites available options for these schools.

Welcome support

Whilst the Local Plan cannot endorse specific school providers we welcome the support for this site from the Education Funding Agency.
Comment

The site does not meet Ark's demographic criteria.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land.

This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Object

I also object to the de-designation of the following areas: Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; Land to the west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, site reference 636. which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews. The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

The more specific site allocations represent a large reduction in the amount of designated and non-designated open space. While we acknowledge the need to build new homes and associated infrastructure such as schools, Croydon’s growing population also needs quality open spaces for all the human amenity and ecosystem services which they provide.

The Local Plan states that the site "met the criteria for de-designation" from the Green Belt however the site is not mentioned the policy SPT which covers changes in Open Space Designations. The council should state clearly what reasons it gives for it no longer meeting criteria for designation as Green Belt. Even if the site does not meet Green Belt criteria, a change to MOL designation should be considered as the site has recreational use and therefore meets criteria for MOL. The Council should remove the proposed site allocation and designate the site as Metropolitan Open Land.
Mr Paul Quaintance

Object

DM44.2

I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt. No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr Paul Quaintance

Object

DM44.2

Building a secondary school and traveller pitches in this area will not be in keeping with the area. The area is very green and popular as a place to spend time in Croydon's natural areas for many many people. Building these sites on green belt land here would not be appropriate. It would detract from the special characteristics of the local area. It would also bring heavy traffic with regards to the secondary school to an area where there is also difficulty parking in the week with other schools / nursery's also in this area. I believe it would affect negatively the local amenities and also would be inappropriate for people enjoying Lloyd Park, Coombe Lodge Café and the wooded areas around these very important local areas. Coombe Wood and Lloyd Park are some of Croydon's few special places. We should not be building on Green Belt land and detracting from the special characteristics of local areas. We should keep and protect the few special places that Croydon has such as Lloyd Park and its surrounding areas and woodland. This is critical given all the development in the centre of Croydon for people to escape and relax in.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>662</th>
<th>Page 3406 of 4384</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2662/02/001/DM44.2</td>
<td>Mr Terence Pais</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2662/01/004/DM44.2</td>
<td>Mr Terence Pais</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The proposal does not meet Strategic Objectives 5, 9 and 10. It will have the greatest impact as the increased traffic, noise, light will affect the fauna of the area, including badgers, deer, owls and pheasants. Increased traffic and impact on tram services will adversely affect the area. Future generations will also need playing fields. Development in the Green Belt is inappropriate because the Green Belt is designed to prevent urban sprawl. The increased development in central Croydon will increase the population of the area and that population will need green space. People do not need to use the playing fields to benefit from them. The visual impact of green space versus a developed space is a benefit. Losing playing field space will have an impact on current users. The site should be retained as a playing field.**

**There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.**

The site should be retained as a playing field.

I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
<th>2664/01/003/DM44.2/O Ms Alison Lawton</th>
<th>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>2699/01/003/DM44.2/O Mr &amp; Mrs Tahir</th>
<th>Object to this site for school as it is in Green belt and there are enough schools in the locality. It would cause extra pressure on traffic and parking in this congested area. Alternative sites should be sought that have less impact on the environment</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We are extremely concerned to learn that proposals are being considered to build a school on the Coombe Lodge playing fields.

Clearly this would be a significant ‘change of use’ for a site which is located within the ‘Green Belt’. Furthermore, we understand that the area is designated as being ‘of Special Character’ within the Borough. As such it is protected from any re-development which would be contrary to conservation and local habitat.

As in other neighbouring boroughs, such developments tend to precipitate and accelerate the erosion of natural area which have been protected for many years for use by all residents of the borough as well as countless visitors. The proposed re-development site is adjacent to Addinton Hills, Coombe Gardens, Lloyd Park and Coombe Farm. We contend that such a development would be totally inappropriate for the area, as the character of these local areas of leisure and relaxation would be negatively affected.

More specifically, the potential re-development may have more obvious negative local impact. It is a matter of record that many inner-city schools and colleges no longer have adequate on-site playing fields to meet their National exercise through sport and physical activities, traditionally in games such as football, athletics and cricket. These are all played at Coombe Lodge. The loss or reduction of the facilities here would further exacerbate this situation within this area of the Borough.

Furthermore, any significant construction project at the proposed location such as a school, would inevitably cause major disruption to the local area for the entire project duration. Large industrial vehicles, construction work and plant deliveries, let alone environmental and noise pollution, would be a blight on the local area for many months, if not years.

No doubt you are aware there are already two schools in Melville Avenue- Old Palace School of John Whitgift and Rutherford Special Needs School. As a consequence, local residents are obliged to endure periods of chaotic traffic movements in Melville Avenue and other connecting roads. It is inevitable that the local roads and side streets would
be even more seriously congested especially at peak periods, due to the significant increase in traffic generated by the construction of a new school on the site of Coombe Lodge playing fields.

There is currently no bus service along Coombe Road and the only adjacent public transport is the Tram Link, so an increase in private vehicles in the area would be inevitable if the re-development proposal were put into practice.

As Croydon residents for many years, we certainly do not feel that this proposed re-development within our local community is appropriate, nor in the local interest. It will certainly not benefit our lifestyle.

We strenuously object to the proposed re-development of the Coombe Lodge playing fields site and urge the Council to abandon the proposed re-development this plot of land so that it continues to provide a much valued recreation facility whilst enhancing the local environment.

We trust we can count on your vigorous support to counter the local planning changes which have raised these current proposals and also to reject any similar inappropriate schemes within the Croyham Ward of the Borough.
Object I note with some concern the proposals in the Croydon Council Local Plan dated August 2015. In particular, the proposal to develop three sites in close proximity for the use of the Travelling population and the proposal to build a new Secondary School on Coombe Road Playing Fields. Croydon is acknowledged as the 'greenest' Borough in South London, with many Croydon parks and open spaces achieving 'Green Flag' status including Lloyd park and Coombe Woods. These are accreditations that we should be proud of and wish to preserve. Royal Russell School objects to these proposals on the basis of the development of Green Belt land and flaws and inconsistencies in the scoring criteria that identified these sites as appropriate for development.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr David Martin

Object

DM44.2
662

I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

---

Mr D Lawton

Object

DM44.2
662

I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr Colin Campbell

Object Soundness - Justified DM44.2 662

I am writing to object to:
The de-designation of Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of these sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Charles Chellapandian

Object Soundness - Justified DM44.2 662

Object to the de-designation of Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid;

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Object DM44.2
662
The new secondary school would require redesignation and this would be contrary to London policies to protect the Green Belt and would detract from the attractiveness of the open space. It would also cause traffic and access problems in the area. The appropriateness of a school adjacent to a travellers site is questionable.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Object DM44.2
662
DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661 Coombe Lodge Nurseries proposes this be used in future as a Gypsy and Travellers site. As I understand it this is currently green belt land and it is totally inappropriate to use green belt land in this way. Such land is precious for wildlife and the community as a whole and should not be allowed to be lost for this purpose. Indeed all green belt land should be regarded as sacrosanct and not be allowed to be downgraded. This also applies to site 662 Coombe Road Playing Fields which again should remain as green belt land and not be allowed to be built upon.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
| 2773/01/001/DM44.2/5 | David Peschier | Support | DM44.2 662 | Support - The Coombe Road playing field would be a suitable site for a school.  
1. Endorse the plan to build a school subject to approving the site plan.  
2. but have concerns about:  
- The lack of transport links serving the proposed new school with approx 1200 pupils and staff - there is currently no bus route along Coombe Road  
- The tram system has insufficient capacity to cope with additional numbers as is already over-loaded in peak times around Lloyds Park area due to pupils and staff travelling to and from the two established schools in close proximity.  
- The road layout would need to be amended to enable safe and secure delivery of pupils to the new school  
- Suggest the school entrance on Conduit Lane with a large new roundabout created at the junction with Oaks Rd to allow access in/out of the school. | No change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. |
| 2774/01/007/DM44.2/0 | Cllr Susan Winborn | Object | DM44.2 662 | Objects to the de-designation of Coombe Road Playing Fields as green belt | No change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. |
Object Soundness - Justified DM44.2 662

I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overview:

Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662:
The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
<th>This contrary to established policy.</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ian Cutts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
<th>The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development. The site should remain as green belt.</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Gibbons</td>
<td></td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overview: Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662. The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The de-designation of:
Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation;
Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662;
as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid;

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

These sites should remain as Green Belt. We object most strongly to these being downgraded to metropolitan open land. No further playing fields must be built on.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>DM44.2</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>DM44.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 02 September 2016 | Cllr Vidhi Mohan | London Borough of Croydon | I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews: Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662. The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid. | }
| Object | DM44.2 662 | **Even more concerning is the proposal to use Coombe Playing Fields (currently Green Belt) for a new school (Policy DM 44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (page 179)). For many people in Croydon, their first open space of any consequence is the land around Lloyd Park. The character of this land has already been tarnished by the tram route running through them, and this proposal can only be seen as part of the insidious erosion of what is surely one of Croydon's prized possessions.** | **The site should remain Green Belt.** | **No change** | **There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.** |
The proposal to build a secondary school at site reference 662 where I understand that the preferred approach is to allow an Academy Trust from a neighbouring borough, which currently runs a single sex selective / grammar academy, to run the school on this site. This is in conflict with SPS.9 which states that the Council will support investment in the improvement and expansion of primary and secondary schools. Croydon Council had a previous proposal, which they could revive, to use this site to relocate and expand Archbishop Tenison’s school - the borough’s most successful co-educational secondary school which is highly popular with strong leadership and which has already invested time and effort in planning for such a move under the previous proposals. Following the failure to proceed with that previous proposal the council undertook to find an alternative site to relocate and expand Archbishop Tenison’s - it has failed to do so and, with this current opportunity of delivering on that undertaking, is now failing to do so by offering this original site to an out of borough academy trust with no experience of running a coeducational mixed ability school. In addition this approach would free up the current Archbishop Tenison’s site in Park Hill for residential redevelopment close to central Croydon or for community use as a primary school. I am deeply opposed to Croydon Council inviting a single sex, grammar / selective school from another borough to build a school on this site rather than meeting its objective under SPS.9 of supporting investment in the expansion of existing secondary schools in the borough.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object Description</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2886/01/008/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mrs Dianne Haile</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the de-designation of Coombe Road playing fields because de-designation would not comply with policy SP7.2 and the protection of the Green Belt.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2888/01/004/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Phillip Moore</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt - site reference 662.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No change There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr Peter Lawton

Object DM44.2 662

I object to the de-designation of Coombe Road Playing Fields as green belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr Gerald Smith

Object DM44.2 662

Policy DM44.2 (page 179) - Loss of Green Belt Areas

I object strongly to the downgrading of Coombe Wood Playing Fields/Croham Hurst and Sanderstead Plantation to facilitate housing development. There is not a lot of greenery in Croydon as a whole (particularly in the north of the borough) so why remove what we have?

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
2913/01/005/DM44.2/O Wendy Wilkinson
Object DM44.2 662
I object to the de-designation of Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt as the de-designation of the site would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

2901/01/13/DM44.2/O Mr. John Newman
Object DM44.2 662
I object to the de-designation of the site as it would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the Green Grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2932/01/003/DM44.2/662</td>
<td>Mr James Lawton</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of Coombe Road Playing Fields as green belt.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2934/01/005/DM44.2/662</td>
<td>J A Meyer</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of Coombe Road Playing Fields as green belt as it would not comply with Policy SP2.7 and protection of the green grid.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I understand that the following Policies will threaten our green spaces. I was born in Croydon and have lived in this area all my life (I am now 63). My parents came here from Scotland in the early 1950s. They chose this area specifically for its green spaces and it is quite unique in that facility. I spent more than 35 years in Real Estate in this area and know very well that the reason people continue to move here, is exactly for those facilities and yet remaining within easy reach of other amenities, London, the coast and airports. Of course, more housing is required but I believe the alternative suggestions to these proposals to be very valid and much more in keeping with the neighbourhood thus maintaining its attractiveness and good standard.

These proposals are ill conceived and will change this particular neighbourhood beyond all recognition and take away that for which it is well known and valued. Please hear the voices of people like me and do NOT continue with the proposed policies set out below and which can be found in your Local Plan:

7. The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179). The site should remain as green belt. Croham Hurst Woods are being de-designated from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land in Policy SP7 of the Strategic Plan (p55 of Policies Map). This is an area of specific natural beauty and scientific interest. Sanderstead plantation is also being downgraded from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land. I object to all these downgrades and feel very strongly about it.
Mr James Marland Object DM44.2 662 No downgrade of (1) Coombe Playing Fields. They should remain greenbelt land and protected.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mrs Jeanne Driscoll Object DM44.2 662 I wish to add my objections made on this document by our local M.P. Chris Philp.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Jennifer Houghton

I object to the proposal to down grade the above site from green belt to Metropolitan, Croydon is a London Borough known for having green spaces and parks which are much appreciated by all the local residents and adds to its positive image.

I also object to the proposed provision of Gypsy/ Traveller site at Conduit Lane this is a green belt site. There are limited facilities for families who would be living there - no local shops or health centre. There is a shortage of local primary school places and no primary school within walking distance, I understand it is of paramount importance to encourage traveller family to send their children to school so that they can continue their education.

No change

DM44.2

662

Jennifer Houghton

2985/01/003/DM44.2/O

Anna Bond

Object

Loss of Green Belt – (1) Coombe Playing Fields, (2) Croham Hurst, (3) Sanderstead Plantation

The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2. Table 11.17, site 662 (p178). The site should remain as green belt. Croham Hurst Woods are being de-designated from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land In Policy SP7 of the Strategic Plan (p25 of Policies Map).

No change

DM44.2

662

Anna Bond

2991/01/002/DM44.2/O

02 September 2016 Page 3428 of 4384
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2999/01/006/DM44.2/0</td>
<td>Mr John Harris</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the de-designation of: Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179). The de-designation of these sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3003/01/007/DM44.2/0</td>
<td>Mr John James</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>I would like to register my objection to DM44.2, Table 11.17, Site 662 (Green Belt development)</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Joseph Trickey

Object DM44.2 662

I wish to state my strong objection to any diminution of local green spaces. The draft local plan Policy DM 44.2 and Policy SP7 propose redesignation from Green Belt status to Metropolitan Open Land for Croham Hurst and also for the Sanderstead Plantation and Coombe Playing Field. The value of maintaining protection for these spaces for health and environmental reasons must be evident to everyone responsible for their protection. For many years I, along with many others, have used these open spaces and woodlands to walk around the area and also for walking into Croydon town. One of Croydon’s great assets is in the number of green spaces available for the public’s recreation, and it is clear from public meetings that the people of Croydon see them as of great benefit. Not only is the public prepared to use them but as is seen from the associations like the Friends of Croham Hurst Woods and the Friends of Wetton Gardens people are also prepared to work for their improvement. I should like reassurance that the redesignation of the land will not result in any erosion of the areas open for walking and for leisure in general.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr Nicholas Hook

Object DM44.2 662

The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2 Table 11.17, site 662 (pg175). The site should remain as green belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
I object to the development plans detailed in this policy and believe the site should remain as green belt. These sites should not be downgraded as proposed.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

I should like to protest against the site chosen for gypsy camps and a new secondary school being built on green belt. There must be better sites for them as we must protect our green belt sites.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Christine Younger

Object

DM44.2
662

I strongly object to this council building or using Green Belt sites for this and any other purpose. Also high rise flats will upset the balance of the areas. I do accept that we need more housing but these should be built on existing empty or land filled sites.

Mr Christopher Andrews

Object

DM44.2
662

Green belt means protected against development. That is the point otherwise the concept of 'Green Belt' and its associated legislation, may as well be scrapped altogether.
2. The de-designation of:
   • Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation;
   • Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662;
   • Land at Shirley Oaks;
   • Rowdown Fields site reference 636 (New Addington does not need another secondary school) as the de-designation of these sites would not comply with Policy SPT.2 and protection of the green grid;

No change

3. There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr Paul Gomm
Object

DM44.2
662
please note my objection to the following policy reference numbers within your current draft plan for planning & development.

No change
There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr Varsha Patel
Object

DM44.2
662
I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change
There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
I also want to express my total opposition to the idea of a school from another borough running another school on site 662. The idea that a Sutton school might be given a site in Croydon, when there are schools here that would dearly love to expand, is incomprehensible. One of the proposals in the plan (SP5.9) says that the council will support investment in the improvement and expansion of primary and secondary schools.

Archbishop Tenison's School was asked to prepare for a move to the Coombe Lane nursery site back in 2008 and, with the full support of the Education Department, the Governors planned the move in great detail. They were dealt a heavy blow, however, when in 2010 the site was withdrawn. The governors were told at the time that no one could build on the Coombe Lane site, because it was greenbelt land. In the last few years the School has expanded as much as it can and the Selborne Road site has been developed in a number of small ways to accommodate extra pupils, but there is a desperate need for large scale development on the site, or a relocation to another, more suitable site.

I want to express just how deeply opposed I am to the plan to allow a Sutton school to build on Coombe Lane. It would be intensely insulting to Archbishop Tenison's leadership and Governors. They have a prior claim on the site, they have been straining to expand for several years, and they have already demonstrated that they can run a school that is successful and popular. If any school moves to the Coombe Lane site, it should be Archbishop Tenison's.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr Gerald Lambert

Object DM44.2

Those policies seem to pose considerable threat to the greenbelt, which is a major cause for concern. Degrading the greenbelt for short term expediency is short-sighted. Surely more appropriate areas can be found for redevelopment!

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Dave Cooper

Object Soundness - Consistent with National DM44.2

I would like to object to parts of the recent Croydon Local Plan with particular reference to the following proposals, as they all will lead to degradation of the natural environment:

DM2 Infill building on existing gardens

DM44.2 Table 11.17 site 661 Loss of Green belt (it's there for a reason!) There must be more suitable site

DM44.2 Table 11.17 site 662 Loss of Green belt

DM31.4 Reclassification of areas of special interest

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
The application to develop a secondary free school at site reference 662 where I understand is to permit an Academy Trust from another borough, currently running a single sex grammar academy to manage the school on that site. I feel this is conflict with SP5.9 which states that the Council will support investment in the improvement and expansion of primary and secondary schools. Croydon Council had a previous proposal which could be revived and used to relocate and expand Archbishop Tenison's school. It is the borough’s most successful co-educational secondary school, it is highly popular with an excellent leadership and which has already invested time and effort in planning for such a move under the previous proposals. Following the failure to proceed with that previous proposal the council undertook to find an alternative site to relocate and expand Archbishop Tenison’s school. I believe it has failed to do so and with this current opportunity of delivering on that undertaking, it is now failing to do so by offering this original site to an out of borough academy trust with absolutely no experience of running a coeducational mixed ability school. In addition this approach would free up the current Archbishop Tenison’s site in Park Hill for residential redevelopment which is close to central Croydon or for community use like a primary school. I am totally opposed to Croydon Council inviting a single sex grammar school from another borough to build a school on this site rather than meeting its objectives set under SP5.9 of supporting investment in the expansion of existing secondary schools in the borough.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
The application to develop a secondary free school at site reference 662 where I understand is to permit an Academy Trust from another borough, currently running a single sex grammar academy to manage the school on that site. I feel this is conflict with SP5.9 which states that the Council will support investment in the improvement and expansion of primary and secondary schools. Croydon Council had a previous proposal which could be revived and used to relocate and expand Archbishop Tenison’s school. It is the borough’s most successful co-educational secondary school, it is highly popular with an excellent leadership and which has already invested time and effort in planning for such a move under the previous proposals. Following the failure to proceed with that previous proposal the council undertook to find an alternative site to relocate and expand Archbishop Tenison’s school. I believe it has failed to do so and with this current opportunity of delivering on that undertaking, it is now failing to do so by offering this original site to an out of borough academy trust with absolutely no experience of running a coeducational mixed ability school. In addition this approach would free up the current Archbishop Tenison’s site in Park Hill for residential redevelopment which is close to central Croydon or for community use like a primary school. I am totally opposed to Croydon Council inviting a single sex grammar school from another borough to build a school on this site rather than meeting its objectives set under SP5.9 of supporting investment in the expansion of existing secondary schools in the borough.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
| 3157/01/005/DM44.2/O  | Mr James Clarke | Object | DM44.2 662 | Loss of Green Belt | DM44.2 662 | While I of course concede that we need to build more houses I believe that there are ample brownfield sites available to achieve this. Building on our Green Belt will totally change the area and I wonder if these proposed projects will include feasibly affordable housing as the average property price in the proposed developments is probably £400,000. | No change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. |

| 3162/01/025/DM44.2/O  | Mr Joe Toner | Object | DM44.2 662 | I would like to voice my objection to the following plan DM44.2 | No change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. |
Coombe playing fields currently Green belt are being proposed for development, I object strongly to all these plans for downgrading. There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
I am objecting to:
The proposal to build a secondary school at site reference 662 where I understand that the preferred approach is to allow an Academy Trust from a neighbouring borough, which currently runs a single sex selective / grammar academy, to run the school on this site.

This is in conflict with SP5.9 which states that the Council will support investment in the improvement and expansion of primary and secondary schools. Croydon Council had a previous proposal, which they could revive, to use this site to relocate and expand Archbishop Tenison’s school - the borough’s most successful co-educational secondary school which is highly popular with strong leadership and which has already invested time and effort in planning for such a move under the previous proposals. Following the failure to proceed with that previous proposal the council undertook to find an alternative site to relocate and expand Archbishop Tenison’s - it has failed to do so and, with this current opportunity of delivering on that undertaking, is now failing to do so by offering this original site to an out of borough academy trust with no experience of running a coeducational mixed ability school.

In addition this approach would free up the current Archbishop Tenison’s site in Park Hill for residential redevelopment close to central Croyden or for community use as a primary school. I am deeply opposed to Croydon Council inviting a single sex, grammar / selective school from another borough to build a school on this site rather than meeting its objective under SP5.9 of supporting investment in the expansion of existing secondary schools in the borough.
Mr Stephen Woodward

We have lived in Sanderstead for over 40 years, and have thoroughly enjoyed the areas to the south of Croydon being unspoilt. In our view these ill conceived proposals will change this area beyond recognition and take away that for which it is well known and valued. Please rethink, and do not continue with the proposed policies set out below and which can be found in your Local Plan:

The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179). The site should remain as green belt. Croham Hurst Woods are being de-designated from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land in Policy SP7 of the Strategic Plan (p58 of Policies Map). This is an area of specific natural beauty and scientific interest. Sanderstead plantation is also being downgraded from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land. I object to all these downgrades and feel very strongly about it.

Mr Steve Simms

I strongly object to any of these new proposals to build on any green belt land.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Sheila Wicks

Object  DM44.2 662

I object to all these down grades in Policy DM44 2 Table 11.17 site 662 p179. They should all stay the same as they are. The now playing fields should stay as they are and local schools should be encouraged to use them.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Saundra Dudman

Object  Soundness - Justified  DM44.2 662

7) DM44.2 Table 11.17 site 662 p179 Coombe Playing Fields, Croham Playing Fields and Croham Hurst should remain Green Belt and not be downgraded to Metropolitan Open Land which could then be used for development, our green belt is precious and we should protect it.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
I wish to register my strong objection (via daughter's email) on the proposed Loss of Green Belt proposals which will have a detrimental effect on the residential amenity of the neighbourhoods around Sanderstead Plantation, Croham Hurst Woods and Coombe Playing Fields. I strongly object to Croydon Council's proposals to change the status of Sanderstead Plantation from Metropolitan Green Belt to Local Green Space, Croham Hurst Woods designated from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land, and Coombe Playing Fields being proposed for development. The current designation of Sanderstead Plantation and Croham Hurst Woods sites provides the protection the sites need from unwanted development and there are no benefits to residents in changing the designation. The proposals will destroy the character of the areas which need to be preserved. Other objections:

- Adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours, by reason of noise, disturbance, overlooking, loss of privacy, wildlife, overshadowing, etc.
- Unacceptably high density / overdevelopment of Coombe Playing Fields site, especially as it involves loss of the open aspect of the neighbourhoods.
- Visual impact of the sites and surrounding neighbourhoods and a detrimental effect on the character of our area.
- As the local plan sets out what the Council will allow to be built over the next 20 years, all planning applications on Sanderstead Plantation or Croham Hurst Woods need to do is be consistent with the local plan to be passed thus ruining these sites and the neighborhood amenities forever.
- Increased density of the population of these sites including overcrowding which is also a health and safety concern.
- The detrimental effects change of land status of Sanderstead Plantation and Croham Hurst Woods and the proposed development of Coombe Playing Fields on the character of the neighbourhood. Croome Hurst Woods is a mature wood with beech and oak trees which will be under threat e.g. less trees, increase in noise, litter.
- Design (including bulk and massing, detailing and materials, if these form part of the application)
- The proposed development of Coombe Playing Fields would be over-bearing, out-of-scale or out of character in terms of its appearance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Object Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>3260/01/006/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Wayne Starr</td>
<td>Also the downgrading of greenbelt sites at Coombe Playing Fields, Croham Hurst and Sanderstead Plantation should not be considered an option. These areas should be preserved and fought for not downgraded.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>3264/01/005/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Brian Watkins</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of Coombe Playing Fields as Green Belt, as the de-designation would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3260/01/006/DM44.2/O Wayne Starr

Object

DM44.2 662

Also the downgrading of greenbelt sites at Coombe Playing Fields, Croham Hurst and Sanderstead Plantation should not be considered an option. These areas should be preserved and fought for not downgraded.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr Matthew Searles

Object

Object to The de-designation of:

- Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation;
- Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid;

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Suzanne Connor

Object

With reference to the Local Plan which has been proposed, please note my objection to the following policies:

> Garden Grabbing
> Policy DM2
> Purley Skyscraper authorisation
> Policy DM40.1
> Purley Pool
> Policy 40.4, Table 11.3, Site 30
> Purley Parking
> Policy 40.4, Table 11.3,
> Sanderstead “Lidl” Site
> Policy DM41.3, Table 11.14, site 306
> Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane, next to Coombe Wood Gardens
> Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 661
> Loss of Green Belt – (1) Coombe Playing Fields, (2) Croham Hurst, (3) Sanderstead Plantation
> The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662
> Lack of Parking in new developments
> Policy DM28
> More Protection; Less “Intensification”
> Policy DM31.4

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr Terrence McCarthy

Object

DM44.2

662

I object to the de-designation of Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; as the de-designation of the site would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid. No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr William Wheeler

Object

DM44.2

662

The present status of these areas, which are Green Belt land, should not be downgraded as proposed which would leave them vulnerable to development. No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
The proposal to build a secondary school at site reference 662 where I understand that the preferred approach is to allow an Academy Trust from a neighbouring borough, which currently runs a single sex selective / grammar academy, to run the school on this site. This is in conflict with SPS.9 which states that the Council will support investment in the improvement and expansion of primary and secondary schools. Croydon Council had a previous proposal, which they could revive, to use this site to relocate and expand Archbishop Tenison’s school - the borough’s most successful co-educational secondary school which is highly popular with strong leadership and which has already invested time and effort in planning for such a move under the previous proposals. Following the failure to proceed with that previous proposal the council undertook to find an alternative site to relocate and expand Archbishop Tenison’s - it has failed to do so and, with this current opportunity of delivering on that undertaking, is now failing to do so by offering this original site to an out of borough academy trust with no experience of running a coeducational mixed ability school. In addition this approach would free up the current Archbishop Tenison’s site in Park Hill for residential redevelopment close to central Croydon or for community use as a primary school. I am deeply opposed to Croydon Council inviting a single sex, grammar / selective school from another borough to build a school on this site rather than meeting its objective under SPS.9 of supporting investment in the expansion of existing secondary schools in the borough.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3312/01/007/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Richard Brandwood</td>
<td>Loss of Green Belt – (1) Coombe Playing Fields - The status of this site should remain the same - and not be changed.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3316/01/007/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr David Dudman</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>7) DM4.2 Table 11.17 site 662 p179 Coombe Playing Fields, Croham Playing Fields and Croham Hurst should remain Green Belt and not be downgraded to Metropolitan Open Land which could then be used for development, our green belt is precious and we should protect it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr Ron Thomas

Object: Soundness - Justified

I object to the following ridiculous proposals...

Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17. Site 662 (p179) NO! Leave Sanderstead these valued GREEN spaces, they make Sanderstead what it is.

No change

Ed Owen

Object: DM44.2 662

I wish to lodge my objection to all the proposals set out in policy number SP7. I am particularly annoyed at the thought of losing Coombe playing fields as my property looks out over this beautiful piece of greenfield site, and to lose it would be an abomination to the local environment and a great loss for the flora and fauna living there!

No change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3339/01/004/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Keith Watt</td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>I am equally concerned about Coombe Playing Fields, currently a Green Belt, being proposed for development. These are valuable and well used green spaces. I see countless empty office buildings and do not see why these cannot be used to create accommodation, rather than build over green spaces which provide a barrier to pollution and changes in climate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3347/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Richard Veldeman</td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179). This is unacceptable at many levels but effectively eliminating another sporting facility from the area is completely wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>3349/01/013/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Richard Jeffries</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the de-designation of: Croham Hurst and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>3349/01/012/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Richard Jeffries</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the de-designation of: Croham Hurst and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Amit Patel

Object

DM44.2 662

I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mrs Kim Vella

Object

DM44.2 662

Loss of Green Belt – (1) Coombe Playing Fields, (2) Croham Hurst, (3) Sanderstead Plantation

The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179). The site should remain as green belt. Croham Hurst Woods are being de-designated from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land in Policy SP7 of the Strategic Plan (p55 of Policies Map). Sanderstead plantation is also being downgraded from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land. I object to all these downgrades.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr A Young

Object DM44.2

662

The changes would change the character of our local area. Therefore, I would like to object to the above policy changes.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
The proposal to build a secondary school at site reference 662 where I understand that the preferred approach is to allow an Academy Trust from a neighbouring borough, which currently runs a single sex selective / grammar academy, to run the school on this site.

This is in conflict with SP5.9 which states that the Council will support investment in the improvement and expansion of primary and secondary schools. Croydon Council had a previous proposal, which they could revive, to use this site to relocate and expand Archbishop Tenison’s school - the borough’s most successful co-educational secondary school which is highly popular with strong leadership and which has already invested time and effort in planning for such a move under the previous proposals. Following the failure to proceed with that previous proposal the council undertook to find an alternative site to relocate and expand Archbishop Tenison’s - it has failed to do so and, with this current opportunity of delivering on that undertaking, is now failing to do so by offering this original site to an out of borough academy trust with no experience of running a coeducational mixed ability school.

In addition this approach would free up the current Archbishop Tenison’s site in Park Hill for residential redevelopment close to central Croydon or for community use as a primary school.

I am deeply opposed to Croydon Council inviting a single sex, grammar / selective school from another borough to build a school on this site rather than meeting its objective under SP5.9 of supporting investment in the expansion of existing secondary schools in the borough.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
The proposal to build a secondary school at site reference 662 where I understand that the preferred approach is to allow an Academy Trust from a neighbouring borough, which currently runs a single sex selective / grammar academy, to run the school on this site. This is in conflict with SP5.9 which states that the Council will support investment in the improvement and expansion of primary and secondary schools.

Croydon Council had a previous proposal, which they could revive, to use this site to relocate and expand Archbishop Tenison’s school - the borough’s most successful co-educational secondary school which is highly popular with strong leadership and which has already invested time and effort in planning for such a move under the previous proposals. Following the failure to proceed with that previous proposal the council undertook to find an alternative site to relocate and expand Archbishop Tenison’s - it has failed to do so and, with this current opportunity of delivering on that undertaking, is now failing to do so by offering this original site to an out of borough academy trust with no experience of running a coeducational mixed ability school. In addition this approach would free up the current Archbishop Tenison’s site in Park Hill for residential redevelopment close to central Croydon or for community use as a primary school. I am strongly opposed to Croydon Council inviting a single sex, grammar / selective school from another borough to build a school on this site rather than meeting its objective under SP5.9 of supporting investment in the expansion of existing secondary schools in the borough.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
| Reference | Author | Object | Description | Change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3411/01/001/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Amarjit Kalsi</td>
<td>DM44.2  662</td>
<td>I object to any downgrading of any Green Belt areas, Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179) and Open Land in Policy SP7 of the Strategic Plan (p55 of Policies Map) refers. We need to cling on what little there is and downgrading Green Belt areas will only open up the Pandora’s Box for developers to exploit, perhaps not now, but certainly in the future as pressure on building new homes grows. Once we go down this route we will lose our precious Green Belt for our future generation and the land is gone for good.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3415/01/009/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Ms C Soroczynski</td>
<td>DM44.2  662</td>
<td>Please note my objections to planning Policy DM44.2 , Table 11.14, site 662</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Croydon is currently running out of space and actually letting more people in through building more flats is putting pressure on our services: we do not have enough schools in the area to cater for all new arrivals. However taking green belt land is a step too far.

Similarly a site for travellers with amenities which would prevent them from invading current green spaces is a good idea, but where to put it needs to be sensibly planned and the current proposal in my view is not adequate.

We wish to object to the downgrading of status of the following open spaces: Coombe Playing Fields, Croham Hurst, Sanderstead Plantation. Under NO circumstances should these open spaces be downgraded.
I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews:
Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662: The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid No change

I understand that you are planning to change the current status of The plantation and Croham Woods and Coombe Playing Fields from Green belt to Metropolitan Open Land. I can only assume that this would allow these current open spaces to be built on in the future. If this is not the case, I cannot see why the current statuses would need to change. I am unable to understand why, as residents, we have not been told directly of your plan to change the status by Croydon Council. These spaces are key to this local community. We currently enjoy walking in the woods and teaching our children about nature and eco systems. There is a wealth of wildlife which habitats the woods, badgers, rabbits, deer and not to mention the different species of birds. Where would they go if the trees were cut down. Sanderstead is a lovely location because of the woods and open spaces, to build on this would be detrimental to the area and a mistake No change
Ms E Rispin

Object DM44.2

662

Please note my objection to the following development of land outlined in recent area plans. These open spaces are vital to the quality of life of the area. As someone whose family has been in Sanderstead for three generations I object as I would like to see my children have the same quality of life and access to open space as their parents, grandparents and great-grandparents.

Loss of Green Belt Coombe Playing Fields. The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179). I object to all this downgrade.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Ms E Hook

Object DM44.2

662

The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2 Table 11.17, site 662 (p179). The site should remain as green belt. Croham Hurst Woods are being de-designated from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land in Policy SP7 of the Strategic Plan (p55 of Policies Map). Sanderstead Plantation is also being downgraded from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land. I object to all these downgrades.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
As a mother I know how important it is in this day and age to have open green spaces to go in the city, that are natural, unspoiled, spacious and adventurous. In this fast paced and pressured computer era, children and families and everyone else, need spaces to go to unwind, to re-energise, to connect to the real, living world and to have clean air to breathe. With down grading green belt land and woods, we jeopardise the physical and mental health of our children and fellow citizens. We disrespect the need for green spaces for wild life and trees to bring healthy air and a healthy eco-system. If we do not teach our children and everyone else the importance of green in a city, we set a bad precedent for the next generation. If we let money be our main aim, choices like this will become easier and easier made and we would be left with no green at all. The strongest thing that Croydon has going for itself are the green spaces and woods. The green belt had been established for a reason. It is not meant to be touched! It is meant to be preserved for the good of all!

Please re-consider your plans and leave the green spaces protected in the green belt. Don't let it be eroded in the name of 'progress'.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Please do not build on greenbelt areas. There is plenty of space in the empty building in central Croydon and in West Croydon. Spend money on empty land and leave the last green parts of Croydon alone. When those green belt areas are gone so will nature. We are not inner city. We have a history of enjoying our green spaces in Croydon.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr Derek Smith

Object DM44.2 662

We are horrified and strongly object to learn recently that Croydon Council has proposals for the re-designation of a number of open areas (public playing fields and woodland) in the Selsdon/Sanderstead, South Croydon area. The purpose of the proposed re-designation is clear to everyone that is to say, new development at some point in time. We recognise the need to increase housing stock, however, the need for adequate public amenities increases with development, and finding the space to provide these becomes increasing more difficult. We should not try solving one problem only to create a more serious one. When public green spaces are no longer available it will become impossible to remove developments to create such spaces. We should therefore treasure the few public open spaces that exist, and not see them as opportunities for development when there are opportunities still existing in brown field sites. It should be kept in mind that the creation of mature woodland etc. would typically take 50 or more years. South Croydon does not have an abundance of such areas, therefore, we need to think seriously when considering changes to any public spaces especially woodland.

Mr Gregory Taylor

Object DM44.2 662

Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179). For the good of all Londoners greenbelt must be cherished and maintained. As a council in a greenbelt area Croydon Council are responsible for protecting our greenbelt, to reclassify this land goes against that aim. The site should remain as green belt. Croham Hurst Woods are being de-designated from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land in Policy SP7 of the Strategic Plan (p55 of Policies Map). Sanderstead plantation is also being downgraded from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land. I object to all these downgrades.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3495/01/006/DM44.2/C</td>
<td>Mr Ian Harris</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the de-designation of: Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; My objection is based on the fact that such a de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3496/02/002/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Ian Leggatt</td>
<td>Object DM44.2 662 This site is in Green Belt / Metropolitan Open Space and should be retained as such. I object to the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3518/01/003/DM44.2/O Mrs Josephine Gable

Object
DM44.2
662

Coombe Playing Fields also appears to have no reason to change its status other than to prepare for development in the future. I believe that this de-designation would have a major negative impact on the character of our neighbourhood and would ask you to re-consider this action or further guarantee that these changes will be held for a minimum of 100 years from implementation.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

3523/01/008/DM44.2/O Mr Mike Rice

Object
DM44.2
662

Dear Sirs,

With reference to the recently published ‘Croydon Local Plan’, as a resident of the past 25 years I give my views as follows:

Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179) Objection, development of Coombe Playing fields is unacceptable being in a Green belt.

Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179) Objection, development of Coombe Playing fields is unacceptable being in a Green belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
<th>I wish to voice my concerns regarding the following:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I totally object to any reduction of green space in the borough of Croydon in favour of development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| No change | DM44.2 662 | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. |

| Object | DM44.2 662 | I wish to object to site 662. For centuries parks and green spaces have been an important part of urban living where people can walk and relax. It would be a sad day if these open spaces were lost for ever. We have enjoyed open places and do not want to see them lost for future generations when with a bit of imagination brownfield sites could be considered ahead of the green belt. Future generations will not thank us for destroying their heritage, and character of their local community. We are aware of the need for housing but here in Sanderstead we have already seen a lot of development in recent years, and its character slowly being eroded. |

| No change | DM44.2 662 | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. |
Miss Lisa K Hall

Object DM44.2 662

I write to object to:

The de-designation of the following sites as green belt on the basis that this would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid. In addition, Croham Hurst is a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and I believe its green belt status should remain to protect it for future generations.

Croham Hurst

Coombe Road Playing Fields, site reference 662

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Linda Hione

Object DM44.2 662

Loss of Green Belt – (1) Coombe Playing Fields, (2) Croham Hurst, (3) Sanderstead Plantation

The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p178). The site should remain as green belt. Croham Hurst Woods are being de-designated from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land in Policy SP7 of the Strategic Plan (p56 of Policies Map). Sanderstead plantation is also being downgraded from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land. I object to all these downgrades. There is no reason to make any changes as these lands need to be protected.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr Michael Steer

DM44.2 662

Object

Policy SP7 Loss of Green Belt. (1) Coombe Playing Fields, (2) Croham Hurst, (3) Sanderstead Plantation

Due to the importance of these spaces to local residents and the community I object to all of these proposed downgrades to change the above listed sites from Metropolitan Green Belt to Local Green Space.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr & Mrs Adams

DM44.2 662

Object

It is also of vital importance to retain playing fields where they exist. Increasingly, schools have fewer and fewer playing fields available to practice sport, as so many have been already sold, to the detriment of the health of our children, so where such playing spaces exist, they should be protected. We believe all these plans will devastate our green spaces, and will have a very damaging impact to the character of the local area, and we object strongly.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr Peter West

Object DM44.2 662

I object to this site as we need space and sensible development that compliments the environment.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Nicola Shipp

Object DM44.2 662

As a resident of Croydon all my life, I wish to register my opposition to the following plans:

DM44.2 SITE 662 – The change of status for Coombe Playing Fields, Croham Hurst Woods and Sanderstead Plantation is of great concern. Homes must not be built on these sites as the whole area would suffer by additional traffic and the already growing strain to services. Not to mention, spoiling lovely open spaces.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
I wish to object to some of the proposals in the Croydon Local Plan as follows:

I object to the proposal (policy DM44.2 Table 11.17) to create a Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane next to Coombe Wood Gardens (site 661) and/or Coombe Farm (site 502). Policy E of “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites” published by the Government in August states that “Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development”. This would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b. Previous scenes from Traveller sites demonstrate that they end up as dump; not the sort of image we want to portray for Croydon.

I object to the proposed loss of Green Belt status for (1) Coombe Playing Fields - (site ref 662) and object to the proposal for development in Policy DM44.2 Table 11.17 (2) Croham Hurst - this is a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation (3) Sanderstead Plantation

The de-designation of these sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

I object to the proposed loss of Local Area of Special Character protection for many roads such as West Hill, Campden and Spencer Roads, the Woodcote Estate and Hartley Farm. Loss of protection will open up these roads to inappropriate development. Roads, such as Oakwood Avenue in Purley should also be included as new Local Heritage Areas.

I object to the possible “Garden Grabbing” that policy DM2 will make much easier. National and London policy classifies gardens as green field, but the proposed new policy DM2 says that the Council will allow building on gardens. We need to keep our green spaces.

I also object to the proposed retail development of the old “Good Companions Pub” site in Hamsey Green, which the proposed policy DM4 1.3 table 11.14 (site 306) would allow. A retail outlet in such a location would cause traffic chaos. It will be far better to develop it as a residential site (with ample parking) and in character with other housing in the area - not a block of flats.
On the question of parking, I note that some new developments do not seem to cater for this. Green Dragon House being a typical example. All new developments should provide for ample parking for residents and their families.

Please take the above comments into account when assessing the proposed Croydon Local Plan.

Yours faithfully

Mr Malcom Saunders
3594/01/007/DM44.2/C

Object to the proposed loss of Green Belt status for
(1) Coombe Playing Fields - (site ref 662) and object to the proposal for development in Policy DM44.2 Table 11.17
(2) Croham Hurst - this is a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation
(3) Sanderstead Plantation
The de-designation of these sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

DM44.2 662

Cllr J Cummings
Object Soundness - Justified
3699/01/018/DM44.2/D

I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews:
Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662;
The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid

No change

DM44.2 662
Mr J Lemanski

Object DM44.2 662

I would like you to note my strong objection to the granting of any Planning Application relating to the following Policy Ref. DM44.2, Table 11.17, Site 662.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Ms J MacEvoy

Object DM44.2 662

I believe that this de-designation would have a major negative impact on the character of our neighbourhood and would ask you to re-consider this action.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mrs J McDonald

Object DM44.2 662

The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179). The site should remain as green belt.

No change. There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr Nick Peiris

Object DM44.2 662


No change. There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr & Mrs Mott  
Object DM44.2 662
I object to this site allocation.  
No change

DM44.2

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr Tom Tannion  
Object DM44.2 662
I wish to register the strongest possible objection to the specific proposals in the Croydon Local Plan proposing a school or gypsy site at Conduit Lane, and a Gypsy site at Coombe Farm.

Regarding Conduit Lane, clearly, Niccolo Machiavelli would have been proud of the tactic of proposing a gypsy site or a school there. Presumably, the thought was that people are gullible enough to believe that these are either / or proposals!! They are certainly as different as chalk and cheese. I consider both options to be unhelpful, inappropriate and out of keeping with the current use of the area. I am also generally surprised that they are considered viable options worthy of serious consideration as they appear random in nature and devoid of any real local knowledge.

Regarding both gypsy site proposals, neither are in keeping with the existing ‘texture’ of the areas. They add nothing to the quality of life of local residents (quite the contrary) and generally they are so out of keeping with the current general use enjoyed by those neighbourhoods that one is left wondering how they even made it into a plan? Were the proposals drawn up by someone completely ignorant of the area?

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mrs Anne Turner

Object DM44.2 662

I would like to put in writing my objections to the following local plans:

I am listing the relevant Policy Numbers:

7. DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662

Green belt

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
I have lived in Sanderstead for nearly 30 years and wish to register my strong objection on the proposals which I believe will have an adverse effect on the sites and residential amenity of the neighbourhoods around Sanderstead Plantation, Croham Hurst Woods and Coombe Playing Fields.

I strongly object to Croydon Council's proposals to change the status of Sanderstead Plantation from Metropolitan Green Belt to Local Green Space, Croham Hurst Woods designated from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land, and Coombe Playing Fields being proposed for development.

The current designation of Sanderstead Plantation and Croham Hurst Woods sites provides the protection the sites need from unwanted development and there are no benefits to residents in changing the designation. If the proposals for the Coombe Playing Fields are passed Croydon will LOSE one of the few areas of natural beauty. There will be fewer places to go for family walks, fewer oak and beech trees which will have an adverse effect on the health and well being of local residents potentially resulting in detrimental effects of mental health ultimately putting a strain on Croydon Council's Social Service and local NHS.

- Adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours, by reason of noise, disturbance, overlooking, loss of privacy, wildlife, overshadowing, etc.
- Unacceptably high density / overdevelopment of Coombe Playing Fields site, especially as it involves loss of the open aspect of the neighbourhoods
- Visual impact of the sites and surrounding neighborhoods and a detrimental effect on the character of our area
- As the local plan sets out what the Council will allow to be built over next 20 years, all a planning application on Sanderstead Plantation or Croham Hurst Woods need to do is be consistent with the local plan to be passed thus ruining these sites and the neighborhood amenities forever
- Increased Density of the population of these sites including overcrowding which is also a health and safety concern
- The detrimental effects change of land status of Sanderstead Plantation and Croham Hurst Woods and the proposed development of Coombe Playing Fields

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Playing Fields on the character of the neighbourhood. Coombe Hurst Woods is a mature wood with beech and oak trees which will be under threat eg less trees, increase in noise, litter.

- Design (including bulk and massing, detailing and materials, if these form part of the application)
- The proposed development of Coombe Playing Fields would be over-bearing, out-of-scale or out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing vicinity
- The loss of existing views from neighbouring properties would adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring owners

I am emailing you to express my concerns about Croydon Council’s Plans to build houses on some of our precious green spaces, back gardens. I understand that there is a great need for housing in the Croydon area and that the number of homeless people in Croydon is high. However, I need assurance that in providing this need we do not destroy our few remaining green spaces as these are vital to the well-being of our environment and people’s health. When I received the information about these proposals from my MP and local residents’ association I had been away from home and so have not studied these plans in depth. However, with the information I have I cannot visualize how these proposals would work without destroying the character of the Shirley area and the destruction of our few remaining green areas.

In order for me to agree to these proposals I would not only require the assurance that these environmental issues were taken into account but the homes that are planned for were affordable to those who are in need of a home, and that they were of good quality, energy efficient homes. Finally, having lived in Shirley for many years I have seen the increase in traffic which has brought about an increase in air pollution which is detrimental to our health. This is another important factor that has to be borne in mind when increasing the density of the population of the area.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Myra Rand

Object

DM44.2

662

I fully oppose the proposals to build on green land. No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr Malcolm Mackenzie

Object

DM44.2

662

We wish to raise objections to a number of the proposals in the draft document which, we feel, will affect the south part of the Borough in particular, but will also make the whole Borough less attractive in which to live. Of particular concern are any proposals which will reduce the "Green Belt" status of an area, such as the Coombe Playing Fields (Policy DM44.2 Table 11.17, site 662 (p179).

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr & Mrs Wakelam

Object

DM44.2-662

We are opposed to the de-designation of Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662. The de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr David Reid

Object

DM44.2-662

I object to Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, Policy DM44.2, site reference 662; as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>I am writing to object to the de-designation of Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662. The de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3794/01/007/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I object to the development plans detailed in this policy and believe the site should remain as green belt. These sites should not be downgraded as proposed.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Tony Connor

Object  DM44.2 662

With reference to the Local Plan which has been proposed, please note my objection to the following policies:

Loss of Green Belt: (1) Coombe Playing Fields, (2) Croham Hurst, (3) Sanderstead Plantation

The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr Tony Sales

Object  DM44.2 662

I am emailing to record my objection to the following policies within the 'Local Plan'.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Loss of Green Belt (1) Coombe Playing Fields, (2) Croham Hurst, (3) Sanderstead Plantation

The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2. Table 11.17, site 662 (p179). The site should remain as green belt. Croham Hurst Woods are being de-designated from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land in Policy SP7 of the Strategic Plan (p55 of Policies Map). Sanderstead plantation is also being downgraded from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land. I object to all these downgrades.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Object to DM44.2 table 11.17 Site 662, we don't want to risk development on these open space sites - we need to encourage people to get out onto green space and exercise!

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Object I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews: Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662.

The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Object to Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179).

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Object DM44.2
662
Green Belt designated areas such as Coombe Playing Fields are being proposed for development; Croham Hurst Woods downgraded designation to Metropolitan Open Land in Policy SP7 of the strategic Plan (p55 of Policies Map); Sanderstead plantation downgraded designation to Metropolitan Open Land. I object to all these downgrades.

No change
There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Object DM44.2
662
Loss of Green Belt * (1) Coombe Playing Fields, (2) Croham Hurst, (3) Sanderstead Plantation. The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179). The site should remain as green belt. Croham Hurst Woods are being de-designated from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land in Policy SP7 of the Strategic Plan (p55 of Policies Map). Sanderstead plantation is also being downgraded from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land. I object to all these downgrades.

No change
There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3813/01/008/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Brandon Hannan</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179). The site should remain as green belt. Croham Hurst Woods are being de-designated from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land in Policy SP7 of the Strategic Plan (p56 of Policies Map). Sanderstead plantation is also being downgraded from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land. I object to all these downgrades.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3814/01/008/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Jon Adams</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179) proposes development of the Coombe Playing Fields, which are currently Green Belt. I object to this proposal as the site should remain as green belt.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Requestor</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3815/01/005/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Jon Taylor</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>It is with regret that I feel the need to object to the following proposals:- Purley skyscraper Policy DM40.1, I feel this proposal is completely out of keeping with the surrounding area and I strongly oppose it. Garden acquisition Policy DM2 This will make ‘garden grabs’ far too easy in my opinion, is far too subjective and is therefore a far weaker form of protection. Sanderstead Lidl site Policy DM41.3 This proposal will likely cause real problems to traffic in the vicinity and I do not it is an appropriate site for retail development. Loss of Green Belt at Coombe Playing Fields and Croham Hurst Policy DM44.2 I believe that both of these locations should remain Green Belt and that re-designation is inappropriate. It will impact the area badly and in conjunction with other changes steadily change the nature of the area for the worse. The Gypsy/Traveller site on Conduit Lane Policy DM44.2 Finally I most strongly object to Council plans to develop a Gypsy/Traveller site here. I feel it is totally inappropriate placing this on Green Belt land and is in direct contravention of the “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites” published by the Government just last August!</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3816/01/007/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Lorraine Oakley</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>No change There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Richard Kellaway | Object | DM44.2 662 | The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid | No change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr Stephen Lambert | Object | DM44.2 662 | I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt. | No change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr L Bowen-Long</td>
<td>Loss of Green Belt &amp; Playing Fields – the proposal to alter land use categories for Coombe Playing Fields, Croham Hurst and Sanderstead Plantation are unnecessary and undesirable downgradings of land areas which help to maintain Croydon Borough as more than just a concrete jungle. There should be balance between the locations of urban sprawl and natural green areas which the local residents can enjoy. Do not progress further with such changes of classification.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Hooper</td>
<td>Policy DM44.2 Table 11.17, site 662. I do not agree to the proposal to open Coombe Playing Fields for development. This is quite contrary to the national aim to improve sporting facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3837/01/003/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3829/01/005/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Consistent with National DM44.2 662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish to object to the following &lt;br&gt;The use of the following as traveller or gypsy sites Coombe Lodge Nurseries site ref 661 Coombe Farm. Site ref 502 This is inappropriate development on Greenbelt. The de designation from Greenbelt of Croham Hurst Woods Coombe rd Playing Fields Sanderstead Plantation Does not comply with SP7.2 and the protection of the green grid</td>
<td>No change There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179). The site should remain as green belt. Croham Hurst Woods are being de-designated from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land in Policy SP7 of the Strategic Plan (p55 of Policies Map).</td>
<td>No change There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Mrs Linda Etheridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Maureen Messett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3851/01/003/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr Mike Etheridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3852/01/003/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr M Mulderry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Those should remain as Green Belt. The whole nature of the area will be destroyed if they are not protected in this way.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

There is no necessity for it and our parents had the foresight to develop the legislation please don't soil there good intentions.
We as a nation have maintained the principles of "the Green Belt" since its first inception in 1935 when it was part of a plan devised by the Greater London Regional Planning Committee eventually becoming law by virtue of the Town and Country Planning Act 1947. Recently the Government formerly set out its policies and principles towards green belts in England and Wales in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: Green Belts, but this planning guidance was superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in March 2012. Planning Authorities are strongly urged to follow the NPPF’s detailed advice when considering whether to permit additional development in the green belt. In the green belt there is a general presumption against inappropriate development, unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated to show that the benefits of the development will outweigh the harm caused to the green belt. The NPPF sets out what would constitute appropriate development in the green belt. I can not find any justifiable cause for allowing building on any "Green Belt" having viewed Gavin Barwell’s email on the matter. This series of developments cannot seriously be described as "Appropriate Development" under any circumstances. Please do not build on land which we, as a nation, have preserved for future generations.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

3861/01/005/DM44.2/0 Mr Neil Walker

Object

DM44.2

662

No change

This is a greenbelt site and not appropriate for development.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
<th>Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179) The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development and they should retain their current status.</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
<th>Below is a list of our objections: 2. Policy DM 44.2 - reclasification of Coombe Playing Fields and Sanderstead Plantations - similarly to the above change of classification will come as threat to character of the area and negatively impact local community.</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

The use of the following location for a Secondary School:

*Coombe Road Playing Fields, site reference 662

as this site would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7a and SP2.7b.

Change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Helen Peskett

Object

DM44.2

I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Carol Winterburn

Object

DM44.2

I am writing to object to:

2. The de-designation of several areas of valuable Green Belt: Croham Hurst (currently a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation), Coombe Road Playing Fields (site reference 662), and Sanderstead Plantation. This de-designation does not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2</th>
<th>662</th>
<th>I object to the de-designation of:</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3877/01/003/DM44.2/O Mrs Robin Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3878/01/004/DM44.2/O Imran Mahmood</td>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
<th>I am writing to object to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. The de-designation of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
<th>I object to the de-designation of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | | No change |
| | | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. |
Object Soundness - Justified DM44.2 662

2. The de-designation of: Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation; Coombe Road Playir Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid;

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land.

This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Object DM44.2 662

Dowgrading of any green spaces is again unacceptable. Our green spaces are valuable for people, the environment and wildlife. It is becoming more relevant these days, not a luxury but a necessity and dowgrading it is a slippery slope to losing it. Maybe this is the intention.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land.

This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Cllr M Neal  
Object DM44.2 662
I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews:
Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662. The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

Ms L Chatfield  
Object DM44.2 662
I am writing my objections development on the following sites as a resident as well as in my capacity as Warden of Croydon Ecology Centre. The sites are in areas that are essential foraging grounds for wildlife, including badgers, which are a protected species. I believe that they are also all on Green Belt Land. I realise that local authorities are being given new powers that allows them to build on parts of Green Belt Land, but I sincerely believe that this will be a terrible mistake, for which future generations will not thank us. These sites are also part of one of the very few large stretches of open green spaces so close the the centre of Croydon, which makes an huge difference to the air quality in our town and to the visual aspect thereof. There is ample evidence to prove that these green urban spaces are essential for the mental well-being of crowded cites. All the open green spaces are there for the benefit of all Croydon's residents and those visiting our Borough, by building on them you are taking away this right from people all over the Borough. Please think again and make use of brown field sites instead. By using brown field sites you have the opportunity improve those sites with well planned and laid out housing and amenities.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr & Mrs Shutter
Object DM44.2 662
The de-designation of Green belt land and Metropolitan Open land for building is quite frankly the sort of policy which is incredibly short-sighted; the green belt was put in place to provide open space for local residents, not to provide cheap building land for development.

Shirley Shephard
Object DM44.2 662
The Coombe Playing Fields, currently Green Belt, are being proposed for development in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p175). The site should remain as green belt. Croham Hurst Woods are being de-designated from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land in Policy SP7 of the Strategic Plan (p55 of Policies Map). Sanderstead plantation is also being downgraded from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land. I object to all these downgrades.
Mr Frances Bell

Object DM44.2 662

I disagree with all proposal's, greenbelt area's should not be downgraded in the way suggested.

No change There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr & Ms Gin Pang & D'Archambaud

Object DM44.2 662

We strongly object to the loss of green belt - Policy DM44.2 table 11, 17 site 662 on page 179.

No change There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Isaac</td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>We are writing to object to the above proposals. We have grown up in South Croydon and have been regular visitors to Coombe Wood and gardens, and now with our young daughter. We are also concerned about the development of Coombe Playing Fields, which are of great value to the community. A school on this site would exacerbate the already considerable traffic congestion in the immediate vicinity and would be an over development of this area. We understand that there are always competing demands and needs for the council to meet in the borough but please recognise the amenity value of precious green areas in Croydon, that would be lost to future generations by insensitive development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Burns</td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>We also object to the fact that the Coombe Playing Fields which are currently Green Belt land is being designated for development. This would be a retrograde step and should remain as Green Belt land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3963/01/002</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Mrs Yendall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3975/01/004</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Niren &amp; Archana Shah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the de-designation of Coombe Road playing fields as Green Belt. The de-designation would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

I object to the de-designation of Chobham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (5551) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation; Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3982/01/10</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Smith</td>
<td>We are strongly against the planning ideas you have over green spaces. Please add these six against to planning ideas with references below DM40.1 DM2 DM28 DM24 DM31.4</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3990/01/01</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>Mr P Upton</td>
<td>I confirm that I object to any changes to the designation of the Coombe Playing Fields</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4023/02/04/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Ms S Amin</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>I am writing to object to the de-designation of Combe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4023/01/11/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Ewin</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>Objection to Croydon Council’s proposal to provide sites for travellers &amp; the building of houses, etc on green land in Shirley &amp; other areas.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[02 September 2016 Page 3506 of 4384]
4027/01/004/DM44.2/O Debby Stanhope Object DM44.2 662 I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt. No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

4028/01/004/DM44.2/O Mrs S Dixon Object Soundness - Justified DM44.2 662 Object to the de-designation of: Craham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation; Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid;

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Object DM44.2 662

As a resident in the area, I am writing to object to the use of the following locations as gypsy and traveller sites:

a) Coombe Lodge Nurseries off Conduit Lane, site reference 661
b) Coombe Farm off Oaks Road, site reference 602

as both sites would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not comply with Policy SP2.7A and SP2.7B.

The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation; Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

These proposals are clearly harmful for the Green Belt and would have a negative impact on the environment and wildlife in Coombe Wood, Shirley Hills and Lloyd Park. It would create a precedent for further erosion of our valuable local amenity. Coombe Road and Coombe Lane are already very busy roads and one of the main arteries into the town centre. The additional traffic emanating from these two sites, without significant road improvements, would exacerbate the traffic congestion, not to mention the additional pressure on the already stretched local services such as schooling and general practitioners. The access roads to these proposed sites are clearly unsuitable for the larger vehicles that this community use as part of their livelihood and way of life. The junctions at Coombe Road, Oaks Road and Conduit Lane are already dangerous for vehicles and this area has the potential with this proposal to become a major accident black spot without significant very costly improvements to the local road network.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a train stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms S Lawson</td>
<td>I object to the development plans detailed in this policy and believe the site should remain as green belt. These sites should not be downgraded as proposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms S Quy</td>
<td>These precious sites should keep their green belt status.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools.
Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4056/01006/DM44.2/0</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Ferguson</td>
<td>We are writing to object to 2. the de-designation of; Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation; Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; because the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and the protection of the Green Belt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4064/01004/DM44.2/0</td>
<td>Mr Gregory Boyce</td>
<td>The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr Chandra Pawa

Object

DM44.2 662

I object to the de-designation of:
- Chorham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation;
- Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662, as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid;

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Dr Kenneth Lim

Object

DM44.2 662

I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
I object to the de-designation of Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>4073/01/004/DM44.2/0</td>
<td>Mr Graham Lyon</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>4078/01/010/DM44.2/0</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Belsey</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>Coombe playing fields and other areas MUST remain Greenbelt for exercise and relaxation, after a busy day. Otherwise there will be more medical and psychiatric problems</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Melissa Chu

Object DM44.2 662

the de-designation of Chorham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (5551) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation; Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662, as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Natwarral Patel

Object DM44.2 662

I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Breakdown</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4082/01/004/DM44.2/0</td>
<td>Philip Jupp</td>
<td>DM44.2</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4085/01/008/DM44.2/0 | Mrs Shelley Chatter-Singh | DM44.2 | 662 | DM44.2, 11.17, 662. This proposal will potentially reduce the amount of green belt land. It is not necessary and may open the floodgates. |
|                      |           |          |           | No change |
|                      |           |          |           | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. |
Vivienne Murray

Object

DM44.2
662

We need more housing further out from Croydon and surrounding we are already becoming overcrowded - don’t spoil our landscapes by building on Green Belt land.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr T King

Object

DM44.2
662

We both strongly object to council plans as below Coombe Playing Fields Policy DM44-2Table 11 site662 We object as above as it is on Green Belt land and not appropriate for development

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
The Chudasama Family

Object Soundness - Justified

Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179). The site should remain as green belt. Croham Hurst Woods are being de-designated from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land in Policy SP7 of the Strategic Plan (p55 of Policies Map). Sanderstead plantation is also being downgraded from Green Belt to Metropolitan Open Land. I object to all these downgrades.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

---

Mr & Mrs Kaczanowski

Object DM44.2

Below is a list of our objections:

2. Policy DM 44.2 - reclassification of Coombe Playing Fields and Sanderstead Plantations - similarly to the above change of classification will come as threat to character of the area and negatively impact local community.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4116/01/003/DM44.2/O</th>
<th>Mr &amp; Mrs Mitton</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
<th>I object to the de-designation of: Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4117/01/009/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Cllr S Brew</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews: Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; Land to the west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, site reference 636. The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
The open area of Coombe Road Playing Fields (site reference 662) also appears to be de-designated from its status as ‘Green Belt’. In both the above cases it is an inappropriate proposal, and any lower classification is considered potentially worrying with the possible intention of making it easier to allow other uses and/or development. Furthermore, such de-designation would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and the protection of the ‘Green Grid’.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

I also object to the de-designation of the following areas which are not even listed in the table on page 53 of the Policies Map, which highlights the changes to the green grid. This information only becomes apparent when looking at individual sites, which begs the question as what other significant changes have not been detailed in the strategic policy overviews: Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662. The de-designation of all the above sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Ms S Rao</td>
<td>Object to the de-designation of Coombe Road Playing Fields (site 662) as Green Belt. This site would not comply with Policy SM7.2 and the protection of the Green Grid.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>Mrs S Chandarana</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt as the de-designation would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the Green Grid.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/01/004/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mrs S Chandarana</td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt as the de-designation would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the Green Grid.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 02/02/004/DM44.2/O | Mrs S Deshpande | Soundness - Justified DM44.2 662 | I am writing to object to:
2. The de-designation of:
• Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of the site would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the Green Grid. | No change |
Object DM44.2 662 The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid

Mr Gary Dean

DM44.2

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Object DM44.2 662 I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

Mr John Gibson

DM44.2

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr John Male

Object DM44.2 662

I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt. No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr Mark Walker

Object DM44.2 662

I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt. No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
<th>4161/01/005/DM44.2/O Mr Trevor Watkins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the de-designation of Chroham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (5551) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation. Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662, as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy 5P7.2 and protection of the green grid.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document ID</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>4164/01/002/DM44.2/O Mr &amp; Mrs Whitehead &amp; Abbott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We are also concerned about the development of Coombe playing fields, which are an important resource for those schools lacking their own green fields. Too many playing fields have already been lost. A school on this site would exacerbate the already considerable traffic congestion in the immediate vicinity.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catherine Martin

Object

DM44.2

662

I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Krutika Patel

Object

DM44.2

662

I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
| 4189/01/004/DM44.2/O | Mr Roger Bolton | Object | DM44.2 662 | The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid | No change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. |

| 4190/01/003/DM44.2/O | Mr Ronald West | Object | DM44.2 662 | I object to the de-designation of: Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation; Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid; | No change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. |
S.R Patel

Object DM44.2 662

I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Annette Merry

Object DM44.2 662

The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>Claire Green</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of: Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>Mr. F Partovi</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop and therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr K Parke</td>
<td></td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
<th>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B Busa</td>
<td></td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4212/01/004/DM44.2/O Bhavil Vyas

Object DM44.2 662

I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

4214/01/004/DM44.2/O Mr J Turvey

Object DM44.2 662

The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
| Document ID | Object | DM44.2 662 | the de-designation of Chroham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (5551) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation; Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy 5P7.2 and protection of the green grid | No change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. |

| Document ID | Object | DM44.2 662 | I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt. | No change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. |
2. The de-designation of:

- Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (6861) and a site of Metropolitan Importance for nature Conservation;
- Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662, because the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and the protection of Green Belt.

Yet again Croydon should surely be encouraging schools to teach children conservation in all its forms and visits to these sites will have a greater impact on a child’s learning than sitting in a class room being taught theory, not practical experience. Croydon School children have a great advantage of having these truly natural sites on their doorstep unlike some Inner London schools, And teaching can be done by parents as well as teachers taking their children at weekends. It will be sad for future generations of Croydon children to be classed in an Inner London School with only a park and no natural areas for children to learn about the world around them. We received the benefits from past generations of Croydon residents, so we should not be destroying it for future generations.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr A Dawe

I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr A Rulkalai
Object 662
I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change
There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr B Pope
Object 662
I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change
There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
| Object | DM44.2 662 | The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid | No change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. |

| Object | DM44.2 662 | The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid | No change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. |
2. The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation; Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid;

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation; Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid;

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr D Patel

Object

DM44.2 662

I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr H Bhanji

Object

DM44.2 662

I object to Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of the site would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid;

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
<th>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>4279/01/004/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr H Khandelia</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>4281/01/004/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr I Roberts</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Detail</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4285/01/004/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr J Balcombe</td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4289/01/004/DM44.2/O | Mr J Patel | DM44.2 662 | I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt. | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. |
4292/01/004/DM44.2/O Mr J Pugh

Object

DM44.2 662

I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

4299/01/004/DM44.2/O Mr Will Johnson

Object

DM44.2 662

I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
<th>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr K MacKenzie</td>
<td></td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr M Buja</td>
<td></td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
<th>The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4330/01/004/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr K Shah</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4331/01/004/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr N Chanuarana</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</td>
<td>There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object

DM44.2

662

The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Object

DM44.2

662

the de-designation of Chroham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation; Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr P Chapman

Object

DM44.2 662

The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr P Nesbith

Object

DM44.2 662

I object to the de-designation of Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4340/01/004/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr R Spurgeon</td>
<td>Object 662</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4342/01/004/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Mr R Patel</td>
<td>Object 662</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr R Venuatakrishna

Object

DM44.2

662

The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Messrs Eccles & Hivdess

Object

DM44.2

662

The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr S Patel

Object

DM44.2
662

I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr V Dawe

Object

DM44.2
662

I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr W Whitehead
Object DM44.2
662
I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

Mrs L Bigglestone
Object DM44.2
662
The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms A Khandelia</td>
<td>I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms B Fontaine</td>
<td>the de-designation of Cheham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (5551) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation; Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662; as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy 5P7.2 and protection of the green grid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM44.2 662</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
| 4359/01004/DM44.2/O | Ms H Lishmund | Object | DM44.2 662 | I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt. | No change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. |
| 4360/01005/DM44.2/O | Susana Winter | Object | DM44.2 662 | De-designation of this site would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and the protection of the green grid. | No change | There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt. |
Tracey Plummer

Object DM44.2 662

I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mrs J Roberts

Object DM44.2 662

I object to the de-designation of the site as Green Belt.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
I am writing to object to:
2. The de-designation of:
   • Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662
   as the de-designation of the site would not comply with Policy SP7.2
   and protection of the green grid.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4378/01/004/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Jennifer Carozzo</td>
<td>The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4384/01/006/DM44.2/O</td>
<td>Ms N Nesterovich</td>
<td>the de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation; Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662, as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maurice Brennan

Object  DM44.2  662  4. Loss of Green Belt – (1) Coombe Playing Fields, (2) Croham Hurst, (3) Sanderstead Plantation in Policy DM44.2, Table 11.17, site 662 (p179). These sites should remain as green belt and not downgraded

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Kuldip Chana

Object  DM44.2  662  The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built up area and could therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
Mr & Mrs Norman

Object

DM44.2
662

The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

Mr Richard Herring

Object

DM44.2
662

The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.

No change

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM44.2 662</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louise Norton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The de-designation of Croham Hurst as Green Belt, despite being a biological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and Coombe Road Playing Fields as Green Belt, site reference 662 as the de-designation of both sites would not comply with Policy SP7.2 and protection of the green grid.</td>
<td>No change There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Marland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy DM44.2 - No downgrade of (1) Coombe Playing Fields, (2) Croham Hurst, (3) Sanderstead Plantation. They should remain greenbelt land and protected.</td>
<td>No change There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposal to build a secondary school next to the proposed Gypsy and Traveller site seems provocative, as the Croydon planning committee only recently finally rejected a similar proposal for the site. Surely councils should be preserving school playing fields.

There are insufficient sites within the urban area of the borough to meet the need for secondary schools. Therefore, the search for sites was expanded to encompass sites in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land. This site, although in Metropolitan Green Belt, is close to a tram stop therefore is capable of serving a wide area of the borough. It is also on the edge of the built-up area and could, therefore, be integrated into existing built form. Once the school buildings are built the remainder of the site will remain designated as Green Belt.

A policy should be considered for Portland Road that would help to manage the return of retail units to residential use, thereby concentrating the retail offer. A number of shopping parades have been designated on Portland Road. These designations aim to concentrate the retail offer and will support the conversion of other retail units to residential.

A policy should be considered for Portland Road that would help to manage the return of retail units to residential use, thereby concentrating the retail offer. A number of shopping parades have been designated on Portland Road. These designations aim to concentrate the retail offer and will support the conversion of other retail units to residential.

A policy should be considered for Portland Road that would help to manage the return of retail units to residential use, thereby concentrating the retail offer. A number of shopping parades have been designated on Portland Road. These designations aim to concentrate the retail offer and will support the conversion of other retail units to residential.

A policy should be considered for Portland Road that would help to manage the return of retail units to residential use, thereby concentrating the retail offer. A number of shopping parades have been designated on Portland Road. These designations aim to concentrate the retail offer and will support the conversion of other retail units to residential.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Cllr/T.</th>
<th>London Borough of Croydon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2775/01/048/DM45.2</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Cllr Tim Pollard</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2776/01/048/DM45.2</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Cllr Helen Pollard</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2812/01/048/DM45.2</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Cllr Jan Buttinger</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2829/01/048/DM45.2</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Cllr Margaret Mead</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2842/01/048/DM45.2</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Cllr Richard Chatterjee</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3430/01/048/DM45.2</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Mr Donald Speakman</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3699/01/048/DM45.2</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Cllr J Cummings</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM45.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment: A policy should be considered for Portland Road that would help to manage the return of retail units to residential use, thereby concentrating the retail offer.

No change: A number of shopping parades have been designated on Portland Road. These designations aim to concentrate the retail offer and will support the conversion of other retail units to residential.

Comment: A policy should be considered for Portland Road that would help to manage the return of retail units to residential use, thereby concentrating the retail offer.

No change: A number of shopping parades have been designated on Portland Road. These designations aim to concentrate the retail offer and will support the conversion of other retail units to residential.

Comment: DM45.3 should refer to South Norwood and Woodside and not South Croydon.

Change: DM45.3 has been changed to reference South Norwood and Woodside.

Comment: DM45.3 should refer to South Norwood and Woodside and not South Croydon.

Change: DM45.3 should refer to South Norwood and Woodside and not South Croydon; a policy should be considered for Portland Road that would help to manage the return of retail units to residential use, thereby concentrating the retail offer.

Change: The Proposed Submission draft will be accompanied by a draft Policies Map which should be clearer. In addition the draft will include in the introduction an improved guide on how to use the plan and which policies would apply for different types of development to make it easier to use. It is noted that the Preferred and Alternative Options draft did include a table which showed what type of changes to designations were being made in each Place.

Comment: DM45.3 should refer to South Norwood and Woodside and not South Croydon.

Change: This is a typographical mistake and it will be corrected.

Comment: DM45.3 should refer to South Norwood and Woodside and not South Croydon.

Change: This is a typographical mistake and it will be corrected.

Comment: DM45.3 should refer to South Norwood and Woodside and not South Croydon.

Change: This is a typographical mistake and it will be corrected.

Comment: DM45.3 should refer to South Norwood and Woodside and not South Croydon.

Change: DM45.3 should refer to South Norwood and Woodside and not South Croydon; a policy should be considered for Portland Road that would help to manage the return of retail units to residential use, thereby concentrating the retail offer.

Change: DM45.3 should refer to South Norwood and Woodside and not South Croydon.

Comment: DM45.3 should refer to South Norwood and Woodside and not South Croydon.

Change: This is a typographical mistake and it will be corrected.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>DM45.3</th>
<th>Change Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2635/01/041/DM45.3/C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Sandford</td>
<td>Bourne Society</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM45.3</td>
<td>DM45.3 should refer to South Norwood and Woodside and not South Croydon; A policy should be considered for Portland Road that would help to manage the return of retail units to residential use, thereby concentrating the retail offer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2775/01/047/DM45.3/C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr Tim Pollard</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2776/01/047/DM45.3/C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr Helen Pollard</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2812/01/047/DM45.3/C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr Jan Buttinger</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2829/01/047/DM45.3/C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr Margaret Mead</td>
<td>Croydon Council</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2841/01/034/DM45.3/C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr Vidhi Mohan</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM45.3</td>
<td>DM45.3 should refer to South Norwood and Woodside and not South Croydon; A policy should be considered for Portland Road that would help to manage the return of retail units to residential use, thereby concentrating the retail offer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2842/01/047/DM45.3/C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr Richard Chatterjee</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3430/01/047/DM45.3/C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Donald Speakman</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3696/01/047/DM45.3/C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr J Cummings</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3804/01/048/DM45.3/C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr L Hale</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM45.3</td>
<td>DM45.3 should refer to South Norwood and Woodside and not South Croydon; A policy should be considered for Portland Road that would help to manage the return of retail units to residential use, thereby concentrating the retail offer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cllr M Neal  3897/01/038/DM45.3/O

**Object**  DM45.3

DM45.3 should refer to South Norwood and Woodside and not South Croydon; A policy should be considered for Portland Road that would help to manage the return of retail units to residential use, thereby concentrating the retail offer.

**Change**

This will be amended as part of the Proposed Submission. The Shopping Parades Policy sets out to consolidate the retail offer as set out.

Cllr S Brew  4117/01/040/DM45.3/O

**Object**  DM45.3

DM45.3 should refer to South Norwood and Woodside and not South Croydon;  

**Change**

This is a typographical error and it will be corrected.

Councilor M Fisher  4125/01/047/DM45.3/C

**Comment**  Soundness - Effective  DM45.3

DM45.3 should refer to South Norwood and Woodside and not South Croydon

**Change**

This is a typographical mistake and it will be corrected.

Mr Clark Dunstan  2166/01/001/DM45.3/O

**Object**  Soundness - Effective  DM45.3  121

The use of Metropolitan open land as described in reference number 121 is retrospective as this land is already being used developed as a school. If this is not a retrospective application then there needs to be no change as the current designation is therefore permissible. It fails to limit any further development of the site by increasing the size and scale of the educational use. The current usage is only 120 pupils yet significant disruption to residents is caused by parents visiting the school for open evenings by car. They have consistently ignored parking restrictions and regulations and the Local Authority either choose to ignore or have insufficient resources to implement the regulations and enforcement. The use of the car park area of MOL is now a MUGA and this should remain the case and any future policy should protect the residents from any development of this area other than an open games area and restrict any further buildings within the designated boundary.

**Change**

As site 121 is under construction it will be removed from the Local Plan.

Charlie Fagan  2634/01/008/DM45.3/C

**ARK**

**Comment**  Soundness - Effective  DM45.3  121

Croydon Council have confirmed site has been assigned to another development.

**Change**

This site is now under construction so it will be removed from the Local Plan.

Rebecca Pullinger  2657/01/035/DM45.3/S

**CPR/ London**

**Support**  Soundness - Justified  DM45.3  121

We support this allocation, and feel it shows appropriate consideration of the value of MOL "any proposed development should seek to ensure that any loss of loss open land is mitigated through alternative provision".

**Welcome support**
Network Rail notes that there are a number of sites adjacent to the Railway and attach a standard response which sets out the issues that need to be considered. In particular with large new developments there is a concern about the risk of trespass and all new developments should have proper and suitable boundary fencing. The risk of greater flooding and drainage that new developments could potentially have on the Network Rail infrastructure and we would not want any increase of flooding or the increase in run off onto Railway Infrastructure.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not:
- Encroach onto Network Rail land
- Affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company’s railway and its infrastructure
- Undermine its support zone
- Damage the company’s infrastructure
- Place additional load on outbuildings
- Adversely affect any railway land or structure
- Over-sail or encroach upon the airspace of any Network Rail land
- Cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future

The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail’s adjoining land.

Future maintenance
The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant’s land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail’s adjacent land and air-space, and therefore all future building should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail’s boundary. The reason for the 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant. Any
less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works. The applicant / resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer, the applicant / resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. all possession costs, all site safety costs, all asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard-against Network Rail’s boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction / maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary with Network Rail will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams’ ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.

Drainage
Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail’s property or into Network Rail’s culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail’s property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail’s property; full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail’s existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal, must not be constructed near to within 10 – 20 metres of Network Rail’s boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property. After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants’ expense.

Plant & Materials
All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail’s property, must at all times be carried out in a “fail safe” manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are
capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.

Scaffolding
Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant’s contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without enroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail’s existing fencing/wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail’s boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling
arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer’s approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration

The potential for any noise/vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which hold relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night time train running and heavy freight trains.

Vehicle Incursion

Where a proposal calls for hard standing area/parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionSussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.asp.

A large number of the sites allocated for development through Detailed Policies and Proposals may result in the loss of green space. This appears to run counter to the Borough’s Strategic Objective 10 (The need to utilise brownfield areas first) and could be replaced with a goal to promote good quality high density developments that protect Croydon’s green spaces. Even undesignated green spaces provide important ecosystem services to Croydon’s growing population.

We are concerned about the potential loss of open space through this site allocation.

The Council should provide additional text in these policies to encourage developers to propose good quality, high density developments which promote the protection and enhancement of green space.

No change

Policies DM10.1 and DM10.2 aims to ensure good quality development that would complement and sensitively responds to its surroundings and improves the quality of the boroughs public spaces and that would include green spaces.

2657/01/007/DM45.3/O Rebecca Pullinger CPRE London

Object Soundness - Effective DM45.3 486

A large number of the sites allocated for development through Detailed Policies and Proposals may result in the loss of green space. This appears to run counter to the Borough’s Strategic Objective 10 (The need to utilise brownfield areas first) and could be replaced with a goal to promote good quality high density developments that protect Croydon’s green spaces. Even undesignated green spaces provide important ecosystem services to Croydon’s growing population.

We are concerned about the potential loss of open space through this site allocation.

The Council should provide additional text in these policies to encourage developers to propose good quality, high density developments which promote the protection and enhancement of green space.

No change

Policies DM10.1 and DM10.2 aims to ensure good quality development that would complement and sensitively responds to its surroundings and improves the quality of the boroughs public spaces and that would include green spaces.
DM46.2 should avoid buildings up to 6 storeys unless they are on corner plots or landmark sites.

DM46.2 should avoid buildings up to 6 storeys unless they are on corner plots or landmark sites.

DM46.2 should avoid buildings up to 6 storeys unless they are on corner plots or landmark sites.

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Thornton Heath Pond Local Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed maximum height for new development would enable growth, enhance the local centre and complement local character of surrounding areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Effective</th>
<th>DM46.2 should avoid buildings up to 6 storeys unless they are on corner plots or landmark sites.</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Thornton Heath Pond Local Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed maximum height for new development would enable growth, enhance the local centre and complement local character of surrounding areas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2062/01/049/DM46.2/O</td>
<td>Councillor Jason Perry</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DM46.2 should avoid buildings up to 6 storeys unless they are on corner plots or landmark sites.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Thornton Heath Pond Local Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed maximum height for new development would enable growth, enhance the local centre and complement local character of surrounding areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2071/01/049/DM46.2/O</td>
<td>Councillor Mario Creatura</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DM46.2 should avoid buildings up to 6 storeys unless they are on corner plots or landmark sites.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Thornton Heath Pond Local Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed maximum height for new development would enable growth, enhance the local centre and complement local character of surrounding areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Document ID</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM46.2</td>
<td>DM46.2 should avoid buildings up to 6 storeys unless they are on corner plots or landmark sites</td>
<td>DM46.2 should avoid buildings up to 6 storeys unless they are on corner plots or landmark sites</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2128/03/17/DM46.2/O</td>
<td>Cllr Steve O'Connell AM</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM46.2</td>
<td>DM46.2 should avoid buildings up to 6 storeys unless they are on corner plots or landmark sites</td>
<td>DM46.2 should avoid buildings up to 6 storeys unless they are on corner plots or landmark sites</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2448/01/04/DM46.2/O</td>
<td>Andy Stranack</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM46.2</td>
<td>DM46.2 should avoid buildings up to 6 storeys unless they are on corner plots or landmark sites</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Thornton Heath Pond Local Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed maximum height for new development would enable growth, enhance the local centre and complement local character of surrounding areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>DM46.2</th>
<th>DM46.2 should avoid buildings up to 6 storeys unless they are on corner plots or landmark sites</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul Sandford</td>
<td>Bourne Society</td>
<td>Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Thornton Heath Pond Local Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed maximum height for new development would enable growth, enhance the local centre and complement local character of surrounding areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Tim Pollard</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Thornton Heath Pond Local Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed maximum height for new development would enable growth, enhance the local centre and complement local character of surrounding areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Cllr</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/06/046/9</td>
<td>O Cllr Helen Pollard</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>DM46.2 should avoid buildings up to 6 storeys unless they are on corner plots or landmark sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/12/046/9</td>
<td>O Cllr Jan Buttinger</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>DM46.2 should avoid buildings up to 6 storeys unless they are on corner plots or landmark sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Cllr</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/01/2016</td>
<td>Margaret Mead</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/01/2016</td>
<td>Vidhi Mohan</td>
<td>DM46.2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM46.2 should avoid buildings up to 6 storeys unless they are on corner plots or landmark sites.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Cllr Richard Chatterjee  
London Borough of Croydon | DM46.2 should avoid buildings up to 6 storeys unless they are on corner plots or landmark sites. | Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Thornton Heath Pond Local Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed maximum height for new development would enable growth, enhance the local centre and complement local character of surrounding areas. | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Effective</th>
<th>DM46.2 should avoid buildings up to 6 storeys unless they are on corner plots or landmark sites.</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Donald Speakman</td>
<td>DM46.2 should avoid buildings up to 6 storeys unless they are on corner plots or landmark sites.</td>
<td>Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Thornton Heath Pond Local Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed maximum height for new development would enable growth, enhance the local centre and complement local character of surrounding areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cllr J Cummings

Object

Soundness

Effective

DM46.2 should avoid buildings up to 6 storeys unless they are on corner plots or landmark sites.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Thornton Heath Pond Local Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed maximum height for new development would enable growth, enhance the local centre and complement local character of surrounding areas.

Cllr L Hale

London Borough of Croydon

Object

DM46.2

DM46.2 should avoid buildings up to 6 storeys unless they are on corner plots or landmark sites

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Thornton Heath Pond Local Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed maximum height for new development would enable growth, enhance the local centre and complement local character of surrounding areas.
DM46.2 should avoid buildings up to 6 storeys unless they are on corner plots or landmark sites;

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough’s housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Thornton Heath Pond Local Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed maximum height for new development would enable growth, enhance the local centre and complement local character of surrounding areas.
DM46.2 should avoid buildings up to 6 storeys unless they are on corner plots or landmark sites.

No change

Croydon will have sustainably grown to accommodate homes to contribute to the borough's housing need. Policy 31.2 should be read in conjunction with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Thornton Heath Pond Local Centre is one of areas with high level of accessibility to public services, including transport, and therefore suitable to accommodate its share of sustainable growth. The proposed maximum height for new development would enable growth, enhance the local centre and complement local character of surrounding areas.
We write on behalf of our clients, Euro Hotels Limited, to comment upon the London Borough of Croydon’s draft Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals document. Our clients' interest relates to the extent of land that is outlined in the accompanying site plan (see Appendix 1) and we are proposing to shortly submit a planning application to comprehensively redevelop the site. The site (0.94 hectares) includes the recently commenced hotel building at 2 Dunheved Road South, and all of the existing buildings which comprise 585 – 603 London Road. In total, the existing buildings include 256 hotel rooms, however this will increase to 336 upon completion of the development at 2 Dunheved Road South (permitted under LBC ref; 14/03259/P at appeal in September 2015). The buildings within the site are used for hotel accommodation and lawfully fall within Class C1 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended). The aforementioned development at 2 Dunheved Road is ‘Phase 1’ of the proposed comprehensive redevelopment of the wider site. The existing buildings have an inefficient layout and an opportunity exists to redevelop the wider site to provide a better quality of hotel accommodation in more sustainable buildings and to provide a more efficient use of the site which is more aligned with the recently renovated Ibis Styles hotel (former Norfolk Hotel). We anticipate submitting an application for the wider masterplan in mid-2016. Our client owns the site in entirety and is committed to delivering a series of new hotel buildings as part of a comprehensive redevelopment. This will result in the demolition of the existing buildings between 585-603 London Road which are currently occupied by the Ibis Croydon, Gilroy Court Hotel and Croydon Court Hotel. The Proposed Development is anticipated to follow on from the ‘Phase 1’ redevelopment proposals which are currently being constructed at 2 Dunheved Road South and these demonstrate the commitment to provide quality hotel accommodation on this site and to deliver this new development. Euro Hotels Ltd have no plans or strategy to redevelop the site for an alternative use and given the commitment to redevelopment and the identifiable demand for hotel accommodation on this site, we are requesting that the site is included in Table 11.19 of the draft Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals as ‘Continued hotel use’.
CPRE London supports the inclusion of the requirement that any proposals must address environmental impacts of redevelopment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>DM46.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPRE London</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Welcome support
Network Rail notes that there are a number of sites adjacent to the Railway and attach a standard response which sets out the issues that need to be considered. In particular with large new developments there is a concern about the risk of trespass and all new developments should have proper and suitable boundary fencing. The risk of greater flooding and drainage that new developments could potentially have on the Network Rail infrastructure and we would not want any increase of flooding or the increase in run off onto Railway Infrastructure.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not:
- Encroach onto Network Rail land
- Affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company’s railway and its infrastructure
- Undermine its support zone
- Damage the company’s infrastructure
- Place additional load on outfalls
- Adversely affect any railway land or structure
- Over-sail or encroach upon the airspace of any Network Rail land
- Cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future

The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail’s adjoining land.

Future maintenance
The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant’s land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail’s adjacent land and airspace, and therefore all railway building should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail’s boundary. The reason for the 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant. Any
less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and airspace to facilitate works. The applicant / resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer, the applicant / resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. all possession costs, all site safety costs, all asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard against Network Rail’s boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction / maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary with Network Rail will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams’ ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.

Drainage
Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail’s property, except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail’s property. Full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail’s existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near/within 10 – 20 metres of Network Rail’s boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property.

After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants’ expense.

Plant & Materials
All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail’s property, must at all times be carried out in a “fail safe” manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are lost or damaged. No plant or materials are to be stored against or in the vicinity of Network Rail’s boundary or on any part of Network Rail’s property.
capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.

Scaffolding
Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant’s contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail’s existing fencing/wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail’s boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling...
arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer’s approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration
The potential for any noise/ vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which hold relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, right time train running and heavy freight trains.

Vehicle Incursion
Where a proposal calls for hard standing area / parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionsSussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.asp.
We wish to make you aware of a number of strong objections that we have with regard to the Proposed Development in between Torridge Road and Haslemere Road, referred to as the "Proposed Development".

As an immediate neighbour to the site of the Proposed Development, we are of the view that the development will have a serious impact on our standard of living and we refer to the Council's rejection in 2012 of the site. The reasons for refusal were which we believe to be valid:

1) Loss of employment generating use
2) Overdevelopment of the site and having inadequate private amenity space for the occupiers
3) Development would not provide a high standard of design and layout
4) No affordable housing.

The most important point the Council fail to acknowledge in their limited literature is that the site as a whole is currently used by two local businesses, but also their a property upon the 3b Torridge Road site which houses a young family with three children. The site is not derelict or can be classed as a brown field site. In order to densely populate a small area of land, the Council are willing to displace two local businesses which provide employment to local people. The scaffolding yard has been part of the local community for over 25 years and provides an invaluable local amenity. The council in their efforts to push for housing, maybe the efforts should concentrate of land that is disused and help local businesses rather than push them away and potentially destroy a business which is literally vital to the community. It is important to note, that due to the Council's intense takeover of disused land where would the Council suggest the two scaffolding firms be located? Unfortunately for the residents of the surrounding areas, the Council in their proposal have only provided very limited information regarding the intentions for the Proposed Development. However, we are aware that 10-30 homes are planned. Therefore we can only assume, the proposed site of development would overlook our properties from the top rooms of the new development, resulting in a serious invasion of our privacy. We believe that the Proposed Development is a direct contravention our human rights. Any potential design of the proposed development does not afford adequate privacy for the occupants adjacent residential properties, particularly with regard to our right to the quiet enjoyment of

The site should not be allocated for residential development.

Change

The site will not be allocated for residential development as it will result in the loss of a protected employment use.
garden amenities. We would urge you to consider the responsibilities of the Council under the Human Rights Act in particular Protocol 1, Article 1 which states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions which includes the home and other land. We believe that any proposed development would have a dominating impact on us and our right to the quiet enjoyment of our property. Article 8 of the Human Rights Act states, that a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life. As residents we have a right to light and therefore the maintenance of such light levels we currently enjoy is of vital importance otherwise this would be a direct infringement of our human rights. The natural lights we currently enjoy from sunlight and in particular the evening sunlight would be impacted due to new structures overshadowing our properties which would be an infringement. Therefore, on this basis alone any Proposed Development should be rejected. Upon review of the Council’s local plan, we believe the proposed development would be in contravention to current planning policies. Any proposed plan would not be in keeping with the current local context and street pattern or, in particular, the scale and proportions of surrounding buildings and would be entirely out of character of the area, the detriment of the local environment. The properties facing the proposed development would be seriously impacted if the proposed development is so densely concentrated that properties are built up against our back gardens. We understand the maximum build of the development could potentially be 10 to 30 homes, towering a maximum of 3 storeys tall, which is not in keeping with our homes, which are two storeys tall therefore any planned development would encroach on our properties style and character. We are unable to fully understand what the Council are actually planning or what any potential developer would plan. Therefore, the objections within this letter are purely speculative and do not allow us as residents to fully argue our oppositions - no surveys, site plans and/or architectural designs have been submitted/provided to the residents and we would request more information is provided. It is all well and good to include the site on a local plan - but on what grounds, what advice, what surveys of the neighbouring community, land and environment surveys/plans. This lack of information is very disturbing and
puts residents in the dark of what the council are actually planning. How can the council reject a site planning application one year and then a few years down the line potentially grant permission on the same grounds the application was rejected. However, despite the lack of information any development behind Torridge/Haslemere Road would be a massive stress on local amenities such as transport, parking, hospitals, local schools, GP Clinics, etc. The adverse noise, smell, pollution from the building/new residents would be of serious concern and potentially would impact directly on our daily lives and our health. We believe that the Proposed Development would be in contravention of any local plan and town and planning regulations. The proposed dwellings would significantly alter the fabric of the area and amount to serious ‘cramming’ in what is a low density roads. The development would allow for very little space currently enjoyed by both roads and we believe that it would lead to gross over-development of the site. The Proposed Development would not result in a benefit to the environment and residents around the area would suffer increased pollution levels as a direct result. In conclusion, the proposal would demonstrably harm the amenities enjoyed by local residents, in particular safe and available on-road parking, valuable enjoyment of privacy and light and the right to enjoy a quiet and safe residential environment. The development of any site would involve vast amounts of digging, excavation and preparing the land – the noise, pollution and fumes, to ensure the land is strong enough to withstand such large structures such as the aforementioned development. Also, any excavation work could have a serious adverse impact upon the stability of the existing structures. In addition, the works will also require the demolition current large structures, these are major works to be carried out on a circa-1960s property and we have serious concerns about the impact that such works could have on the stability of our own adjoining properties, health and safety and potential contamination. We believe that the Proposed Development would not provide sufficient parking space. In addition to this, there is already intense on-street parking pressure on Torridge Road/Haslemere Road and Bensham Lane, and we believe the proposed additional parking provision will damage both highway safety and residential amenity. We also have serious concerns that the plot size
and orientation will not easily accommodate cars within the proposed development if on-site parking is planned. The area concerned is limited in space and the entrance into the development from Torridge Road is very narrow with two houses either side and would make access to the proposed spaces limited and only possible from one direction and would affect the stability of the houses on either side, there would be serious disturbances in noise/vibration from cars at all hours of the day and late night activities. Road safety would be compromised for other road users, pedestrians including the local children who are able to play/run around freely on Torridge Road. We understand the Council have a quota that must be met in respect of affordable housing however there are other sites within the Croydon area that can fulfil the Council’s requirements without encroaching on resident’s human rights, such as the site on Bridgstock Road opposite the Hindu Temple or the large structure opposite Thornton Heath rail station. We would like to point out that the dwellings proposed would not fall within the definition of affordable housing. House prices on Torridge Road are increasing at a considerable pace and the average price is currently circa in excess of GBP 350,000 and as the new development would inevitably be priced at a value with reference to this, we do not believe the new dwellings would be considered to be affordable to people on a low income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>DM46.3</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27/01/001</td>
<td>DM46.3</td>
<td>Object to planning application at 3b Torridge Road on grounds of loss of employment and overcrowding</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>The site is existing Tier 4 site and as a consequence will be removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/02/001</td>
<td>DM46.3</td>
<td>Please register the attached letter and petition as official objections to any planning of site 3B Torridge Road</td>
<td>Justified</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>The site 3B Torridge Road is an existing Tier 4 site and will be removed from the site allocations list</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You have incorrectly and illegitimately categorized the site as disused.

I can confirm that there is currently, and has since I have been resident there (in 2009) 2 x legitimate companies working out of that yard and employing up to 20 people (NEW ERA scaffold and P. J. MORGAN scaffold.)

I am somewhat confused, you have apparently visited the site (see document detailed record) and surmised that the site is disused, clearly you were not able to see the two legitimate and tax paying scaffold companies both working out of the site. Could you shed some further light on your record of that visit, as the categorized aspect of your assessment is clearly incorrect and most likely a mistake on your part?

Furthermore you go on to assert that the site has been disused for 18 months in the accompanying ‘background’ document. Again, as we have established you have conveniently overlooked the 2 legitimate companies working out of the site. Could you please provide the site assessment document that must have accompanied this visit and assessment please? Failure to do so renders your assessment of the site mute from this juncture on in the event you are not able to provide evidence that the site is [and has been for at least 18 months] disused.

Finally, I am again surprised to see that there is no reference in your documentation to the previous proposal being refused on the grounds of density and the removal of legitimate business from the site to enable development. Correspondence from your office informed me that two overarching reasons for refusing the initial proposal of 11 homes on the site were refused on the grounds that it was too dense a proposal for the site in terms of access, and secondly that it would take desired employment out of the area. Please could you address both of those points in detail prior to moving on with this as I can see you have not only overlooked those initially salient points, you have outright contradicted them.

To surmise, you have failed to supply me with any meaningful density calculator as it applies to your estimated 10-37 homes on the site. You have failed to even acknowledge that there are existing businesses working there and your actions will serve to move those businesses out...
of the area. You have also failed to address the logic for a U turn on both the density aspect and the removal of legitimate business from the area, as was your position only 2 years ago.

286/01/001/DM46.3/S Mr John Curley
Curley Skip Hire

Support

Soundness - Justified

DM46.3 286

Site 286 is an outdated factory that has been vacant for many years. It is the only non-residential building on this side of Osborne Road and it is entirely proper that it should be developed for residential use especially as there is a need for more housing and especially affordable homes.

Welcome support
Network Rail notes that there are a number of sites adjacent to the Railway and attach a standard response which sets out the issues that need to be considered. In particular, with large new developments there is a concern about the risk of trespass and all new developments should have proper and suitable boundary fencing. The risk of greater flooding and drainage that new developments could potentially have on the Network Rail infrastructure and we would not want any increase of flooding or the increase in run off onto Railway Infrastructure.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not:
- Encroach onto Network Rail land
- Affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company’s railway and its infrastructure
- Undermine its support zone
- Damage the company’s infrastructure
- Place additional load on outlings
- Adversely affect any railway land or structure
- Over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land
- Cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future

The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail’s adjoining land.

**Future maintenance**

The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant’s land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail’s adjacent land and air-space, and therefore any ferry building should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail’s boundary. The reason for the 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant.
less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail's land and airspace to facilitate works. The applicant/resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer, the applicant/resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. possession costs, site safety costs, asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard-against Network Rail's boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction/maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary with Network Rail will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams’ ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.

Drainage
Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail’s property or into Network Rail’s culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail’s property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail’s property, full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail’s existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near/within 10 – 20 metres of Network Rail’s boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property. After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants’ expense.

Plant & Materials
All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail’s property, must at all times be carried out in a “fail safe” manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are
capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.

Scaffolding
Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant’s contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass-proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail’s existing fencing/wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail’s boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling
arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer’s approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration
The potential for any noise/vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which hold relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night time train running and heavy freight trains.

Vehicle Incursion
Where a proposal calls for hard standing area/parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionsSussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.asp.

Site 468 at land adjacent to 55 Pawsons Road is proposed to be allocated for residential development. A need has been identified for additional housing sites in Croydon and Pawsons Road meets the criteria. The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between this need and the impact that additional sites has on the environment and nearby residents.
strong objection to Pawsons Road site for residential development as new residents will make the parking situation worse. A car park or dog friendly area would be better options

A need has been identified for additional housing sites in Croydon and Pawsons Road meets the criteria. The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between this need and the impact that additional sites has on the environment and nearby residents.

Site 468, Grass area adjacent to 55 Pawsons Road. The loss of such green space in this densely populated area should be avoided.

A need has been identified for additional housing sites in Croydon and Pawsons Road meets the criteria. The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between this need and the impact that additional sites has on the environment and nearby residents.

Site 468, Grass area adjacent to 55 Pawsons Road. The loss of such green space in this densely populated area should be avoided.

A need has been identified for additional housing sites in Croydon and Pawsons Road meets the criteria. The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between this need and the impact that additional sites has on the environment and nearby residents.

Site 468, Grass area adjacent to 55 Pawsons Road. The loss of such green space in this densely populated area should be avoided.

A need has been identified for additional housing sites in Croydon and Pawsons Road meets the criteria. The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between this need and the impact that additional sites has on the environment and nearby residents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness/ Comment</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2128/03/019/DM46.3/O</td>
<td>Cllr Steve O’Connell AM</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM46.3 468</td>
<td>The loss of such green space in this densely populated area should be avoided. The green space should be protected.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2448/01/051/DM46.3/O</td>
<td>Andy Stranack Croydon Council</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM46.3 468</td>
<td>Site 468, Grass area adjacent to 55 Pawsons Road. The loss of such green space in this densely populated area should be avoided.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2571/01/005/DM46.3/O</td>
<td>Jennifer Radford</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM46.3 468</td>
<td>I would also like to be provided with further details of the following matters that have been used as reasons to discount many of the proposed sites that scored significantly higher than the Site and site no. Site 468: Proposed residential development in the Proposal.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2635/01/044/DM46.3/O</td>
<td>Paul Sandford Bourne Society</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM46.3 468</td>
<td>Site 468, Grass area adjacent to 55 Pawsons Road. The loss of such green space in this densely populated area should be avoided.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2657/01/037/DM46.3/C</td>
<td>Rebecca Pullinger CPRE London</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM46.3 468</td>
<td>We support that any redevelopment would need to mitigate the loss of green space through alternative provision.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site 468 at land adjacent to 55 Pawsons Road is proposed to be allocated for residential development. A need has been identified for additional housing sites in Croydon and Pawsons Road meets the criteria. The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between this need and the impact that additional sites has on the environment and nearby residents.
Rowland Brothers

Object Soundness - Effective 468

Our clients would like to make a representation in support of the de-designation of the above land from local open land. Our clients are also broadly supportive of the idea that the land be used as land for residential development.

However, our clients would like the Council to give consideration to the use of part of the site as a parking area for their business.

Rowland Brothers are an established local funeral director and they are a known and trusted company in Croydon. Rowland Brothers are also a major local employer with over 100 employees providing a vital local service to people at a very difficult time in their lives.

Rowland Brothers have operated from their premises on the Whitehorse Road since before the Second World War and have grown and adapted to meet the needs of Croydon's diverse community.

The growth of the service has meant that there are more vehicles using the premises. Not only hearses and funeral cars, but also private ambulances and the vehicles used by family members of the deceased.

This intensification of vehicular activity over the years has resulted in congestion and parking difficulties most particularly in Northbrook Road, but there has also been spillover into Mayo Road and Broadway Avenue opposite Rowland Brothers.

Due to the congestion in and around Rowland Brothers at times it has been necessary to park private ambulances in Northbrook Road after bringing the deceased to Rowland Brothers. The sight of these vehicles can be distressing for the neighbours and Rowland Brothers would like to be in a position to park these vehicles off the public highway.

Rowland Brothers also cater to the needs of various communities and faiths in Croydon and are providing new facilities that will allow different communities and faith to be able to see through the bereavement/funeral process on the premises. There are new facilities that allow family members to wash the deceased and the chapels of rest are now more intensively used by mourners sitting with the deceased until the funeral.

Due to the differing funerary customs of diverse communities sometimes a number of people will be visiting the

Therefore, Rowland Brothers would like to support the de-designation of this land as local open land, but with the addition of a car parking area on the area marked in red on the attached plan.
Rowland Brothers would like to add a car park at the rear of their premises to allow relatives and visitors to deceased persons and Rowland Brothers employees to be able to park without causing disruption to their neighbours.

Rowland Brothers have the support of the local community for their suggested car parking area and a petition with 70 local signatures is attached. Rowland Brothers have always tried very hard to maintain good relationships with their neighbours and they feel that it would be a distinct improvement to the area for some off road parking to be provided for their employees and customers, thereby easing parking and congestion problems for the neighbours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - DM46.3</th>
<th>Petition in support of comment</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Welcome support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2704/02/001/DM46.3/O</td>
<td>Rowland Brothers</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - DM46.3</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>Petition in support of comment 2704/01/001</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2751/01/001/DM46.3/S</td>
<td>Mr S Parkayasky</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>DM46.3</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>Welcome support DM46.3</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2775/01/051/DM46.3/O</td>
<td>Cllr Tim Pollard</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - DM46.3</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>Site 468, Grass area adjacent to 55 Pawsons Road. The loss of such green space in this densely popuated area should be avoided.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2776/01/051/DM46.3/O</td>
<td>Cllr Helen Pollard</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - DM46.3</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>Site 468, Grass area adjacent to 55 Pawsons Road. The loss of such green space in this densely popuated area should be avoided.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A need has been identified for additional Housing sites in Croydon and Pawsons Road meets the criteria. The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between this need and the impact that additional sites has on the environment and nearby residents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2812/01/051/DM46.3/O</td>
<td>28/01/05</td>
<td>Cllr Jan Buttinger</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>Site 468, Grass area adjacent to 55 Pawsons Road. The loss of such green space in this densely populated area should be avoided.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2829/01/051/DM46.3/O</td>
<td>29/01/05</td>
<td>Cllr Margaret Mead</td>
<td>Croydon Council</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>Site 468, Grass area adjacent to 55 Pawsons Road. The loss of such green space in this densely populated area should be avoided.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2838/01/001/DM46.3/O</td>
<td>38/01/01</td>
<td>Mr Marek Dworzak</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>I am against the plan for a housing development in the area next to 55 Pawsons Road. We already have massive issues with parking and it would only get worse. I support Rowland Brothers application for creating their car park on the tarmac area.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2841/01/037/DM46.3/O</td>
<td>41/01/03</td>
<td>Cllr Vidhi Mohan</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>Site 468, Grass area adjacent to 55 Pawsons Road. The loss of such green space in this densely populated area should be avoided.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2842/01/051/DM46.3/O</td>
<td>42/01/05</td>
<td>Cllr Richard Chatterjee</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>Site 468, Grass area adjacent to 55 Pawsons Road. The loss of such green space in this densely populated area should be avoided.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>DM46.3 468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bev</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I write as a long standing resident of Saxon Road. I wish to state that parking has been an ongoing issue. And I agree with Rowland Brothers that the TARMAC area should serve a purpose that will ultimately relief the lack of parking spaces and congested situation we face on my road and adjoining streets in particular as train commuters take up most of the spaces; this is worsened during football season. Please therefore allow Rowland Brothers to use the tarmacked area as a car park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Soundness - Effective</th>
<th>DM46.3 468</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Donald Douglas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any loss of green space is a tragedy; however the current use of the space seems to only serve the use of people with dogs which in itself discourages other people using the same in particular children for fear disease resulting from the dog defecation.

I have noted the proposal put forward by Rowlands Brothers. Their proposal extend only to the current tarmac area the intention of which is to secure parking for their business. I appreciate Rowlands Brothers business interest however there evidence that proposal would ease the current parking congestion. It seems the only beneficiary from this proposal would be Rowlands Brothers and this cant represent value for money for the use of a community asset.

The second proposal in to building housing. There continue to be a shortage of social housing and therefore would support the development of social housing providing that adequate parking so as not to increase current parking congestion.

The third option should be to make the area dog free and encourage the local community to manage the green area, you have one volunteer!!!

Welcome support
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>2945/01/001/DM46.3/C</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs R Sayer</td>
<td>DM46.3</td>
<td>We would like to support ROWLAND BROTHERS for using some of the land between NORTHBROOK ROAD and PAWSONS ROAD so that they can park their Company Vans and cars to save space in MAYO ROAD/NORTHBROOK ROAD/SAXON ROAD for residential parking. The residents have very limited space to park in the above roads due to Rowlands leaving their Vans/Cars overnight and at weekends. Therefore we are totally AGAINST more residential flats being built on this site, as it will cause even more parking problems.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>3430/01/051/DM46.3/O</td>
<td>Mr Donald Speakman</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Site 468, Grass area adjacent to 55 Pawsons Road. The loss of such green space in this densely populated area should be avoided.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>3526/01/011/DM46.3/O</td>
<td>Linda Stevens</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>I wish to voice my concerns regarding the following: I totally object to any reduction of green space in the borough of Croydon in favour of development.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 September 2016</td>
<td>3699/01/051/DM46.3/O</td>
<td>Cllr J Cummings</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Site 468, Grass area adjacent to 55 Pawsons Road. The loss of such green space in this densely populated area should be avoided.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>Site Reference</td>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3804/01/052/DM46.3/O</td>
<td>Cllr L Hale</td>
<td>DM46.3 468</td>
<td>Site 468, Grass area adjacent to 55 Pawsons Road. The loss of such green space in this densely populated area should be avoided</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3897/01/041/DM46.3/O</td>
<td>Cllr M Neal</td>
<td>DM46.3 468</td>
<td>Site 468, Grass area adjacent to 55 Pawsons Road. The loss of such green space in this densely populated area should be avoided</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4022/01/012/DM46.3/O</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Ewin</td>
<td>DM46.3 468</td>
<td>Objection to Croydon Council's proposal to provide sites for travellers &amp; the building of houses, etc on green land in Shirley &amp; other areas</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4117/01/044/DM46.3/O</td>
<td>Cllr S Brew</td>
<td>DM46.3 468</td>
<td>Site 468, Grass area adjacent to 55 Pawsons Road. The loss of such green space in this densely populated area should be avoided</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4125/01/051/DM46.3/O</td>
<td>Councillor M Fisher</td>
<td>DM46.3 468</td>
<td>Site 468, Grass area adjacent to 55 Pawsons Road. The loss of such green space in this densely populated area should be avoided</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A need has been identified for additional housing sites in Croydon and Pawsons Road meets the criteria. The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between this need and the impact that additional sites has on the environment and nearby residents.

There are other open spaces in the area that are better maintained and utilised; therefore there is provision in this area.

Site 468 at land adjacent to 55 Pawsons road is proposed to be allocated for residential development. A need has been identified for additional housing sites in Croydon and Pawsons Road meets the criteria. The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between this need and the impact that additional sites has on the environment and nearby residents.
Councillor Luke Clancy  
**Comment**  Soundness - Effective  
DM46.3  499  
Site 499, Croydon University Hospital Site, London Road. Any shrinkage of the site to allow for residential development must very carefully consider the parking and infrastructure impact on an already densely populated part of the borough.

The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between the redevelopment of this site, the impact that additional sites has on the environment and nearby residents, and the need to maintain and ensure continued provision of the services provided by the Croydon University Hospital.

Councillor Dudley Mead  
**London Borough of Croydon**  
**Comment**  Site 499, Croydon University Hospital Site, London Road. Any shrinkage of the site to allow for residential development must very carefully consider the parking and infrastructure impact on an already densely populated part of the borough;

The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between the redevelopment of this site, the impact that additional sites has on the environment and nearby residents, and the need to maintain and ensure continued provision of the services provided by the Croydon University Hospital.

Councillor Jason Perry  
**London Borough of Croydon**  
**Comment**  Site 499, Croydon University Hospital Site, London Road. Any shrinkage of the site to allow for residential development must very carefully consider the parking and infrastructure impact on an already densely populated part of the borough.

The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between the redevelopment of this site, the impact that additional sites has on the environment and nearby residents, and the need to maintain and ensure continued provision of the services provided by the Croydon University Hospital.

Councillor Mario Creatura  
**London Borough of Croydon**  
**Comment**  Site 499, Croydon University Hospital Site, London Road. Any shrinkage of the site to allow for residential development must very carefully consider the parking and infrastructure impact on an already densely populated part of the borough.

The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between the redevelopment of this site, the impact that additional sites has on the environment and nearby residents, and the need to maintain and ensure continued provision of the services provided by the Croydon University Hospital.

Cllr Steve O'Connell AM  
**Object**  Any shrinkage of the site to allow for residential development must very carefully consider the parking and infrastructure impact on an already densely populated part of the borough.

The impact on parking and infrastructure should be assessed.

The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between the redevelopment of this site, the impact that additional sites has on the environment and nearby residents, and the need to maintain and ensure continued provision of the services provided by the Croydon University Hospital.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2448/01/050/DM46.3/C</td>
<td>Andy Stranack</td>
<td>Croydon Council</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>Site 499, Croydon University Hospital Site, London Road. Any shrinkage of the site to allow for residential development must very carefully consider the parking and infrastructure impact on an already densely populated part of the borough. No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2635/01/043/DM46.3/O</td>
<td>Paul Sandford</td>
<td>Bourne Society</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>Site 499, Croydon University Hospital Site, London Road. Any shrinkage of the site to allow for residential development must very carefully consider the parking and infrastructure impact on an already densely populated part of the borough. No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2775/01/050/DM46.3/C</td>
<td>Cllr Tim Pollard</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2776/01/050/DM46.3/C</td>
<td>Cllr Helen Pollard</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2812/01/050/DM46.3/C</td>
<td>Cllr Jan Buttinger</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Soundness - Effective</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2829/01/050/DM46.3/C</td>
<td>Cllr Margaret Mead</td>
<td>Croydon Council</td>
<td>Site 499, Croydon University Hospital Site, London Road. Any shrinkage of the site to allow for residential development must very carefully consider the parking and infrastructure impact on an already densely populated part of the borough.</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between the redevelopment of this site, the impact that additional sites has on the environment and nearby residents, and the need to maintain and ensure continued provision of the services provided by the Croydon University Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2841/01/036/DM46.3/O</td>
<td>Cllr Vidhi Mohan</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Site 499, Croydon University Hospital Site, London Road. Any shrinkage of the site to allow for residential development must very carefully consider the parking and infrastructure impact on an already densely populated part of the borough;</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between the redevelopment of this site, the impact that additional sites has on the environment and nearby residents, and the need to maintain and ensure continued provision of the services provided by the Croydon University Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2842/01/050/DM46.3/C</td>
<td>Cllr Richard Chatterjee</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Site 499, Croydon University Hospital Site, London Road. Any shrinkage of the site to allow for residential development must very carefully consider the parking and infrastructure impact on an already densely populated part of the borough.</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between the redevelopment of this site, the impact that additional sites has on the environment and nearby residents, and the need to maintain and ensure continued provision of the services provided by the Croydon University Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3430/01/050/DM46.3/C</td>
<td>Mr Donald Speakman</td>
<td>Croydon University Hospital Site, London Road. Any shrinkage of the site to allow for residential development must very carefully consider the parking and infrastructure impact on an already densely populated part of the borough.</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between the redevelopment of this site, the impact that additional sites has on the environment and nearby residents, and the need to maintain and ensure continued provision of the services provided by the Croydon University Hospital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3699/01/050/DM46.3/C</td>
<td>Cllr J Cummings</td>
<td>Croydon University Hospital Site, London Road. Any shrinkage of the site to allow for residential development must very carefully consider the parking and infrastructure impact on an already densely populated part of the borough.</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between the redevelopment of this site, the impact that additional sites has on the environment and nearby residents, and the need to maintain and ensure continued provision of the services provided by the Croydon University Hospital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site 499, Croydon University Hospital Site, London Road. Any shrinkage of the site to allow for residential development must very carefully consider the parking and infrastructure impact on an already densely populated part of the borough.

The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between the redevelopment of this site, the impact that additional sites has on the environment and nearby residents, and the need to maintain and ensure continued provision of the services provided by the Croydon University Hospital.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness - Justified</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This site is immediately adjacent to, and shares a common boundary with site 286 (which is a preferred proposal site). Site A285 is a waste transfer station which has been in continued, uninterrupted use for many years, and complies with all current regulatory requirements. However the dust and noise created by the operation of the site and the movement of skip lorries is detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring residential properties, 14 of which share a common boundary with the site. There have been a fair number of complaints to the local authority over this matter. The access is not suited to skip lorries either being a narrow road with cars closely parked.

A waste transfer site is not appropriate in a residential area and should be included in the list of preferred sites.

No change

54 Northwood Road is an operational employment site and there is a presumption against the loss of employment uses.
In regards to Table 11.19 of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options), the preferred option for a continuation of the existing use at site A400 (324-340 Bensham Lane, Thornton Heath) would not facilitate Council in meeting the relevant Strategic Objectives. However, how these objectives would be met were the site’s preferred option to be identified for residential uses as outlined below.

Strategic Objective 3: As detailed in the attachment to this representation form, the site is ideal for residential development and fulfils the criteria in Appendix 1 identified as factors that are considered when recognising sites as preferred options for new housing. The site is of an appropriate size to accommodate in excess of ten dwellings, and will assist Council in providing housing of various types and tenures throughout the residents’ lives.

Strategic Objective 4: The existing development has a significant detrimental impact on the streetscape and urban grain. Allocating the site for a preference of residential uses in place of the continuation of the existing use would revitalise the streetscape and create a renewed opportunity for housing. Furthermore, as demonstrated in the attachment to this representation form, the benefits of identifying the site as a preferred option for residential uses would not necessarily result in the loss of employment land or residential uses. Issue is raised over the impact a continuation of the use would have on the amenity achieved at the future residential uses at the 2nd and 3rd floors where prior approval has been granted. Omitting the site as a preferred option for residential uses would be a missed opportunity to renew the site and surrounds.

Strategic Objective 5: Permitting residential uses on the site is an excellent opportunity to encourage high quality development that enhances and integrates into the surroundings. The existing warehouse use is out of keeping with the remaining streetscape and would be better located elsewhere within the Borough. This consideration is expanded on in greater detail in the attachment.

Strategic Objective 8: As detailed in the attachment to this representation form, the site is ideally located for residential development, being within close proximity to a range of

As demonstrated in this statement Day Lewis House, 324-340 Bensham Lane should be considered as a preferred option for residential uses within Table 11.19 of the exhibited Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options). The site presents an exceptional opportunity for residential development and has proven its suitability against the assessment criteria in Appendix 1 (used to identify sites as having a preferred options for residential uses). It has further been confirmed that the site is compatible with such identified sites.

The submission has demonstrated that residential uses would revitalise the existing undesirable urban character, and can be accommodated on the site. Furthermore the loss of such an opportunity based on the reasoning that it would result in a loss of employment land and a community facility would be to the detriment of the future growth and development of the site, its surrounds and the Borough.

Change
The lawful use of this site is an office (Class B1a) which, outside of the Office Protection Area in the Metropolitan Centre, is not proposed to be protected in the Local Plan. Therefore, this site is suitable for residential development and can be allocated as such in the Local Plan.
sustainable transport modes. Providing dwellings in such locations encourages connectivity to, from and within the Borough.

The approach is not deliverable. The preferred option for land uses at site A400 should be reviewed to ensure the optimum development potential and the accumulative social, economic and environmental benefits for the site, vicinity and Borough are achieved. How identifying the site’s preferred option of residential uses can deliver this is demonstrated in greater detail in the attachment to this representation form.

The preferred approach does not encourage sustainable development. As identified in greater detail within the attachment to this response, allocating site A400’s preferred land use option as a continuation of the existing use does not capitalise on the opportunities for sustainable development. The site is capable of accommodating a range of residential housing types, is ideally located to sustainable transport options, and (given the availability of alternative sites for the warehousing and community facility, and the expectant release of industrial land within the Borough) would not necessitate a loss of employment land or community uses. Consideration should also be given to the revitalisation and projection of a sense of place new housing could give to the urban design and built environment. The provision of new housing would meet the needs of future generations and contribute to fulfilling the Borough’s housing requirements.

Day Lewis House’s current use is a large office/industrial building. Prior approval has been granted for the conversion of the 2nd and 3rd floors from B1 (office) use to C3 (residential) uses. The 1st floor comprises B1 office uses with the exception of a small unit, which is leased to a church user at the moment. The ground floor use is occupied by a warehousing.

Prior Approval (14/01005/GPDO) was granted on 16/05/2014 for the conversion of the site’s offices to houses to provide 14 two bedroom and 4 one bedroom flats on the second and third floors.

Council’s reasoning for not including the site as a preferred option advised that:

1) The site is operational as an employment site and there is a presumption against non-employment
uses; and

2) The site is an operational community facility and there is a presumption against non-community uses.

Part 1) of this reasoning should be viewed with regard to paragraph 22 of the NPPF, which requires planning policies to avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment uses where there is no reasonable expectation of the continued use for that purpose, and that land allocations should be regularly reviewed.

The London Borough of Croydon’s Employment Land Review Update 2013 identifies this type of site as being a ‘small pocket of unallocated local market employment land’, catering for the needs of small to medium sized business requiring warehousing. The Review projected the land demand for such uses within the Borough to be broadly balanced with supply.

Additionally The Land for Industry and Transport SPG advises that although Croydon is a ‘Restricted Transfer’ Borough, meaning that despite there being a relatively low level of industrial land, the possibility of small scale releases is not precluded.

A property search identified a number of currently vacant industrial sites within Croydon to which the use could be relocated.

The continuation of the warehouse use would exacerbate the detrimental impact the existing development has on the urban fabric and street’s functionality. Indeed, the development of the site would dramatically revitalise the appearance and viability of the streetscape, in which a high standard of urban design can be provided to engage the street, replacing the current hardstand parking, dominating facade and traffic confusion associated with the egress and access of heavy vehicles associated with the use.

The loss of the community facility identified in point 2) is a reference to the RWR Church operating in a single small unit of the six located on the first floor. The Church has been semioperational since 2011. Its D1 use is not a lawful use; and the conversion of offices to places of worship is not permitted under use class orders. Its operational purpose within the existing building was to occupy vacant space. It was not intended as a long term use.
In considering that this use commenced unlawfully, is not a permanent use and does not fall within Council’s use description of the site; restricting the redevelopment for residential uses on the basis community facilities would be lost would be onerous in this instance.

Consideration is additionally given to the appropriateness of this use and impacts of noise, music and traffic movements associated with the worshippers on the occupiers of the future residential uses permitted at the second and third floors. Reference is made to the Black Sheep Bar, Croydon which closed in recognition of being in the wrong location following the evolution of its surrounds and conversions of adjoining uses to residential development.

Dialogue has recently been established with council (in the form of two pre-application meetings held on 01/04/15 and 02/08/15) in which the redevelopment of the site to permit a purely residential scheme was discussed. The initial response received from Council’s Place Making Officer over whether the existing uses should be replaced with residential dwellings has been positive.

Appendix 1 of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options) identifies the basic criteria in assessing each site as being preferable for residential uses. Below each criterion is a response as to how the subject site demonstrates it is ideally suited for residential uses.

a. Is the site big enough for 10 or more new homes?
   This site has a total area of 0.25ha. This would permit in excess of 10 homes. Given the size of the site it is considered that there is also sufficient capacity to accommodate a range of units including 3 bedroom dwellings (which are preferred for sustainable development under Policy DM 1 of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options)). Furthermore the site is ideally located for residential development, being within close proximity to a range sustainable transport modes, services, commercial premises and job opportunities. The site’s orientation will not necessitate an unreasonable loss of solar access or loss of privacy on the adjoining sites were residential uses to be developed.

b. Are there any existing or proposed...
policy constraints that would prevent the development of the site altogether?

There are no current policies specifically relevant to the site that would prevent future residential development. However the construction of residential developments on the site would fulfill the relevant national and local policies. The objectives of the NPPF in relation to sustainable development is outlined above. It is considered that the location of the site would adequately uphold these objectives, while the allocation of residential uses would demonstrate compliance with paragraph 151 of the NPPF to encourage sustainable development through plan making. The Housing and Planning Bill 2015-2016 is targeted to be adopted in April 2016. One of the primary objectives of The Draft Bill is to provide Starter Homes for first time buyers. Potential development of the site would facilitate an opportunity for LB Croydon to meet any future starter home requirements likely to be directed from Central Government following the gazettal of The Bill.

c. Is the existing land use protected from development unless certain criteria are met (such as demonstrating lack of demand for an industrial premises or community use);

A property search has identified a number of vacant alternative industrial sites within the Borough, while a practicing church is located next door to the site. This demonstrates an adequate supply of alternative locations for these uses, and that the development of residential uses would not necessitate their loss.

d. Are there any factors that would prevent the site being developed (such as legal covenants or viability issues);

Associated factors which have the potential to affect the development of the site are assessed below:

- Sustainability: The site is located on brownfield land. The location of the site allows easy access to public transport links including the rail stations at Thornton Heath and Selhurst. The location is prime for residential uses and would encourage strengthened economic development.
- Flooding: The site falls outside of any associated flood zones.
- Topography: The site is relatively flat. This permits opportunities for innovative designs including the potential introduction of defensible space and an upgrade of the Bensham Lane streetscape.
- **Trees/Vegetation**: There are no mature trees on the site. However, there is opportunity for future development to introduce planting within the Bensham Lane frontage, upgrading the existing character of the streetscape.

- **Community**: The site is capable of accommodating the level of growth anticipated for Thornton Heath. Associated Section 106 Agreements and Affordable Housing will be included as part of development applications.

e. Could better use be made of the site for another use such as a new school based on the criteria in the following paragraphs?

Although Appendix 2 of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options) has identified the north west of the borough as an area in need of primary school classrooms, Ecclesbourne Primary School is located just 300m from the site, while the preferred option for No. 843 London Road 700m to the west is additionally identified as a primary school use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1949/01/025/DM47.2/C</th>
<th>Beth Havelock</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>DM47.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport for London</td>
<td>TFL is considering the options for improvements to Five Ways. TFL will work with the Council to provide updates on the project and ensure the plans are correctly reflected within the Local Plan.</td>
<td>The Plan should be updated to reflect the improvements to Five Ways.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It should be noted, that our client was surprised to see the proposed allocation in the current consultation document. In the era of Localism, engaging with the landowner on the options for future redevelopment would have been expected. Paragraph 155 requires authorities to have early and meaningful engagement with a variety of bodies, including business; the site is occupied by a well-established business and the Council has not sought to establish whether the owner and/or the business has any intentions regarding the sites future within the plan period that makes an allocation deliverable. Moving forward however, the Trust welcomes the opportunity for discussions with the Council regarding any potential allocation.

The garden centre has been put forward as part of these site allocations. The proposed allocation promotes the site for a secondary school to come forward for development between 2021 and 2026, the second phase of development in the emerging local plan. The site is considered by the Council to be of a suitable size for a secondary school albeit at this stage no consideration has been given as to how the listed diving board might impact the design of a new secondary school, given the requirements of national guidance and other plan policies. The supporting sustainability appraisal recommends that the site requires public transport improvements as part of the development to mitigate against the current low public transport accessibility rating. The Trust does not consider this is a suitable or appropriate allocation for the site which is currently occupied by a successfully trading business; namely the garden centre. Nor has the supporting evidence base been sufficiently provided to justify the allocation in addition to the sites location on the edge of the urban area, its geographical relationship to its potential catchment area. These matters are considered below.

A number of evidence base documents support the emerging Local Plan Part 2. Of note for this site is the Education Evidence Base (September 2015). This provides a vague and preliminary assessment of the anticipated pupil place projections for Croydon. Within this document it is stated that the Borough will need sites to deliver additional school places (at secondary level) in between 2018/19 and 2023/24, which will coincide with the expected

In summary and for the reasons set out above, the Trust objects to the emerging allocation (Site 11) and requests the site should not be allocated for educational purposes. The site is not located in a suitable location for a school, nor does it have the transport infrastructure in place to accommodate delivery. Furthermore, the site is not considered to be a sufficient size to accommodate a secondary school of the size required and identified in the evidence base document. All of these factors make the site unsustainable in terms of the guidance set out in the NFFP and therefore ‘unsound’ when factored against the relevant tests for policies and allocations.

I would be grateful if we as agents for the Trust can be kept up-to-date on the process of consideration of these representations, and would also welcome engagement with the Council regarding the options for the site’s redevelopment.

There is no willing landowner to bring this site forward as a secondary school. As it has been identified as being undeliverable the allocation for a secondary school has not been taken forward.

deliverability of the site between 2021 and 2026. Borough wide, up to 24 FE are required to be provided by 2022 in the possible configurations of: - 2 new 8FE and 1 new 6FE school; or, - 4 new 6FE schools

We do not consider the current Education Evidence Base to sufficiently support the allocation. It does not assess site suitability, or approach the assessment of sites for secondary schools. Therefore, there is no assessment of the site nor is there an assessment of other suitable sites. As part of the supporting evidence base, we would expect to see a full site assessment alongside the other preferred or alternative options to ensure that the allocation meets the Soundness Tests of the NPPF; that the allocation and policy is justified. In addition, the projected pupil places has been presented within this document, however there is no evidence presented which details the specific calculations and methodology employed to reach these assumptions in terms of housing and population growth.

Secondly, the Trust questions the suitability of the site for redevelopment as a secondary school and the size of school required. The site is located in a mixed use area, which has a wide range of uses including, retail, leisure and commercial which the current garden centre use complements.

The Department for Education Guidance identifies for a secondary school (11-16 years) the minimum guidance size for a school building as 1050sqm + 6.3sqm per pupil. Based on average school class capacity of 30 pupils and for an average 6 form entry school this equates to approximately 900 pupils. A school of this size would require a building of approximately 7,000sqm, which at one storey would cover the vast majority of the site. Even if a 2-storey school was proposed, there would still be a requirement for external space such as playing fields and associated car parking and servicing. Considering that the development of the site will also need to accommodate the listed structure, and ensure that any proposals preserve and enhance the setting of the listed structure, it is too small to accommodate such development unless the school’s design and facilities are to be compromised.

The site presently, has a PTAL rating of 1b which equates to a low accessibility rating. As outlined in the Sustainability Appraisal transportation
Improvements are required prior to the site being redeveloped for educational purposes to make the site suitable and accessible. The delivery of these improvements falls to third parties and cannot at this time be guaranteed to ensure the delivery of the school. Moreover, the required improvements to public transport access cannot be funded by a school in the same way as a major development scheme might be expected to do so.

The NPPF places a presumption in favour of sustainable development, but when you look at the location of the site in the context of its catchment area, it is not in a location where you could expect that alternative forms of transport could overcome the lack of public transport. Links to the adjoining residential areas are limited and where walking to the site was an option, the overall proportion of students likely to be within a reasonable walking distance would be small. There can therefore be an expectation that mechanical transport will dominate.

It is therefore considered that the lack of accessibility undermines the deliverability of the site for education purposes.

2629/01/004/DM47.2/S Jamie McFarland
Support The Education Funding Agency has approved 3 new Free Schools currently looking for sites within Croydon. This site has been identified as being potentially suitable options for the permanent location of the Ark Croydon Secondary Academy. We would welcome the opportunity to work with Croydon Council and the respective trust to make these sites available options for these schools.

2634/01/003/DM47.2/S Charlie Fagan
Support We are confident that a successful secondary school could be developed on this site.
- The site is situated in an area which has been identified as requiring additional secondary pupil places in the coming years
- The site is a suitable size to accommodate the development of a secondary school
- The site is located in an area which meets the demographic criteria for Ark schools
- The site is located near Ark Oval Primary Academy and would therefore create an opportunity to establish a link between the two schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>DM47.2 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential development if the site is not required for a school by 2021. I am currently applying through Croydon for a free school, the proposed name for the school is MADE academy. MADE academy will like to express interest in the site mentioned in section 1. We aim to provide a creative and robust curriculum. My question is; Will the borough need another school before the dates suggested on the sites? Will there be negotiations on the intake size, such as five form entry instead of an eight form entry for the suggested school?</td>
<td>MADE academy will like to express interest in the site mentioned in section 1. We aim to provide a creative and robust curriculum. My question is; Will the borough need another school before the dates suggested on the sites? Will there be negotiations on the intake size, such as five form entry instead of an eight form entry for the suggested school?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Croydon College is the freehold owner of the site, Title number: SGL 618428. The site is cleared and available for development immediately. Access to the site will hopefully be improved as part, or as a consequence, of the proposed Fiveways junction improvements recently approved by the Council. We believe the site is well suited, given its location, access and surrounding uses, for an extension of the housing development previously granted. We believe that issues related to access and the current designation could be dealt with to free up a very suitable housing site.

The College has previously considered the development of a feeder school, either on this site, near its main campus in Fair Field, or elsewhere in the borough, but we are able to confirm that the Heath Clark site is not required by the College for school use and will not be in the future. The College therefore believes that sustainable housing provision should be delivered on this site.

Croydon College owns the site freehold and there are no restrictions on its development. It is a cleared, open site. The northern part of the site was developed by Bellway Homes in 1999 and existing access roads can potentially be opened up to service the remainder of the site. The nursery could be relocated within a high density residential led scheme with some community and commercial elements. Access and local open space designations need to be addressed, but the Sustainability Appraisal recommends any loss of open space is mitigated by much needed development.

The site is sustainably located, in an urban location with excellent transport links. The proposed improvements to the Fiveways junction will add to the PTAL rating of the site. The site is not restricted by surrounding uses or topography, and a fully sustainable scheme could be developed without risk of high cost. We believe the site is highly suited to sustainable building technologies and amenity spaces.

Croydon College is very supportive of the concept of housing development on this site and has made previous representations to this effect, including the call for sites refresh in April 2014. The College can confirm it does not need the site for educational purposes, and in discussions with the Council over recent years, believes that it may be a more sustainable location for housing.

The College believes that sustainable housing is welcome. However, the site will remain allocated for mixed use as a secondary school is required to meet the identified need in the borough.
housing development in the Borough is extremely important and welcomes the number and quality of sites that are identified by the Council in these documents.

2634/01/006/DM47.2/C Charlie Fagan ARK

Comment DM47.2 16

This site would not be suitable for Ark due to being a mixed development.

No change

Comment is noted.

2657/01/008/DM47.2/O Rebecca Pullinger CPRE London

Object Soundness - Justified DM47.2 16

A large number of the sites allocated for development through Detailed Policies and Proposals may result in the loss of green space. This appears to run counter to the Borough's Strategic Objective 10 (The need to utilise brownfield areas first) and could be replaced with a goal to promote good quality high density developments that protect Croydon's green spaces. Even undesignated green spaces provide important ecosystem services to Croydon's growing population. We are concerned about the potential loss of designated Local Open Land.

The Council should provide additional text in these policies to encourage developers to propose good quality, high density developments which promote the protection and enhancement of green space.

No change

The site did not meet the criteria for Local Green Space and is considered appropriate for a mixed use development.

2818/01/002/DM47.2/S Keisha John Support I am currently applying through Croydon for a free school, the proposed name for the school is MADE academy. MADE academy will like to express interest in the site mentioned in section 1. We aim to provide a creative and robust curriculum.

My question is; Will the borough need another school before the dates suggested on the sites? Will there be negotiations on the intake size, such as five form entry instead of an eight form entry for the suggested school?

MADE academy will like to express interest in the site. My question is; Will the borough need another school before the dates suggested on the sites? Will there be negotiations on the intake size, such as five form entry instead of an eight form entry for the suggested school?

No change

The proposed dates align with the borough's need for additional secondary school places. The Council would seek to achieve a minimum of 6 forms of entry in order to meet this need.
Mr Richard Jeffries

Object DM47.2

Other Sites that the Council should reconsider instead of both Coombe Lodge Nurseries and Coombe Farm are the following:

- 16 - Heath Clark playing fields, Stafford Road, Waddon
- 120 - Timebridge Community Centre, Field Way, New Addington
- 518 - Land adjacent to 103 Gander Green Lane, The Admirals Walk, Old Coulsdon
- 522 - Wandle Road surface car park, Wandle Road, Croydon
- 536 - Land of former Croydon Airport runway, south of Imperial Way, Waddon
- 552 - Land adjacent to Ashburton playing fields at rear of 2-88 Caledon Road, Addiscombe
- 553 - By Pavilion Playing Fields, Purley Way, Waddon
- 632 - Land south of Threehalfpenny Woods, Kent Gate Way, Waddon
- 636 - Land west of Timebridge Community Centre, Lodge Lane, Elmerslie, Addington
- 767 - Cane Hill-south part, Hollymead Road / Portsdown Road, Coulsdon

Use as a Gypsy and Traveller site No change

This site did not meet the criteria to be used as a Gypsy and Traveller site. It is also required to meet the need for school places in the borough.

Linda Stevens

Object DM47.2

Soundness - Justified

16

I wish to voice my concerns regarding the following:

I totally object to any reduction of green space in the borough of Croydon in favour of development.

No change

There are very few sites available in the borough large enough to accommodate a secondary school such that some sites currently designated open space have been proposed for new schools.

Councillor Luke Clancy

Object DM47.2

Soundness - Justified

25

Site 25, Morrisons Supermarket, 500 Purley Way. The creation of up to 1028 homes on a mixed use site would be extremely challenging in an area where the road network already struggles with parking and vehicular movements. The loss of employment land would need to be justified.

No change

The site has been allocated for a mixed development of residential, retail commercial and community uses. The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between this need and the impact that additional sites has on the environment and nearby residents.

Councillor Dudley Mead

Comment DM47.2

25

Site 25, Morrisons Supermarket, 500 Purley Way. The creation of up to 1028 homes on a mixed use site would be extremely challenging in an area where the road network already struggles with parking and vehicular movements. The loss of employment land would need to be justified.

No change

The site has been allocated for a mixed development of residential, retail commercial and community uses. The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between this need and the impact that additional sites has on the environment and nearby residents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>DM47.2</th>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>反应</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2062/01/052/DM47.2/O</td>
<td>Councillor Jason Perry</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Site 25, Morrisons Supermarket, 500 Purley Way. The creation of up to 1028 homes on a mixed use site would be extremely challenging in an area where the road network already struggles with parking and vehicular movements. The loss of employment land would need to be justified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2071/01/052/DM47.2/O</td>
<td>Councillor Mario Creatura</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Site 25, Morrisons Supermarket, 500 Purley Way. The creation of up to 1028 homes on a mixed use site would be extremely challenging in an area where the road network already struggles with parking and vehicular movements. The loss of employment land would need to be justified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2128/03/020/DM47.2/O</td>
<td>Cllr Steve O'Connell AM</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>The creation of up to 1028 homes on a mixed use site would be extremely challenging in an area where the road network already struggles with parking and vehicular movements. The loss of employment land would need to be justified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The loss of employment land would need to be justified. The site has been allocated for a mixed development of residential, retail commercial and community uses. The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between this need and the impact that additional site has on the environment and nearby residents.
Network Rail notes that there are a number of sites adjacent to the Railway and attach a standard response which sets out the issues that need to be considered. In particular with large new developments there is a concern about the risk of trespass and all new developments should have proper and suitable boundary fencing. The risk of greater flooding and drainage that new developments could potentially have on the Network Rail infrastructure and we would not want any increase of flooding or the increase in run off onto Railway Infrastructure.

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not:
- encroach onto Network Rail land
- affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company’s railway and its infrastructure
- undermine its support zone
- damage the company’s infrastructure
- place additional load on cuttings
- adversely affect any railway land or structure
- over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land
- cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future

The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail’s adjoining land.

Future maintenance
The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant’s land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail’s adjacent land and air-space, and therefore all works or proposed works over Network Rail’s boundary should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail’s boundary. The reason for the 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant. Any...
less than 2m (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works. The applicant/resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. The applicant/resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. all possession costs, all site safety costs, all asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard-against Network Rail’s boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction/maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary with Network Rail will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams’ ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.

Drainage
Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail’s property or into Network Rail’s culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail’s property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail’s property; full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail’s existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near within 10 – 20 metres of Network Rail’s boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property. After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants’ expense.

Plant & Materials
All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail’s property, must at all times be carried out in a “fail safe” manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are
capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.

Scaffolding
Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant’s contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling
Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing
In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail’s existing fencing/wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail’s boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting
Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling
arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineer’s approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration
The potential for any noise/vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which hold relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night time train running and heavy freight trains.

Vehicle Incursion
Where a proposal calls for hard standing area/parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionsSussex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/1538.asp x.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Object Description</th>
<th>Soundness of Development</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2448/01/052/DM47.2/O</td>
<td>Andy Stranack</td>
<td>Croydon Council</td>
<td>Site 25, Morrisons Supermarket, 500 Purley Way. The creation of up to 1028 homes on a mixed use site would be extremely challenging in an area where the road network already struggles with parking and vehicular movements. The loss of employment land would need to be justified.</td>
<td>DM47.2 25</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2635/01/045/DM47.2/O</td>
<td>Paul Sandford</td>
<td>Bourne Society</td>
<td>Site 25, Morrisons Supermarket, 500 Purley Way. The creation of up to 1028 homes on a mixed use site would be extremely challenging in an area where the road network already struggles with parking and vehicular movements. The loss of employment land would need to be justified.</td>
<td>DM47.2 25</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Reason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2775/01/052/DM47.2/O</td>
<td>Cllr Tim Pollard</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified DM47.2</td>
<td>Site 25, Morrisons Supermarket, 500 Purley Way. The creation of up to 1028 homes on a mixed use site would be extremely challenging in an area where the road network already struggles with parking and vehicular movements. The loss of employment land would need to be justified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2776/01/052/DM47.2/O</td>
<td>Cllr Helen Pollard</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified DM47.2</td>
<td>Site 25, Morrisons Supermarket, 500 Purley Way. The creation of up to 1028 homes on a mixed use site would be extremely challenging in an area where the road network already struggles with parking and vehicular movements. The loss of employment land would need to be justified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2812/01/052/DM47.2/O</td>
<td>Cllr Jan Buttinger</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified DM47.2</td>
<td>Site 25, Morrisons Supermarket, 500 Purley Way. The creation of up to 1028 homes on a mixed use site would be extremely challenging in an area where the road network already struggles with parking and vehicular movements. The loss of employment land would need to be justified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2829/01/052/DM47.2/O</td>
<td>Cllr Margaret Mead</td>
<td>Croydon Council</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified DM47.2</td>
<td>Site 25, Morrisons Supermarket, 500 Purley Way. The creation of up to 1028 homes on a mixed use site would be extremely challenging in an area where the road network already struggles with parking and vehicular movements. The loss of employment land would need to be justified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2841/01/038/DM47.2/O</td>
<td>Cllr Vidhi Mohan</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM47.2</td>
<td>Site 25, Morrisons Supermarket, 500 Purley Way. The creation of up to 1028 homes on a mixed use site would be extremely challenging in an area where the road network already struggles with parking and vehicular movements. The loss of employment land would need to be justified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site 25, Morrisons Supermarket, 500 Purley Way. The creation of up to 1028 homes on a mixed use site would be extremely challenging in an area where the road network already struggles with parking and vehicular movements. The loss of employment land would need to be justified. The site has been allocated for a mixed development of residential, retail commercial and community uses. The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between this need and the impact that additional site has on the environment and nearby residents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4117/01/045/DM47.2/O</td>
<td>Cllr S Brew</td>
<td>Site 25, Morrisons Supermarket, 500 Purley Way. The creation of up to 1028 homes on a mixed use site would be extremely challenging in an area where the road network already struggles with parking and vehicular movements. The loss of employment land would need to be justified;</td>
<td>The site has been allocated for a mixed development of residential, retail commercial and community uses. The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between this need and the impact that additional site has on the environment and nearby residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4125/01/052/DM47.2/O</td>
<td>Councillor M Fisher</td>
<td>Site 25, Morrisons Supermarket, 500 Purley Way. The creation of up to 1028 homes on a mixed use site would be extremely challenging in an area where the road network already struggles with parking and vehicular movements. The loss of employment land would need to be justified.</td>
<td>The site has been allocated for a mixed development of residential, retail commercial and community uses. The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between this need and the impact that additional site has on the environment and nearby residents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My specific representations are four fold:

i) Notwithstanding the Article 4 Direction - it is the relationship with the Local Plan policies and proposals that is important - the Plan should be the - single source of truth - and currently there appears to be inconsistency, lack of vision, possibly leading to confusion and missed opportunities for regeneration and good forwards planning.

ii) There appears to be no reflection of the potential for the currently derelict and unsightly portion of the Waldron's Conservation Area - specifically No 34 Waldrons - a possible key small site and / or one which could supporting delivery of starter homes (see attached below) identified in adopted Supplementary Planning Document [adopted by Full Council 22 April 2013].

iii) Finally to bring to attention to the Council that under its general powers an LPA can serve a Section 215 notice (Town & Country Planning Act 1990) on the owner or occupier where the building or land is clearly adversely affecting the amenity of the area and can require them (the owner or occupier) to clean up the building or site.

iv) I am concerned that the permitted development rights for properties in the vicinity of this site have had an article 4 direction applied (removing permitted development rights) yet there appears to be no regard to the proper planning of the area by specifically omitting to include the remaining portion of the conservation area site of the a key and visually prominent part of the Conservation Area which currently is adversely affecting the amenity of the area.

A34 THE WALDRONS

9.2.3 Though there was evidence of neglect of the locally listed building from 2008 onwards, it suffered significant damage during a fire on New Year’s Eve 2010. Damage to the structure is ongoing due to the lack of protection against the elements. If, at all possible, the building should be retained, or at least part retained, in recognition of the significant contribution it makes to the character of the conservation area as an important point of entry from the Croydon Flyover. Part retention would involve calculated decisions about what elements of the building are salvageable, which initially appear to be the south end of the site, including the ‘turreted’ tower, and could be potentially retained and part reconstructed alongside some new
build elements to allow for the site to be brought back into active use. 9.2.4 If it is justified to a satisfactory degree that the site must be re-developed then all proposals must be carefully designed to preserve and enhance the special character of the conservation area, including height, scale, mass, architectural detailing and materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/01/053/DM47.2/C</td>
<td>Luke Clancy</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
<td>Site 301, Sea Cadet Training Centre, 34 The Waldrons. Any new development should complement and enhance the adjoining Waldrons conservation area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM47.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A need has been identified for additional housing sites in Croydon and the site allocated meets the criteria. The loss of the community use on this site has recently been justified by evidence provided as part of the recent planning approval (reference 16/00879/P) which has given planning approval for the erection of a part four/five/six storey building to provide 19 one bedroom, 17 two bedroom and 6 three bedroom and 6 studio flats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2062/01/053/DM47.2/C</td>
<td>Dudley Mead</td>
<td></td>
<td>Site 301, Sea Cadet Training Centre, 34 The Waldrons. Any new development should complement and enhance the adjoining Waldrons conservation area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM47.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A need has been identified for additional housing sites in Croydon and the site allocated meets the criteria. The loss of the community use on this site has recently been justified by evidence provided as part of the recent planning approval (reference 16/00879/P) which has given planning approval for the erection of a part four/five/six storey building to provide 19 one bedroom, 17 two bedroom and 6 three bedroom and 6 studio flats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2062/01/053/DM47.2/C</td>
<td>Jason Perry</td>
<td></td>
<td>Site 301, Sea Cadet Training Centre, 34 The Waldrons. Any new development should complement and enhance the adjoining Waldrons conservation area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM47.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A need has been identified for additional housing sites in Croydon and the site allocated meets the criteria. The loss of the community use on this site has recently been justified by evidence provided as part of the recent planning approval (reference 16/00879/P) which has given planning approval for the erection of a part four/five/six storey building to provide 19 one bedroom, 17 two bedroom and 6 three bedroom and 6 studio flats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2071/01/053/DM47.2/C</td>
<td>Councillor Mario Creatura</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2128/03/021/DM47.2/C</td>
<td>Cllr Steve O'Connell AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2448/01/053/DM47.2/C</td>
<td>Andy Stranack</td>
<td>Croydon Council</td>
<td>Soundness - Justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2635/01/046/DM47.2/O</td>
<td>Paul Sandford</td>
<td>Bourne Society</td>
<td>DM47.2 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2775/01/053/DM47.2/C</td>
<td>Cllr Tim Pollard</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>DM47.2 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2776/01/053/DM47.2/C</td>
<td>Cllr Helen Pollard</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
<td>DM47.2 301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment
Soundness - Justified
Site 301, Sea Cadet Training Centre, 34 The Waldrons. Any new development should complement and enhance the adjoining Waldrons conservation area.

Change
A need has been identified for additional housing sites in Croydon and the site allocated meets the criteria. The loss of the community use on this site has recently been justified by evidence provided as part of the recent planning approval (reference 16/00879/P) which has given planning approval for the erection of a part four/five/six storey building to provide 19 one bedroom, 17 two bedroom and 6 studio flats.

Comment
Soundness - Justified
Site 301, Sea Cadet Training Centre, 34 The Waldrons. Any new development should complement and enhance the adjoining Waldrons conservation area.

Change
A need has been identified for additional housing sites in Croydon and the site allocated meets the criteria. The loss of the community use on this site has recently been justified by evidence provided as part of the recent planning approval (reference 16/00879/P) which has given planning approval for the erection of a part four/five/six storey building to provide 19 one bedroom, 17 two bedroom and 6 studio flats.

Object
DM47.2
301
Site 301, Sea Cadet Training Centre, 34 The Waldrons. Any new development should complement and enhance the adjoining Waldrons conservation area.

Change
A need has been identified for additional housing sites in Croydon and the site allocated meets the criteria. The loss of the community use on this site has recently been justified by evidence provided as part of the recent planning approval (reference 16/00879/P) which has given planning approval for the erection of a part four/five/six storey building to provide 19 one bedroom, 17 two bedroom and 6 studio flats.
**Comment Soundness - Justified**

Site 301, Sea Cadet Training Centre, 34 The Waldrons. Any new development should complement and enhance the adjoining Waldrons conservation area.

**Change**

A need has been identified for additional housing sites in Croydon and the site allocated meets the criteria. The loss of the community use on this site has recently been justified by evidence provided as part of the recent planning approval (reference 16/00879/P) which has given planning approval for the erection of a part four/five/six storey building to provide 19 one bedroom, 17 two bedroom and 6 three bedroom and 6 studio flats.

---

**Object**

The allocation of the site for development is supported, but the requirement for community use (in additional to residential use) is opposed. In this regard, UK Land Assets (UKLA) own the land and purchased it after the marketing agents had undertaken soft marketing of the site to community organisations. This marketing exercise failed to attract a suitable community organisation and accordingly, UKLA purchased the site in good faith on the assumption that the land could be redeveloped for a mixture of open market and affordable housing. The site is considered to be ideally suited to open market and affordable housing and therefore the preferred approach would be most appropriate for Croydon if the site were allocated for open market and affordable residential development only. Redevelopment of the site is deliverable, but if the site must be delivered for both residential and community use, the amount of affordable housing will not be maximised. If community use is required, the level of affordable housing that can be delivered will significantly decrease, resulting in a less sustainable development.

**Change**

A need has been identified for additional housing sites in Croydon and the site allocated meets the criteria. The loss of the community use on this site has recently been justified by evidence provided as part of the recent planning approval (reference 16/00879/P) which has given planning approval for the erection of a part four/five/six storey building to provide 19 one bedroom, 17 two bedroom and 6 three bedroom and 6 studio flats.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3006/01/004/DM47.2/O</td>
<td>Mr. John Sadler</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>DM47.2</td>
<td>There should be no loss of carpark</td>
<td>A need has been identified for additional housing sites in Croydon and the site allocated meets the criteria. The loss of the community use on this site has recently been justified by evidence provided as part of the recent planning approval (reference 16/00879/P) which has given planning approval for the erection of a part four/five/six storey, building to provide 19 one bedroom, 17 two bedroom, 6 three bedroom and 6 studio flats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3430/01/053/DM47.2/C</td>
<td>Mr. Donald Speakman</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM47.2</td>
<td>Site 301, Sea Cadet Training Centre, 34 The Waldrons. Any new development should complement and enhance the adjoining Waldrons conservation area.</td>
<td>A need has been identified for additional housing sites in Croydon and the site allocated meets the criteria. The loss of the community use on this site has recently been justified by evidence provided as part of the recent planning approval (reference 16/00879/P) which has given planning approval for the erection of a part four/five/six storey, building to provide 19 one bedroom, 17 two bedroom, 6 three bedroom and 6 studio flats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3699/01/053/DM47.2/C</td>
<td>Cllr J Cummings</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>DM47.2</td>
<td>Site 301, Sea Cadet Training Centre, 34 The Waldrons. Any new development should complement and enhance the adjoining Waldrons conservation area.</td>
<td>A need has been identified for additional housing sites in Croydon and the site allocated meets the criteria. The loss of the community use on this site has recently been justified by evidence provided as part of the recent planning approval (reference 16/00879/P) which has given planning approval for the erection of a part four/five/six storey, building to provide 19 one bedroom, 17 two bedroom, 6 three bedroom and 6 studio flats.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A need has been identified for additional housing sites in Croydon and the site allocated meets the criteria. The loss of the community use on this site has recently been justified by evidence provided as part of the recent planning approval (reference 16/00879/P) which has given planning approval for the erection of a part four/five/six storey building to provide 19 one bedroom, 17 two bedroom and 6 three bedroom and 6 studio flats.
Site 301, Sea Cadet Training Centre, 34 The Waldrons. Any new development should complement and enhance the adjoining Waldrons conservation area.

A need has been identified for additional housing sites in Croydon and the site allocated meets the criteria. The loss of the community use on this site has recently been justified by evidence provided as part of the recent planning approval (reference 16/00879/P) which has given planning approval for the erection of a part four/five/six storey building to provide 19 one bedroom, 17 two bedroom and 6 three bedroom and 6 studio flats.

Object

Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd

Object

Object to proposed allocation. It should be amended to supports retention of supermarket or mixed use retaining the store

No change

The allocation was incorrectly named with the wrong map and did not in fact include Sainsbury's but rather an adjacent site.

Object

Henderson Global Investors

Object

Object to proposed allocation. It should be amended to supports retention of supermarket or mixed use retaining the store

No change

The site has been allocated for a mixed development of residential, retail commercial and community/health uses. The Council acknowledges that a balance needs to be struck between this need and the impact that additional site has on the environment and nearby residents.

The site is part of a well-trading and established retail area. Whilst the opportunity for residential would help the council meet housing strategic objectives we feel that this is less appropriate for the site than an approach offering an improvement and enhancement of the retail offer. Furthermore, commercial space located in Croydon centre (i.e. not on the 294-330 Purley Way site) would be more appropriate in helping the Council meet their Strategic Objectives.

We feel that a mix of retail, commercial and residential would not be deliverable since commercial tenants are seeking accommodation in Croydon centre rather than out of town and the values in residential accommodation would not be attractive enough in a strong-trading and established retail area.

We consider that the site and surrounding areas would benefit more from an improved and enhanced retail offer since the area is already established as such.