

16th June Planning Committee Addendum

Item 6.1 – 21/06097/FUL – 1A Meadow Rise, Coulsdon, CR5 2EH

Since the publication of the Committee Report, the following has occurred:

- An amended application form clarifying the existence of a Co-Applicant was submitted, approved, and uploaded to the Council's Public Access Module for planning applications;
- An amended computer-generated image providing a rendering of the proposed street scene at the junction of Meadow Rise and Woodcote Grove Road was submitted, approved, and uploaded to the Council's Public Access Module for planning applications; and
- An objection from local MP Chris Philp stating that the proposal would be an out of character overdevelopment of the site that would have detrimental impacts on biodiversity, local amenity, local infrastructure, and urban greening was received and registered.

Item 6.2 – 21/01298/FUL – 62 The Ridge Way, South Croydon, CR2 0LF

Development Description:

An error occurred when inviting members of the public and ward councillors to the 16th June Planning Committee, giving the description of development as "*4no. houses and 5no.maisonettes*" when the correct description was "*5no. houses and 4no.maisonettes*".

The public consultations which were carried out during the course of the planning application were done with the correct description whilst the Officer Report shows the assessment was on the correct description. Officers subsequently sent out invite letters with a correct description.

Drawing Numbers:

Updated plans to incorporate a rooflight for Unit 5 have been submitted. This affects the following drawing numbers:

- 0065_P10 – Proposed Site Block Plan/Roof Plan. Change to 0065_010A;
- 0065_P15 – Proposed Third Floor Plan. Change to 0065_P15A;
- 0065_P22 – Proposed Street Elevations. Change to 0065_P22A.

Additional Representations:

A further 2 objections were received following the publication of the Officer's Report regarding the above planning application. These are resubmissions of the original objections received. The following additional points have been raised:

- There are ground floor windows of No. 1 Arkwright Road;
- Increase in density;
- Inadequate parking;
- Available outdoor space too deficient for the number of people;
- Transport links and the quality of the roads combined with the hills, mean cycling is an absurd notion as the main method of transport.

Report amendments

The table in section 1 showing the bedroom provision within the existing dwelling has been amended from 3 bedrooms to 5:

	Dwelling Sizes					Total
	One bedroom	Two bedroom	Three bedroom	Four bedroom	Five or more bedrooms	
Existing	0		4		<u>1</u>	1
Proposed	0	1	4	4	0	9

Paras 7.42: *"The dwelling has no windows that face the application site at ground floor and 2no. windows at first floor; one serves a bathroom, and the other is a secondary window to a bedroom."*

This is changed to the following:

- The dwelling has ~~no~~ 3no. windows that face the application site at ground floor; these serve a shower room, a utility and kitchen. The shower room and utility are non-habitable rooms, and the kitchen is a habitable room. ~~and~~ There are also 2no. windows at first floor; one serves a bathroom, and the other is a secondary window to a bedroom.

Para 7.43: *"These unneighbourly windows place undue restraints on the development, and as such the light and outlook they receive will not receive significant protection. The window at first floor of No. 1 Arkwright Road which serves a habitable room is considered to be unneighbourly, in accordance with the SDG and therefore, it is not given significant protection."*

This is changed to the following:

- These unneighbourly windows place undue restraints on the development, and as such the light and outlook they receive will not receive significant protection. Two of the windows at ground floor are non-habitable and are therefore not offered protection. The third window at ground floor serves a kitchen which is a habitable room; additionally, the window at first floor of No. 1 Arkwright Road which also serves a habitable room is considered to be unneighbourly, in accordance with the SDG and therefore, they are not given significant protection. Furthermore, the ground floor windows are concealed by boundary treatment which consists of a tall hedge along the boundary line, therefore, these windows would be less impacted.

Para 7.49: "As outlined above, section 2.9.3 of the SDG sets out that the light and outlook that unneighbourly windows receive will not receive significant protection. While the 25-degree BRE guideline would be breached in relation to the ground floor flank windows of No. 60, officers have applied the 25-degree angle to the first-floor windows and these are in compliance."

This is changed to the following:

- As outlined above, section 2.9.3 of the SDG sets out that the light and outlook that unneighbourly windows receive will not receive significant protection. ~~While the~~ The 25-degree BRE guideline would be marginally breached in relation to the ground floor flank windows of No. 60, officers have applied the 25-degree angle to the first-floor windows and these are in compliance. However, it should be noted that the buildings are staggered and if a perpendicular line is applied to the ground floor windows of the neighbouring property, this misses the proposed development as the view point from these windows would be across the rear gardens, therefore, decreasing the impact on the outlook of this dwelling as the 25 degree angle would not be within the direct line of the proposed development.

Condition 8 – landscaping and hardstanding.

Officers recommend amending this condition to include a wider scope. Suggested wording:

- *Full details of soft and hard landscaping, including new tree planting details, and biodiversity enhancements, and boundary treatments to be submitted for approval and retained as appropriate thereafter.*

Item 6.3 – 21/06318/FUL – Braeside and Tree Tops, Firs Road, Kenley, CR8 5LD

Additional Representations:

A further 1 objection was received following the publication of the Officer Report, objecting due to the proposal not being in keeping with the area. This is already addressed in the Officer report.