

## Planning Committee

Meeting held on Thursday, 25 July 2024 at 6.30 pm in Council Chamber, Town Hall, Katharine Street, Croydon CR0 1NX

### MINUTES

**Present:** Councillor Michael Neal (Chair);  
Councillor Clive Fraser (Vice-Chair);  
Councillors Ian Parker, Lara Fish, Sean Fitzsimons, Mohammed Islam,  
Humayun Kabir, Helen Redfern, Appu Srinivasan and Fatima Zaman

**Also Present:** Councillor Laila Ben-Hassel

**Apologies:** Councillor Mark Johnson

### PART A

35/24 **Disclosure of Interest**

There were no disclosures of a pecuniary interest not already registered.

36/24 **Urgent Business (if any)**

There was none.

37/24 **Development presentations**

There were none.

38/24 **Planning applications for decision**

39/24 **22/03566/FUL - British Legion Memorial Hall, 1268A London Road, Norbury, London, SW16 4EJ**

Demolition of the existing building to the rear of Astral House and subsequent erection of a 5-storey building to provide ground floor community use (Class E(f)) with 20 residential units (Class C3) over and associated works.

Ward: Norbury and Pollards Hill

The officer presented details of the planning application and in response to members' questions explained that:

- The windows that aligned with the walkway were bedroom windows, it was believed that the bedrooms would not be used as much during the

day as residents had the main living space and balconies available to them. Whilst the bedroom windows were full height and there was the potential for overlooking, officers considered this to be the most appropriate type of design for the scheme. The size of the windows had been increased to allow more natural light into the units so that they would be BRA compliant.

- The separation distance between the windows of the two buildings was 18.1m.
- Officers had notified all residents of Astral house about the application.
- The staircase provided the main access to the flats, the design of the staircase had a perforated frame which allowed natural light into the units.
- The plan showed that the two refuse areas were going to be separated from each other. There would be one refuse store for residents and another refuse store for commercial waste.
- The British Legion Hall vacated in January 2021 and officers assumed that they would have taken anything that would have been of interest to them.
- Officers had a rule of thumb that there should be 18m-22m between the windows of two buildings, the windows of the proposed development and the adjacent building had a separation distance of 18.1m and so was considered compliant.
- There was only one way in and out of the site.
- An end user had been identified for the ground floor nursery and the applicant confirmed that the proposed development would meet their current and future needs.
- The separation distance between the rear wall of the nursery and the rear wall of the site was 3.6m.
- There was a plan to reduce the CO2 emissions by 69% based on the current building regulations and to achieve this, developers would use heat recovery ventilation, heat pump and solar panels. These measures would be secured as part of a planning condition.
- The policy requirement was that if there was a community facility that was going to be lost then an appropriate provision would need to be provided as part of the redevelopment of the site. The provision that had been provided was a reduction in floor space and based on the formal provision that is there, they had secured an end user whose current and future needs would be met so the scheme complied with policy DM19.
- The nursery on site met the policy requirement for community use.
- London Road was on a red route so there were parking restrictions in place, the development would have a gate which would prevent members of the public from entering the site and it was believed that most people who arrived at the site would travel via public transport. The site was in a PTAL 3 area so car would not be the typical mode of transport.
- There was no policy requirement for the developer to provide places at the nursery at a limited cost.

- Throughout the planning process, officers had a slightly lower height tested and they found that lowering the height by one storey would not have had a significant impact on neighbouring buildings.
- The cycle storage was integral to the main building, there was pedestrian and vehicular access gates at the front of the site which prevented unauthorised individuals from entering the site. As the cycle and refuse stores were close to the main entrance, only those who were permitted access to the nursery or residential areas could access the cycle storage.
- There was a slight shortfall regarding the requirements for blue badge spaces on the site. There would be three spaces to serve both Astral House and the proposed development, so it did fall short of the London Plan standards. Officers would secure the car club, which was the equivalent of at least 10 private owned vehicles. Officers concluded that the benefits of the scheme outweighed the non-compliance of a comprehensive blue badge scheme.
- Officers had recommended some conditions regarding amplified noise and the control of the hours of use. There was a noise assessment submitted along with the application that was considered by environmental health officers, who concluded that there was the ability to secure sufficient mitigation regarding noise and disturbance from the proposed development.
- The nursery was 175 sqm and the external space of the nursery was 105 sqm.
- Given the perforated nature of the staircases design, it would be open to the elements and there was an internal lift which could also be used if necessary.

Aaron Zimmerman spoke in support of the application and Ward Member Councillor Laila Ben-Hassel addressed the Committee with her view on the application. After the speakers had finished, the Committee began the deliberation, during which they raised the following points:

- The daylight and sunlight impact on 1217 London Road and the major impact of occupants of astral house were of particular concern.
- The application did not meet the policy requirement of 60% family sized units.
- The proposed development did not integrate well with the character of the area; however, it was noted that the site was largely if not wholly out of view from London Road.
- The proposed development would provide 20 residential units on a Brownfield site.
- The community use on the site via the nursery was appreciated.
- There was concern that residents would have to find measures to prevent overlooking through the large bedroom windows in the development.
- The developer had compromised 5 family units across two floors, which meant that 10 families would have their living arrangements compromised due to a design which was implemented to comply with a light standard that was difficult to meet.

- There would be overlooking from Astral House and passers-by.
- The use of the ground floor for a nursery was appreciated.
- The improvements to the courtyard, such as the landscaping and the reduction of parking was considered beneficial to both the new residential development and Astral House.
- With modifications to the railings to reduce the visibility from astral house into the properties.
- The staircase was not considered to be practical.
- The 15% affordable housing units in the scheme was appreciated.
- The scale and design of the development could have a detrimental impact on the amount of sunlight that would reach properties at Astral House.
- The lack of parking provision was a concern.

The substantive motion to GRANT the application based on the officer's recommendation and in addition, conditions regarding the railings and the details for the obscure glazing for windows facing Astral House to be presented to officers was proposed by Councillor Fish. This was seconded by Councillor Fraser.

The motion to grant the application was taken to a vote and carried with eight Members voting in favour and two Members voting against.

The Committee RESOLVED to GRANT the application for the British Legion Memorial Hall, 1268A London Road, Norbury, London, SW16 4EJ.

40/24 **Items referred by Planning Sub-Committee**

There were none.

41/24 **Other planning matters**

1 **Weekly Planning Decisions**

**RESOLVED** to note the weekly Planning decisions as contained within the report.

The meeting ended at 7.41 pm

**Signed:**

**Date:**

.....  
 .....