

17th November 2022 Planning Committee Addendum

Item 6.1 – 21/01785/FUL – 96-98 George Street

Representations

One additional representation, from the same address as other two objections. Issues raised that were not already covered in the report are summarised as follows:

- Traffic or Highways
- Café layout confusing
- Fire floor layout plans do not show layouts
- Could make better use of College Square frontage

These matters are all addressed within the main body of the report.

Updated documents

Since the report was published an updated Fire Strategy was received from the application. This was published on 15th November. It clarifies matters covered in the Officer Report and raises no new issues; hence re-notification is not required.

Revisions

Paragraph 9.123 should be amended to read:

Additionally, there are three Sheffield-type cycle stands on George Street adjacent to Suffolk House, providing secure storage for a further total of 6 cycles within 40m of the site.

Item 6.2 – 21/06276/FUL – 15A Russell Hill, Purley, CR8 2JB

Revisions

Paragraph 1 description should read: Demolition of existing single storey detached dwellinghouse and detached garage. and Erection of a three storey building (two storey building above ground level and one storey of lower ground accommodation) comprising 7 self-contained flats; private/communal amenity and play space; hard and soft landscaping; boundary treatment; reinstatement of existing crossover and new crossover to provide forecourt parking; cycle and refuse provision and land level alterations including raising to the front (amended plans)

Table below should read:

Housing Mix					
	1 bed (2 person)	2 bed (3 person)	2 bed (4 person)	3 bed (5 person)	TOTAL
Existing				1	1
Proposed (market housing)	1	4		2	7
TOTAL	1	4		2	7

Paragraph 3.1 should read: The applicant seeks full planning permission for the demolition of existing single storey detached dwellinghouse and detached garage. Erection of a three storey building (two storey building above ground level and one storey of lower ground accommodation) comprising 7 self-contained flats; private/communal amenity and play space; hard and soft landscaping; boundary treatment; reinstatement of existing crossover and new crossover to provide forecourt parking; cycle and refuse provision and land level alterations including raising to the front (amended plans).

Paragraph 3.2 should read: Amended plans were received on the 28th July 2022 which sought to centralise the front gable feature to break down the massing of the building and included alterations to the internal layout and rear elevation; such amendments include accommodation in the roofspace. Third parties were re-consulted regarding these amendments given their significance and the time lag between the submission and the receipt of the amended plans.

Paragraph 3.7 – the following text is DELETED – This is the application to which this reserved matters relates.

Paragraph 6.2 should read: The following Councillor and MP made representations: Councillor Samir Dwesar [objecting] on the grounds of; Cumulative impact, Loss of a family home, Obtrusive by design, Overdevelopment, Overlooking, Residential amenity, Traffic/Highways.

Paragraph 8.7 should read: CLP Policy DM1.2 seeks to prevent the net loss of small family homes by restricting the loss of three-bedroom units and the loss of units that have a floor area of less than 130sqm. The existing property is a four bedroom detached home but falls below 130m² so is classified as a small family home

Paragraph 8.9 should read: The proposed development would result in the demolition of a small family home with a GIA of 127m², it is noted that this is marginally below the 130m² threshold as set out in Policy DM1.2. Of the 7 units proposed 2 units would have at least 3-bedrooms and as such the proposal would result in a net increase in family homes. In addition, members attention is drawn to the previous approval on site which allowed for the demolition of the existing property. As permission was granted for the reserved matters in September 2022 this permission remains live. Given the fallback position and the significant weight that has to be attached to housing

delivery as set out in the framework and the net increase of one family sized unit it is considered that the proposal would accord with the development plan when taken as a whole.

Paragraph 8.13 should read: 8.13 Layout, Height, Form, Scale and Massing: The application site fronts onto Russell Hill and while the land levels fall substantially from the north-east to south-west. The immediate area is residential in character and historically comprised large detached single and two storey detached properties within generous plots. However more recently the immediate area has been subject to a number of planning applications and consents to demolish the existing properties and to erect a number of flatted developments. As a result the more recently constructed development is of a larger scale to the buildings that they replaced, examples being No's 19-21, 32a, 30a. These new developments have increased the quantum of built form resulting in buildings of a larger scale and with tighter relationships to the site boundary; most of which appear as three stories with accommodation in the roofspace. Such schemes have also included large excavation works towards the frontage resulting in visible engineering works. Site access is currently sited to the north-western corner of the site and leads onto a single storey detached garage. While the existing dwelling could be classed as a bungalow neighbouring buildings vary in scale, being one or two stories. The site forms part of an established building line however is set substantially lower than the adjacent highway.

Paragraph 8.14 should read: CLP policy DM10.1 states that new development should seek to achieve a minimum height of 3 storeys. The proposed development has been designed to appear as two stories with accommodation in the roof space when viewed from the street, with a centralised gable feature to the front and a pair of symmetrical gables towards the rear. The proposed roof typology is that of a hip with intersecting gable features towards the north-eastern and south-western elevations. The proposed hip roof and gable features, while larger in form than the building it replaces, would seek to respect the character of the locality and complement the architectural styles of nearby dwellings and more recently the flatted developments. The overall height of the development would sit above the adjacent properties but given the topographical changes and variation of architectural forms would not appear overly dominant or out of character with the immediate area. A generous separation distance between the site and that of 15 and 15a would offset any increase in perceived mass.

Paragraph 8.21 should read: The indicative materials for the building would consist of red and buff bricks with clay roof tiles and white render. The window frames would be of a darker colour to contrast with the warm colour of the red brick and roof tiles. These materials are acceptable given the mixed character of the area.

Paragraph 8.25 should refer to Russell Hill not Highland Road.

Paragraph 8.34 should add the following sentence at the end: Flats 3 and 4 are capable of meeting M4(3) and the remaining units are capable of meeting the lower requirement of M4(2).

Paragraphs 8.40, 8.41 8.42 and 8.44 should refer to number 15b Russell Hill and not 15a.

Paragraph 8.55 – in the last sentence, this refers to on-street parking.