

ADDENDUM

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE A – Addendum	
Report Title	Willow Tree Riding Establishment, Ronver Road, SE12 0NL	
Ward	Grove Park	
Contributors	Georgia McBirney	
Class	PART 1	27 February 2020

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1 This is an addendum to the planning committee agenda published on the 17th February in respect of Planning Committee A on the 27th February 2020.
- 2 This addendum responds to the written representation from the applicants received on the 21st February 2020, following the publication of the committee report for Item Agenda Item 3 (Willow Tree Riding Establishment, Ronver Road, SE12 0NL). These representations are Appendix AD1.

2 RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATION

- 3 Officers have reviewed the received representation from the applicants and make the following comments and corrections:
- 4 In response to point two of the letter, the TPO applies to the whole site and paragraph 5 of the committee report is correct. The inclusion of saplings within the scope of the TPO is not material to the planning decision, only works to the relevant protected trees. The applicant has the option to seek a Certificate of Lawfulness if they intend to remove new growth they do not consider would fall within the scope of the TPO without expressly seeking relevant planning consents. The applicants are encouraged to seek certification if required, however this is not material to the planning decision regarding the current application.
- 5 In response to point six concerning the sub-stations, the following correction is made to paragraph 31 of the committee report:

Existing sub-stations would be situated behind the proposed reception/office building and to the side of Stalls 02. The sub-stations are shown on the existing and proposed site plans, however, no existing and proposed elevations of the sub-stations have been provided.
- 6 In response to point 8, officers acknowledge paragraph 101 contains a typographical error. The committee report reads 'increase', this should be replaced by 'decrease', therefore paragraph 101 of the committee report should read as:

The volumes of the demolished and proposed buildings would be broadly commensurate according to the applicant's calculations, with a slight decrease in 6m³ in volume. As noted above, the building volumes would be iterated differently across the site, with 9 buildings demolished and 5

proposed. The building footprints would move closer to the site access, arrayed around the proposed surfaced car park.

- 7 The other references to the applicant's volume assessment in the report are correct and note a decrease.
- 8 In response to point nine, Officers have considered the totality of the new buildings and their visual and volumetric impact as set in paragraphs 105 to 107 of the committee report. In response to point 11, Officers consider that Paragraph 145 of the NPPF has been correctly applied.
- 9 In response to point 13, Officers have had regard for the fall back position that part of the site may be lawfully used as an equestrian centre. This is referenced throughout the report.
- 10 The Council's Highways Officer has reviewed the submission and maintains the objection to the proposed development. In respect of the parking impact of the proposed development further information would still be required.
- 11 In response to point 17, the Highways Officer highlights that safe pedestrian and disabled access to the site should not be secured by condition given the building configurations. The Highways Officer also highlights that the TRICS data in Appendix AD1 is not comparable and the swept path drawings are not scalable.
- 12 In response to point 19, Officers note the applicant's comments in relation to the eaves height and maximum height of the proposed Tack Building and Stores and highlight that in policy terms the impact of the proposed building is considered to be the same.
- 13 The applicant's comments in points 23 to 26 are noted, however, Appendix AD1 does not clarify which trees are to be removed. This is following requests by the Tree Officer for verification at application stage and ahead of the local meeting.
- 14 In response to point 27, Officer's note that the application is not recommended to be refused on flood risk ground and that if the proposal were otherwise acceptable, the required information would have been requested.
- 15 Officers note the applicant's comments on possible appeal costs in point 28. Officers consider that the application is unacceptable in principle and amendments would have resulted in a materially different scheme as per paragraph 246 of the committee report. Officers have provided relevant consultee comments at the applicant's request upon the publication of the committee report.
- 16 Officers maintain the Local Planning Authority has behaved reasonably in the planning process. The Council has not recommended the scheme for refusal on any matter that could be substantively be addressed by condition, and has undertaken an objective analysis of the submission in accordance with adopted policy and guidance and in line with the previous Planning Inspector's cautious approach to this ecologically sensitive site.

3 CONCLUSIONS

17 The written representation from the applicant has not provided any additional evidence that would warrant the approval of the application. Officers therefore maintain the recommendation to refuse planning permission.