

## Representation Form for the Croydon Local Plan Review 2019:

		Personal Details
1.	Representation Number:	MORA #019
2.	Title	Mr
	First Name	Derek
	Last Name	Ritson
	Profession	Retired – Former Communications Engineer I. Eng. M.I.E.T.
3.	Representative	Planning Adviser Executive Committee Member
4.	Organisation	Monks Orchard Residents' Association
5.	Address Line 1	██████████
	Address Line 2	████████████████████
	Address Line 3	██████████
	Postcode	██████████
6.	Email Address	planning@mo-ra.co

### NPPF Plan Making

16. Plans should:

- a) be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of **sustainable development**<sup>10</sup>;
- b) be prepared **positively**, in a way that is aspirational but **deliverable**;
- c) be shaped by early, proportionate and effective engagement between plan-makers and communities, local organisations, businesses, **infrastructure** providers and operators and statutory consultees;
- d) **contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals**;
- e) be accessible through the use of **digital tools** to **assist public involvement** and **policy presentation**; and
- f) serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant).

Name or organisation: **Monks Orchard Residents' Association**

7. To which part of the Croydon Local Plan Review does this representation relate?

Croydon Local Plan Review:

**CLP review - (Ch3 Shirley Place)**

Policy

**SO3**

Option

**Option 3**

Figure/Table

N/A

8. Do you think that the proposed policy or part of the plan meets the objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements for Croydon (and the unmet needs of neighbouring authorities) as defined in **NPPF (2019) para 16**?

Yes

No

9. If No

Which sub paragraph of para 16 does the policy **NOT meet NPPF Para 16**.

Para a)

Para b)

Para c)

Para d)

Para e)

Para f)

10. Do you think that the proposed policy or part of the plan enables the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies of the National Planning Framework?

Yes

No

11. What other NPPF Paragraph does the Policy NOT Comply?

Para

Para

12. What other Policy of the EMERGING LONDON PLAN does the Policy NOT comply?

Chapter

Policy

Strategic option 3 –  
Limited release of Green Belt land for residential development to reduce some pressure off residential growth in the existing urban area.

### Homes already under construction

18

### Number of homes in Shirley in 20 years (the proposed Place target)

360 to 450

### Description of the option

There will be less change in Shirley across all strategic options, beyond a small area of focussed intensification around Shirley Local Centre. In the area of focussed intensification around Shirley Local Centre there will be a gradual change in character to denser forms of development. About a third of development will be on windfall sites.

Same as **Option 2 but consideration of Green Spaces.**

We do **NOT** believe that **any** current local green spaces should be **forfeited for development.**

**Increase in population requires additional green spaces.**

**What is the ratio of population of a locality to Green Spaces (area per 1000 population?)**

### Help shape the future of the Place of Shirley

- SE1. How should Shirley change to help meet the need for homes and infrastructure in the borough?
- SE2. What other potential development sites in Shirley should the Local Plan review allocate for development?
- SE3. Do you think any proposed sites in Shirley should be removed from the Local Plan review? If so, which one(s)? Please explain why.
- SE4. What community facilities in Shirley are important to you?
- SE5. What new community facilities are required in Shirley?
- SE6. Are there any green spaces in Shirley that should be protected as Local Green Spaces? Please provide evidence as to why they are irreplaceable for you.
- SE7. Are there any other green areas in Shirley (that are not informal green spaces, linear open spaces, Metropolitan Open Land or Green Belt) that should be protected? Please explain why.

- SE1. How should Shirley change to help meet the need for homes and infrastructure in the borough?
- First - it is necessary to undertake localised “**Characterisation Studies**” to determine appropriate ranges of densities for the various localities within the Shirley Place in accordance with the existing and planned infrastructure as required by the London Plan Policy D1A Infrastructure requirements for **sustainable densities**.
- SE2. What other potential development sites in Shirley should the Local Plan review allocate for development?
- None
- SE3. Do you think any proposed sites in Shirley should be removed from the Local Plan review? If so, which one(s)? Please explain why.

Site ref	Name of site	Proposed use	Number of homes (if applicable)	New site (not in Croydon Local Plan 2018) applicable
90	Car park of The Sandrock public house	Residential	Up to 25	✓

This site **Ref. No: 19/01134/FUL** | Received: Mon 11 Mar 2019 | Validated: Tue 16 Apr 2019 | Status: Decided and refused - was for **19 Flats** so up to 25 dwellings would **not** be appropriate.

Also:

Between the Shirley Parish Hall, Wickham Road and westwards to the top of the dual carriageway on Shirley Road are a few remaining buildings which were part of the original Shirley Village. They are also part of Shirley’s history and are important in respect of the area’s character.

Shirley Cottage, next to the Parish Hall, was built in 1721 by John Claxton and apart from being the residence of some notable people throughout time was also the birthplace of Shirley’s first Vicar, Matthew Farrer. The Village Building/Working Men’s Club (no.35) was instigated by the Rev. William Wilks for Shirley’s ‘working men’ and built in 1889 with funds raised and donated largely by the Shirley community. The building also became Shirley’s first public lending library.

Further on are the cottages of the old village believed to date from around the mid-1800s.

- These locations should be re-designated as an area of “Historic Importance” and removed from the “*focussed Intensification*” for re-development designated area.

- SE4. What community facilities in Shirley are important to you?
- There are very limited community facilities in Shirley North Ward – for Monks Orchard Residents.
    - Communal meeting and activity clubs for elderly.
- SE5. What new community facilities are required in Shirley?
- Suggest:
    - Gymnasium;
    - Community Hall;
    - Play Activity Areas for Children;
    - Additional GP/Health Centres;
    - Homes for Elderly;
    - Clubs and organised activities for teenagers.
- SE6. Are there any green spaces in Shirley that should be protected as Local Green Spaces? Please provide evidence as to why they are irreplaceable for you.

- Shirley Bowling Green – (Spring Park) as important activity for elderly;
- All current “Allotments” as beneficial to the community and meet objectives of London Plan Chapter 8;
- All of the existing Green Spaces should be retained and protected as Local Green Spaces.
- They are important amenity spaces for fitness, environmental impact and children’s play areas, dog walking and general peace and tranquillity.
- Green areas between existing dwellings (Barnfield Avenue ‘Green’, Shirley Avenue ‘Green’ & Greenview Avenue ‘Green’).

SE7. Are there any other green areas in Shirley (that are not informal green spaces, linear open spaces, Metropolitan Open Land or Green Belt) that should be protected? Please explain why.

- All existing Allotments should be retained as allotments;
- Burial grounds (and consecrated church grounds) should be retained;
- Nature Reserves (two existing - one at Long Lane Woods at Bywood Avenue - Bird Sanctuary and the other at Glade Woods).