The following material has been received since the publication of the agenda for this meeting:

**Planning Application 19/01931/FUL: Claremont Court, 4 St James' Road Surbiton, KT6 4QP**

Corrections / amendments to previously published report
Ref: 19/01931/FUL - Claremont Court, 4 St James Road, Surbiton, KT6 4QP

Description of Development: Erection of a three storey residential building in the courtyard to provide 5 flats (3x1 bed and 2x2 bed) and extensions and alterations to existing building to provide 1x1 bed flat and 1x studio flat, plus associated works to enlarge an existing flat, pedestrian circulation, amenity space and bin and cycle stores on site.

Corrections/amendments to report:

- Paragraph 1, sentence 2 should read “1 response has been received which was a letter of support.”
- Paragraph 23 should read “Together the NPPF, 2019 and the London Plan, 2016 (consolidated with alterations since 2011) operate to secure development of a high quality and where applicable replace poor design with better design.”
- Paragraph 32, sentence 3 should read “It would measure approximately 23m in length and 6m in width. It would provide outdoor amenity space and seating to all residents of Claremont Court and St. James’ Court, including the future occupants of the proposed dwellings.”
- Paragraph 33, sentence 5 should read “As to the new entrance the glass entrance doors would be sheltered by a new canopy and the associated signage would comprise bronze coloured metal”
- Paragraph 47, sentence 5 should read: “Overall, the proposals would not create an unacceptable sense of enclosure.”
- Paragraph 52 should read: “Despite an increase in the built form across the site, the proposed development is considered to ensure a good standard of amenity in compliance with Paragraph 127 of the NPPF, 2019, Policy 7.6 of the London Plan, 2016 and Policy DM10 of the LDF Core Strategy, 2012.”
- Paragraph 63, sentence 1 should read: “In this case the applicant has not submitted any information to demonstrate how the proposed development would achieve the required reductions in C02 and internal water usage.”
- The site boundary on page 1 of the Committee Report was incorrectly drawn. For the avoidance of doubt, the red line does not include Lloyds Bank: