

Merton Council

Planning Applications Committee

22 March 2018

Supplementary agenda

20 Supplementary Agenda - Modifications

1 - 6

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Applications Committee 22nd March 2018 Supplementary Agenda - Modifications Sheet

Item 5. Deacon House, 10 Atherton Drive, SW19 5LB 17/P2878 Ward: Village

Drawing numbers (page 9).

Drawing number P_08P amend to P_08

Consultation (page 10).

Five late letters received:-

Parkside Residents Association

- Unacceptable impact of basements on ground stability and hydrology.
- Loss of mature trees and impact upon neighbours trees.
- Potential impact upon a heritage asset, 21 Calonne Road.
- Noise and nuisance from a car park in a residential area.
- Loss of amenity to neighbouring residents.
- Application lacks a construction traffic management plan.

Consultant Acting for 19 Calonne Road

- The Committee Report fails to inform the committee of the highly relevant expert advice from independent hydrologist.
- The Basement Construction method statement is unsound.
- The application fails to address concerns previously raised.

19 Calonne Road

- The application has been put on the agenda without allowing ample time to process submitted information. The owner of 19 has instructed a hydrology consultant to review the report submitted by the applicant and the report by Hydrock concludes that the submitted report by Structa does not comply with the Council's guidance on basements to ensure a safe design.

21 Calonne Road

- It is noted that following presentations it is now proposed to retain and protect the row of holly trees located at the boundary of 10 Atherton Drive and 19 and 21 Calonne road. These provide important screening between properties.
- Paragraph 37 of the submitted tree report recommends protection of trees T19 and T25, which form part of a group. However, paragraph 18 states 'Access to the rear garden may require the removal of T19 and T25 although every effort should be made to retain these trees'. This is both contradictory and unacceptable. If every effort should be made to retain them, they should be retained and that should be a requirement.
- Because there is a straight drop of approximately 1.5 m from 10 Atherton Drive to 21 Calonne Road (which is grade II listed) at this point there is a danger of a land slip if T19 and T25 were removed as their roots are securing the ground. It is therefore essential that these trees are protected and if a TPOs are not considered necessary that there should be a specific condition of any approval of the application.
- The sycamore tree T26 is actually at 25 Calonne Road and the Cypress hedge in the rear garden of 21 is also at 25 Calonne Road and thus not protected by the existing garage.

25 Calonne Road

-Although the revised tree survey will only destroy 14 trees instead of 18 on the application site, for various reasons the damage will be greater, possibly 8 trees on neighbours properties will be damaged-to be replaced by a car park for 12 vehicles and an extension for playrooms, with vegetation replaced by paving, with resultant noise and air pollution, with serious hydrogeological risk to properties nearby. The application should therefore be refused.

Recommendation (page 16).

Officers proposed amendments to conditions:

Condition 11 – to replace ‘August 2017’ with ‘January 2018’ and replace ‘03/11/2017’ with ‘26/02/2018’.

Condition 13 – to replace ‘11 meters’ with ‘14 meters’.

Condition 16 – DELETE this condition as it is already at Condition 8.

Officers proposed additional conditions:

Condition 21

Prior to commencement of development, details of the proposed design, materials and construction (including foundations design) of the basement within 5 meters of existing neighbouring trees shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason

To protect and safeguard the existing neighbouring trees in accordance with Policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2015, Policy CS 13 of Merton’s Core Planning Strategy 2011 and Policies DM D5 and DM O2 of the Adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

Item 6. Garages RO 30-40 Barnes End, New Malden KT3 6PB

17/P3989 Ward: West Barnes

Drawings (page 21)

B-01 Rev E B-02 Rev C replace B01 Rev D and B-02 Rev B

Consultation (page 24).

- Two additional representations received. No new objections.

Planning considerations (page 29)

Insert at end of paragraph 7.13

- Amended plans received: The roof lights on the rear elevation have been moved, with the bottom of the sill now at 1.5m reducing any potential overlooking/privacy concerns. It is noted that the planning officer did not consider the original sill height to cause adverse overlooking/privacy issues, however the applicant has offered the adjustment.

Item 7. Garages RO 49-55 Barnes End, New Malden KT3 6PB
17/P3991 Ward: West Barnes

Consultations (page 45).

Three additional representations received. No new objections.

Item 8. 7a Cannon Close, Raynes Park, SW20 9HA
18/P0235 Ward: West Barnes

No modifications.

Item 9. Woodman, 222 Durnsford Rd, SW19 8DR
17/P4187 Ward: Wimbledon Park

Consultation (page 74).

7 letters of support received. The letters reiterate the points raised in the other letters of support already received. This takes the total number of letters of support to 24.

Recommendation (page 90).

Conditions

The applicant has requested that the proposed conditions set out a clear distinction between conditions applicable to the public house and separately those applicable to the residential development. This will enable those related to the public house to be submitted and discharged expeditiously and so enabling the public house to be refurbished in advance of the discharge of the residential implementation conditions.

Officers confirm that there is no objection to this approach. The conditions will be worded accordingly to allow the Public House to be open asap.

Item 10. 24 The Grange, Wimbledon, SW19 4PS
17/P3581 Ward: Village

No modifications.

Item 11. Dog & Fox, High Street Wimbledon, SW19 5DX
17/P3255 Ward: Village

Planning considerations (page 133).

A clarification to the report is required at paragraph 7.8.3.

The original submission showed that a reduction in run-off rates of 8% would be achieved. The applicant was asked to investigate the potential for a greater reduction in surface water run-off and in response further attenuation measures were incorporated to achieve a 12% reduction. Whilst London Plan policies seek a 50% reduction, it should be noted that the scheme is not for a demolition and rebuild and as such there are limited opportunities to further attenuate water flow due to the built up nature of the site. Therefore, having regard to the site circumstances and the fact that surface water run-off would be improved over and above the existing situation, it is considered that the impact on surface water run-off would be acceptable in planning terms.

An amplification is required at paragraph 7.5.15.

The impact on the stables adjacent to the site requires further investigation and therefore a condition is recommended (Condition 14) to secure a more detailed Construction Management Plan. This document should be informed by an equestrian expert, such as an adviser from the British Horse Society or a similarly qualified competent person, to ensure that the impact on the welfare of horses and riders is properly taken into account.

Item 12. Standor House, 284 London Rd, Mitcham
17/P3923 Ward: Cricket Green

No modifications.

Item 13. Phoenix Hotel, 123-125 Merton Rd, SW19 1ED
17/P3551 Ward: Abbey

Consultation (page 169).

Two late letters from occupiers of Flat 2, 121 Merton Road and the management company for 1B Griffiths Road

Flat 2, 121 Merton Road

The proposal will cause loss of light to bedroom window and parking for vehicles servicing the flats may cause disturbance. Therefore object to proposal in its current form.

1B Griffiths Road

The proposal would block light to windows in flats 1 and 2 Griffiths Road.

Recommendation (page 174).

Add extra condition (16) The height of building 'C' shall not exceed 3.1 metres measured from ground level.

Reason for condition: In the interest of neighbour amenity and to comply with policies CS14 (Design) of the Adopted Merton Core Planning Strategy (2011) and DM D2 (Design Considerations in all Developments) of the Adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014).

Item 14. 49 Murray Rd, Wimbledon, SW19 4PF
17/P2820 Ward: Village

Consultation (page 180)

Five late letters have been received from 19 Homefield Road, 29, 50 Murray Road and an Architect acting for the owners of 51 Murray Road and from the owners of 29 Murray Road:

19 Homefield Road (Owner of garages and land rear of 30-36 Murray Road)

-Plans of basement lack detail.

-No details of a construction management plan.

-Increased risk of flooding.

-The existing house is a heritage asset.

-Construction traffic would affect parking.

29 Murray Road

- The basement would extend well beyond the original house under half the very large garden and is not good news for numbers 47 or 51 Murray Road as displaced water must go somewhere.
- An inspection chamber in 41 Murray Road has always flooded in bad weather.
- Common sense should prevail and the plans be dismissed.

50 Murray Road

- Previous objections still apply, with a basement covering nearly 50% of the garden risk of flooding to properties in Murray Road.

51 Murray Road

- The Architect acting for 51 Murray Road states that the boundary between properties is incorrectly shown.
- The drawings do not adequately show the elevations of 51 and only the rear of 47 despite their close proximity to major excavation works.
- The applicant has failed to provide cross sections and the longitudinal sections are schematic.
- The situation either side of the boundary showing relative depths, with such close proximity of neighbouring dwellings, is important in order to address the true impact.
- There does not appear to be any information on ground water issues.
- The proposal will cause additional noise and disruption from construction and use.
- The proposal will result in overlooking and loss of privacy.
- The owner of 51 has important ornamental trees and shrubs within 1 m of the boundary and these contribute to garden amenity and should not be harmed by development.

Recommendation (page 184).

Replace Condition 12 with the condition recommended below by the Council's Flood Risk Management Engineer.

Add the informative recommended below - to be Informative number 15.

Comments received from Council's Flood Risk Management Engineer:

- The submitted FRA is acceptable and in accordance with Policy.
- The proposed surface water drainage for the site will be limited by attenuation provision to a max flow rate of 3.9l/s.
- De-watering method should be set out in a detailed Construction Method Statement and silts and other pollutants should be removed prior to any discharge of dewatering.
- Recommend the following condition and informative:

Condition

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a detailed scheme for the provision of surface and foul water drainage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The drainage scheme will dispose of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS), the scheme shall:

- Provide information about the design storm period and intensity, attenuation and control the rate of surface water discharged from the site to no more than 3.9l/s;
- Include a timetable for its implementation;

iii. Provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development, including arrangements for adoption to ensure the schemes' operation throughout its lifetime.

No works which are the subject of this condition shall be carried out until the scheme has been approved, and the development shall not be occupied until the scheme is carried out in full. Those facilities and measures shall be retained for use at all times thereafter.

Reason

To reduce the risk of surface and foul water flooding and to ensure the scheme is in accordance with the drainage hierarchy of London Plan policies 5.12 & 5.13 and the National SuDS standards and in accordance with policies CS16 of the Core Strategy and DMF2 of the Sites and Policies Plan.

Informative

No surface water runoff should discharge onto the public highway including the public footway or highway. When it is proposed to connect to a public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary.

Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required (contact no. 0845 850 2777).

Item 15. 21 Rural Way, Streatham, SW16 6PF **17/P3153 Ward: Graveney**

No modifications.

Item 16. Land RO 4-10 South Park Rd, Wimbledon, SW19 8ST **18/P0351 Ward: Trinity**

No modifications.

Item 17. The Pavilions, Watermill Way, SW19 2RD **17/P0390 Ward: Colliers Wood**

Additional representations:

1 additional letter of objection has been received (making a total of 16), raising objection for the same reasons as those given in objection to the proposal for rooftop development at Nos.4-10 South Park Road (14/P2355).

Item 18. Planning Appeal decisions.

No modifications.

Item 19. Enforcement summary.

No modifications.