

All minutes are draft until agreed at the next meeting of the committee/panel. To find out the date of the next meeting please check the calendar of events at your local library or online at [www.merton.gov.uk/committee](http://www.merton.gov.uk/committee).

## PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

13 OCTOBER 2016

(7.15 pm - 10.32 pm)

PRESENT Councillor Linda Kirby (Chair), Councillor John Bowcott,  
Councillor David Dean, Councillor Philip Jones,  
Councillor Andrew Judge, Councillor Najeeb Latif,  
Councillor Peter Southgate, Councillor Geraldine Stanford and  
Councillor Imran Uddin

ALSO PRESENT Neil Milligan  
Sue Wright  
Jonathan Lewis  
Chris Chowns  
Lisa Jewell

### 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Abigail Jones

### 2 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST (Agenda Item 2)

There were no declarations of pecuniary interest.

Councillor John Bowcott made a statement to inform the Committee that he had Chaired the Design Review Panel meeting that considered one of the applications on the agenda (Item 7) but he did not take part in the debate or vote on the proposal.

Councillor David Dean made a statement to inform the Committee that his son was a member of Wimbledon RFC (Item 5). Although this wasn't a pecuniary interest, Councillor Dean left the Chamber for the duration of this item.

Neil Milligan, Planning Manager, declared that he had once played Rugby at Wimbledon RFC.

### 3 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Agenda Item 3)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2016 are agreed as an accurate record.

### 4 TOWN PLANNING APPLICATIONS - COVERING REPORT (Agenda Item 4)

The published Agenda and Supplementary Agenda tabled at the meeting form part of the Minutes:

a) Supplementary Agenda: A list of modifications for agenda items 6, 8, 9, and 10 were published as a supplementary agenda.

b) Verbal Representations: The Committee received verbal representations detailed in the minutes for the relevant item.

c) Order of the Agenda – The Chair amended to order of items to the following: 8,10,7,5,6,9,11,12, 13 and 14

5 WIMBLEDON RFC, BARHAM ROAD, SW20 (Agenda Item 5)

Proposal: Application for variation of Condition 2 (Approved Plans) attached to LBM Planning Permission Ref.14/P1995 (Dated 24/7/2016) relating to the variation of approved plans in respect of an increase in height of the single storey side extension.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation and verbal representations from two objectors to application and the applicant.

Members asked officers to clarify the situation, Officers explained that the single storey building had been built at a height 400mm higher than the scheme approved in 2014. Local residents who objected had measured this to be 900mm, but Planning Officers were sure that it was 400mm. The reason for this increase in height was that a parapet wall had been added to accommodate a water drainage system from the flat roof. Members also noted that the set back of the extension had been reduced from 2m to 1.5m, when comparing the actual building to the approved plans. However Officers did not think that this change caused sufficient detriment to neighbours as to warrant a refusal.

RESOLVED

1. The Committee voted to GRANT variation of conditions
2. The Committee requested that Officers look at the approved Conditions regarding the use of the Flat Roof and if necessary add a condition to prevent access, except for maintenance

6 20 BELVEDERE GROVE, WIMBLEDON, SW19 7RL (Agenda Item 6)

Proposal: Erection of rear extensions at ground, first and second floor levels and construction of basement beneath rear extensions

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation and additional information in the Supplementary agenda. The Committee received verbal presentations from an objector to the application and the applicant.

Officers asked members to note the Planning Inspectors comments in his appeal decision, appended to the agenda report, which stated that the previous application did not have an unacceptable impact on the immediate neighbours. He did, however, think that the previous application lacked 'spaciousness' around the building and that

this had a negative effect on the setting within the Conservation Area. The current application has a new roof design that is reduced in bulk and massing and respects the proportions of the building. This roof would have a significantly different appearance from the street, and that this addressed the issues of 'spaciousness'.

Members asked officers about the type of piles to be used in the construction of the basement, Officers said they would add a condition requesting the use of vibration reducing piles

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT permission subject to conditions

7 247 THE BROADWAY, WIMBLEDON, SW19 1SD (Agenda Item 7)

Proposal: Demolition of existing office building and construction of a new five storey office building (Class B1 use) together with associated car/cycle parking and landscaping.

The Committee noted the officers report and presentation and additional information in the Supplementary Agenda. The Committee received verbal representations from three objectors to the application, the Agent and Architect to the application, and Councillors Katy Neep and Charlie Chirico.

Objectors made comments including:

- Out of keeping with the surrounding buildings
- Too high - 2 storeys higher than neighbours
- Will take sunlight and light from Trinity Church, especially in the winter months
- Not a good design – unsympathetic with cheap garish materials
- DRP said glass and metal cladding is too much of a contrast with the other buildings in the area
- Will be overbearing on an area that is currently a vibrant and dynamic family area
- Goes against social cohesion in the area
- Set too far forward
- Want to see some greenery

In reply the Planning Officer Commented that the Church is not residential and therefore it cannot be given the same protection as a residential property would be for daylight and sunlight. There are a variety of materials used in the design which is a modern design and not in a conservation area

The Agent to the application made comments including:

- It is a Policy Compliant development and residents said that they wanted offices only.
- There is an existing permission for this land but it is a mixed use development.
- Light levels for the Church are not required because it is not residential

The Architect to the application made comments including:

- It is simple light contemporary building
- The external cladding is glass and can be in much softer colours than shown on plans
- The building has an active frontage that references Wimbledon Town Centre
- It is designed to revitalise the area
- It is 'smart' building with a very good BREEAM rating
- It is not as tall as the YMCA building

Councillor Katy Neep made comments including:

- Does not comply with Merton Core Strategy
- Modern block out of context with its surroundings in terms of its height, bulk and mass
- Will not enhance the area – particularly when consider how the area is used by the community
- Visibly higher than surrounding buildings and so not in keeping
- We do have a Masterplan for this area that is not yet in place

Councillor Chirico made comments including:

- To say it's not as high as YMCA is not acceptable, as this building is in the middle of a community hub
- Applicant said they looked to Town Centre when designing this building but this is not the Town Centre,
- It is a key part of The Broadway where key services are provided
- Want to see a low rise, high quality development with brick not glass

Officers asked the Committee to note that there is currently no approved masterplan or height guidelines for development in this area.

Members asked about the DRP (Design Review Panel) comments – they asked for a reduction in height by one storey and also said that it was too different from its neighbours. Officers said that the sixth storey had been reduced and incorporated but not removed, it would not be seen from the street but could be seen from the gardens of properties on the other side of the road.

Members asked about the existing approved scheme and noted that the scheme being considered tonight was taller and bigger but a more attractive design. The new scheme mirrored the extant scheme at the back.

Members Commented:

- They did not want to see anything larger than the extant scheme
- This application was too big and too high
- Design of building not good enough to overcome the other objections
- The extant scheme was proportional and balanced, this scheme is not
- This proposal does not relate to its neighbours; it ignores its neighbours. DRP commented that it did not take heed of its neighbours
- DRP commented that this Scheme is too different from its neighbours
- Would like to see some greenery

## RESOLVED

The Committee agreed to:

1. REFUSE the application for the following reasons:
  - Unacceptable height, size, bulk, and massing of the proposed building
  - Design does not relate to neighbouring buildings
2. DELEGATE to the Director of Environment & Regeneration the authority to make any appropriate amendments in the context of the above to the wording of the grounds of refusal including references to appropriate policies

## 8 144 CENTRAL ROAD, MORDEN SM4 5RL (Agenda Item 8)

Proposal: Change of Use from Class A4 (Public House) to Class A5 (Hot Food Takeaway) together with shopfront alterations and installation of air condensers and extraction flue

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation and additional information in the Supplementary agenda. The Committee received a verbal representation from an objector and the agent to the application.

Members asked officers about the extraction and condenser units and the potential for noise nuisance. The Planning Officer explained that Environmental Health had approved the units based on manufacturer's data and therefore condition 9 required all plant to be maintained and operated in accordance with the manufacturer instructions

Members asked about the opening hours of the previous Public House use and noted that these finished at 11pm. Members asked for the opening hours of the proposal to be reduced to 11pm. Members also asked for a condition to be added regarding maintaining cleanliness in the vicinity of the proposed business.

## RESOLVED

The Committee voted unanimously to GRANT permission subject to conditions in the report and additional conditions to be attached:

- Hours of opening be reduced to 11am-11pm
- Cleanliness of the external area to be maintained by applicant

9 1A COURTHOPE ROAD, WIMBLEDON, SW19 7RH (Agenda Item 9)

Proposal: Demolition of existing four storey building and erection of new four storey building with accommodation arranged over five levels including semi-basement and accommodation within the roof space comprising 9 x two bedroom self-contained flats together with associated car parking and landscaping.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation, a verbal presentation from an objector to the application and the agent to the application.

Members commented that the proposed building was preferable to the existing building. There was sympathy for local residents owing to the length of the construction period but members noted that conditions required a construction method statement which would aim to reduce the issues residents were concerned about.

Members commented that other Planning Authorities levy additional fees for basements given the additional inspection requirements and asked officers to consider this.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted unanimously to GRANT permission subject to completion of a S.106 Agreement and conditions

10 91 OAKLEIGH WAY, MITCHAM, CR4 1AW (Agenda Item 10)

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension, rear roof extension and hip to gable roof extension, 2 x rooflights to the front roof slope. New roof over existing front porch and bay window, and erection of ancillary outbuilding in the rear garden.

The Committee noted the officers report and presentation and the information contained in the Supplementary Agenda. The Committee received verbal representations from an Objector and the Agent to the application.

The Objector raised residents' concerns including:

- Why was the main entrance on the first floor
- The Plans do not allow for a single dwelling

- The written description does not match what is shown in the plans.

Members commented on the number of bedrooms proposed and that the house was unlikely to be able to provide enough amenity space if all bedrooms were occupied.

Members commented on the lack of annotation on the plans and that it was difficult to understand how the internal layout could be used as a family house, and how the incidental use of the outbuilding would relate to the main dwellinghouse.

Members commented that the design of the roof and extension seemed overbearing compared to the plot size. The extension and outbuilding left very little amenity space for residents.

RESOLVED

The Committee agreed to:

1. REFUSE the application for the following reasons:
  - Unacceptable bulk, mass and design of the roof
  - Design of the outbuilding
2. DELEGATE to the Director of Environment & Regeneration the authority to make any appropriate amendments in the context of the above to the wording of the grounds of refusal including references to appropriate policies

11 42 PARKSIDE GARDENS, WIMBLEDON, SW19 5ET (Agenda Item 11)

Proposal: Installation of eight photovoltaic solar panels (retrospective)

The Committee noted the officers report and presentation, a verbal representation from an Objector and from the Agent to the application. The Planning Officer explained that the original application had only sought green roofs on 2 of the lower roofs, not the main flat roof of the building, but that a revision had been approved showing all the flat roofs as green roofs. The house as built has green roofs on 3 of the lower roofs and therefore has more green roof elements than the original approval. If the panels were 6.5 cm lower they could be added under permitted development rights. The objector raised residents' concerns, as detailed in the report. The Agent explained that the panels were sited to minimise the effect on the surroundings.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning permission subject to conditions

12 19 WILMORE END, SOUTH WIMBLEDON, SW19 3DE (Agenda Item 12)

Proposal: Erection of a two storey side extension, extending beyond front wall of dwellinghouse.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation.

Members asked officers about the Parking and Delivery Management Plan for the Construction of the development and noted that this plan would suggest that smaller vehicles and loads would be better suited to this development given its access arrangements. The Transport Planning Officer did not advise that parking be conditioned for the construction phase.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted unanimously to GRANT permission subject conditions

13 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS (Agenda Item 13)

RESOLVED

The Committee received the Report

14 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - SUMMARY OF CURRENT CASES (Agenda Item 14)

RESOLVED

The Committee received the Report