

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

22 MARCH 2018

(19.15 - 11.50 pm)

PRESENT Councillors Councillor Linda Kirby (in the Chair),  
Councillor Najeeb Latif, Councillor Philip Jones,  
Councillor Laxmi Attawar, Councillor Peter Southgate,  
Councillor Stephen Crowe, Councillor Andrew Judge,  
Councillor Geraldine Stanford and Councillor Joan Henry and  
Councillor John Bowcott

ALSO PRESENT Councillor Gilli Lewis-Lavender  
Councillor Brian Lewis-Lavender  
Councillor Hamish Badenoch  
Neil Milligan – Building and Development Control Manager  
Tim Bryson – Planning Team Leader North  
Tim Lipscomb – Planning Officer  
Sarath Attanayke – Transport Planning Officer  
Lisa Jewell – Democratic Services Officer

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor David Dean.  
Councillor John Bowcott attended as Substitute

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

Councillor Geraldine Stanford declared that she had an interest in Item 17, and that she would not take part in the discussion or vote on that item.

Councillor Linda Kirby declared that she had an interest in Item 17, and that she would not take part in the discussion or vote on that item, and that she would leave The Chair for that item.

Accordingly for Item 17 both Councillors sat away from the Committee.

Councillor Najeeb Latif declared that he had an interest in Item 13, as he owns a property that borders the application site, and so he would not participate in that item and left the chamber for the duration of the item.

Councillor John Bowcott made a statement to inform the Committee that he Chaired the Design Review Panel meeting that considered Item 17, but he did not take part in the debate or vote on the proposal

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

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 February are agreed as an accurate record.

#### 4 TOWN PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Agenda Item 4)

Supplementary Agenda: Amendments and modifications to the Officer's report were published in a Supplementary Agenda. This applied to items 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, and 17

Order of the meeting – The Chair announced that the order of items taken at the meeting would be: 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 9, 12, 15, 18 and 19

#### 5 DEACON HOUSE, 10 ATHERTON DRIVE, SW19 5LB (Agenda Item 5)

Proposal: Erection of a new detached garage with basement car park and erection of a two storey side extension with basement games room.

The Committee noted the officers report and presentation and additional information in the Supplementary Agenda. The Planning Team Leader introduced the application and stated that the Basement Car Park was not to be used for commercial purposes, would have parking for 8 cars and had a depth of 4.4m from ground to floor level. The House Basement would have a depth of 3.2m from ground to floor level.

The Committee received verbal representations from two objectors to the application, the Applicant's Agent and the Ward Councillor Hamish Badenoch.

Leon Fattal, a local resident, raised objections to the application including:

- The application fails to meet Merton Council's own Policy on Basement developments
- There is no Basement Impact assessment as required by policy DMD2, and the application is not compliant with this policy
- The proposal presents a serious risk of subsidence
- There are uncertain ground water flows
- The application will damage 14 trees on the site and 8 trees on Neighbouring sites
- The trees are an important part of the Conservation Area and are of significant amenity value
- The new condition 21 will do nothing to prevent this
- Why is there no Traffic Management Plan

Matthew McFeely, a lawyer representing local residents made points including:

- Our expert reports raise serious concerns
- The Officer's report takes the view that nothing can be said by the experts employed by the objectors

- It would be unlawful to grant permission based on the Officer's report
- There is crucial information missing, there is no Basement Impact Assessment and basic information, the depth of the basement, is missing
- The only experts who meet the qualification standards to advise on subsidence are those employed by the objectors
- There is no rational to proceed with this application, the Committee cannot accept the Officer's report

The Applicant's Agent made points including:

- Application has been with The Council for 8 Months now
- 25 of the representations received come from the same three properties
- All of the applicant's surveys have been prepared by experts
- The application will not impact on the Conservation Area or Listed Buildings
- Trees will not be harmed, trees close to the site have been assessed. The application will result in an increase in trees, with native species being planted
- Council Officers have no objections, Merton's Basement Policy is clear and has been complied with
- A detailed Basement Construction Method Statement has been submitted
- Site Specific Flood Risk has been assessed as no risk
- There are no recorded issues with surface water
- Measures for mitigating flood risk are in place, and the flood risk officer has no objections
- The Proposal will not impact on neighbours or the Conservation Area
- All of the neighbour objections will be dealt with either by condition or through Building Regulations
- All necessary information has been on the Council's website since September

Councillor Hamish Badenoch made points including:

- There are many holes in this application
- Why was no Basement impact Assessment submitted despite the scale of the application?
- Why does the report not make reference to the objectors' expert reports?
- Why is there no clear consideration of the potential for flooding?
- Why is the Basement Impact Assessment only required after approval?
- Why approve an application that does not meet Council policies DMD2 and SPD9?

- If approved this will expose Neighbours and The Council to risk

### Members' Questions

Members asked does this application meet DMD2 and does DMD2 require a Basement Impact Assessment?

Officers replied that DMD2 does not actually request a Basement Impact Assessment but does say what needs to be assessed, further details are required later in the process. The Development Manager added that the Basement Impact Assessment is a general term for a collection of statements. We have Hydrology, Geology and Construction Statements and Officers are satisfied with these. There is one final statement required and that is a detailed Construction Plan.

A Member Asked if there had been procedural unfairness with this application?

Officers replied that the Application was withdrawn from the February Meeting because there was one piece of information missing.

The Heights of the Basement have always been on the website.

Officers are satisfied that the procedure has been correct

A member asked what are the distances between the outside edge of the basement and the foundations of the listed building at number 21 Calonne Road, and Officers gave the figures as measured from the plans

A member asked why are two sides geological reports so different?

The Planning Team leader said he did not know but that Council Engineer has considered and is satisfied with the applicant's expert reports.

A member asked what does London Plan say about max number of parking spaces?

Officers replied that London Plan seeks to limit parking spaces in order to limit car movement. This application is a special circumstance as the cars are a personal classic car collection being stored. There is an additional condition to make the use ancillary to the dwelling

A Member commented that care is needed as the application is so close to a Grade II listed building and asked why Officers were relaxed about ignoring the paperwork of the objectors

The Development and Building Control Manager replied:

- The proposed basement is at least 4 to 5 m away from the foundations of the listed building.
- The Council's experts have looked at the impact of the scheme on hydrology, flooding and trees and they have no objections.
- Still have to look at Construction, but this basement is independent in the garden.

- If minded to approve the application, Member's could delegate authority to the Director of Environment and Regeneration so that a legal view could be sought on the application process
- The use of the basement is ancillary to the house

Members made comments including:

- Landowners can use their land in any way that is compatible with planning policy and the law
- If due process has been followed then there are no objections to this application
- Support a process that there is a legal view on the application before final approval.
- Concern that there is so much of a difference between the geological reports of the applicant and objectors.
- Other London Boroughs require a Basement Impact Assessment and Traffic Management Plan before consideration
- It would be very difficult to enforce Domestic use, but there is no sustainable reason for refusal

## RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions in the officer's report and to delegate authority for the final decision to the Director of Environment and Regeneration in order that he can consider the legal issues raised.

## 6 GARAGES RO 30-40 BARNES END, NEW MALDEN KT3 6PB (Agenda Item 6)

Proposal: Demolition of 24 garages and construction 2 x new 3 bedroom dwellings with associated parking and landscaping.

The Committee noted the officers report and presentation and additional information in the Supplementary Agenda. The Committee received verbal representations from two objectors, the Applicant's Agent and a Ward Councillor

The Objectors raised residents' concerns including:

- The proposed development would cause visual intrusion to neighbours, and would reduce amenity and privacy. The new properties would impact on privacy and would look straight into existing bedrooms and gardens.
- The development will have significant impact on an existing wall, and it should be conditioned that this must be rebuilt.
- The proposals are too high, bulky and their massing is too great

- The design is inappropriate - especially the windows
- Acknowledge the need for housing but these units will be too small
- There is resident demand for garage parking

The Applicant's Agent made points including:

- The application will not cause any direct overlooking
- Off street parking will be provided
- Windows have been repositioned following Officer comments
- There will be no reduction in light to neighbouring properties
- Existing Garages are very run down
- The development will improve safety in the area, it will be highly sustainable with green roofs and photovoltaic panels. The development meets all planning policy requirements.

Ward Councillor Brian Lewis Lavender made points including:

- It is extremely dangerous that emergency vehicles cannot reach the proposed properties
- The proposal does not have enough space for refuse collection and wheelie bins
- Access will be across private land
- Screening for privacy using planting will not be practical

The Building and Development Manager made points in answer to the objectors comments:

- The proposed development will be the same height as existing properties
- The application has assessed overlooking, and found no reason for objection
- The Boundary Wall is not listed and so can only be protected by informative
- Obscured glass will be used in side windows
- There is no policy to protect garage parking

In reply to Member's questions Officers replied:

- The Access Road is not wide enough for all Emergency Vehicles to get close to the proposed houses. However Building Regulations say that Fire Engines must be able to get within 45m of a property, and then hoses can be used if necessary. In this case a Fire Engine could get to within 20m of the proposed properties.
- Anecdotal evidence says that the existing garages are used purely for storage and not for cars, therefore there is no issue with parking of displaced cars.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

7 GARAGES RO 49-55 BARNES END, NEW MALDEN KT3 6PB (Agenda Item 7)

Proposal: Demolition of 9 garages and construction 1 x new 2 bedroom dwellings with associated parking and landscaping.

The Committee noted the officers report and presentation. The Committee received verbal presentations from two objectors, the applicant's agent and ward councillor

The Objectors made points including:

- The proposed property is ugly and shoehorned into a small space
- It will impact on the view and amenity of existing houses, it will cause privacy issues, overshadowing and noise
- There will be issues collecting the bins, currently the refuse lorry has to reverse down to collect.
- The current parking situation is dire. The turning circle is already full of parked cars
- Current residents have not been allowed to rent garages
- The Officer's report is wrong; there are 55 maisonettes neighbouring the site – not 26 Semi-detached houses
- The approach is only 2.7m wide – which is a fire safety breach

The Applicant's Agent made points including:

- This application is for a single storey house
- It exceeds London Plan Standards,
- It will not impact on Car Parking
- There will be a flat roof – it will not impact on Daylight or Sunlight
- The development will improve safety in the area, it will be highly sustainable with green roofs and photovoltaic panels. The development meets all planning policy requirements.

Ward Councillor Gilli Lewis Lavender made comments including:

- This is an ugly building, and is too big for the small site, and is not in keeping with the area
- It is intrusive as it will be sited right up to the neighbours fence
- There is a glaring error in the report - there are 55 maisonettes neighbouring the site – not 26 Semi-detached houses
- It will make parking issues even greater

- Impossible for Fire Engines to get to the proposed property
- Nobody knows where the nearest Fire Hydrants is

In answer to objector points and members questions officers replied:

- This is a modern single storey building, it is considered acceptable, and cannot overlook as single storey
- Fire Engines do not have to get to right outside a house. Under Building Regulations Fire Engines must be able to get within 45 m of properties; they can then attach their hoses to a fire hydrant. This is not uncommon.
- The Amenity Space is south east facing
- There are roof lights in the proposed property and overall the internal light is considered acceptable.

Members commented that:

- Have to accept this type of backland development, where property is 'shoehorned in'.
- The design of the building is unattractive and hostile
- Worry about the living conditions inside the proposed bungalow

## RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

8 7A CANNON CLOSE, RAYNES PARK, SW20 9HA (Agenda Item 8)

Proposal: Erection of a first floor and two storey side extension.

The Committee noted the officers report and presentation. The Committee received verbal presentations from two objectors to the application, the applicant's agent and a two ward councillors.

The Objectors made points including:

- The existing bungalow was built as a backland development, would it be permitted today.
- Would not object to a refurbishment of the original bungalow
- This application will double the volume of the property, and cause overlooking and a loss of privacy to neighbours
- Trees will be removed
- Neighbours' windows will now face a high wall



- The proposal will be twice the size of the existing house and much larger than the surrounding houses
- The proposal is contrary to Merton Policies regarding bulk , scale and overdevelopment

The Applicant's Architect made points including:

- The new first floor has been carefully designed to not overlook – there are no windows that face neighbouring properties
- The site is 410m<sup>2</sup> , the current footprint is 76m<sup>2</sup> and the proposed footprint is 90m<sup>2</sup> , so therefore it occupies less than 25% of the plot.
- The property will not cause overshadowing. There are trees on the boundary with Heath Drive
- The proposal will be the same height as other buildings on Cannon Close.

Ward Councillor Gilli Lewis Lavender made points including:

- Photos of the existing bungalow should have been shown at this meeting
- Do not agree with some of the distances quoted by officers
- This is overdevelopment, with no consideration given to the neighbours
- Windows will give rise to overlooking
- Residents should not be affected by Planning Applications

Ward Councillor Brian Lewis Lavender made points including:

- The entrance road is very narrow and could get blocked by an ambulance, being so near to a Doctor's Surgery
- Proposed property does not have any parking
- The plot is very small, in the past only a bungalow was allowed.

In reply to the Objectors Comments, The Building and Development Control Manager made points including:

- In reply to points about overlooking, the windows are acceptable, some may overlook but the separation distances of 40m make these acceptable
- It is larger than other properties in the street, but sits on a large plot
- Car parking is already available
- The application will cover 25 to 30% of the plot.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

9 WOODMAN, 222 DURNSFORD RD, SW19 8DR (Agenda Item 9)

Proposal: Refurbishment of existing public house including new garden area following demolition of single storey side and rear extensions. Creation of 18 new residential units, comprising the erection of two storey buildings with accommodation within the roof space fronting the crescent (7 houses) and erection of a 3 storey block of flats fronting Durnsford Road (11 x 1 bedroom flats), and associated car parking, landscaping and alterations to the highway.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation and additional information in the Supplementary Agenda – Modifications.

Members asked officers if there could be conditions to ensure that the Pub buildings are occupied and not left empty or subject to a change of use. Officers commented that it is difficult to condition issues that are business decisions, however they would talk to the applicants and asked for the wording of a suitable condition to be delegated to officers. Officers said that if a change of use was proposed that application would come back to committee.

Members commented that this scheme is to be applauded.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted unanimously to GRANT Planning Permission subject to S106 agreement and conditions in the officers report, re-worded conditions to accommodate the public house alterations/refurbishments and an additional condition regarding the Pub and its occupation and use be delegated to officers

The Director of Environment and Regeneration be given delegated authority to agree the detail and wording of the re-worded conditions and the additional condition

10 24 THE GRANGE, WIMBLEDON, SW19 4PS (Agenda Item 10)

Proposal: Erection of a single storey extension to east and south west elevations, a two storey extension to west elevation, excavation of basement and reconfiguration of second floor and erection of dormer windows, including amalgamation of the coach house at 24A The Grange with 24 The Grange

The Committee noted the officers report and presentation. The Committee received verbal representations from two objectors to the application, the Applicant's agent and the Ward Councillor.

The Objectors made points including:

- The application property and its surrounding Edwardian properties are all locally listed
- This application does not respect the space between the buildings

- The proposed frontage will not improve the streetscene
- The temporary fencing installed by the new owner impacts on rear of neighbours house
- The application will cause visual intrusion and will block light.
- The house is already large. The above ground extension would cause a loss of privacy to neighbours.
- The basement is enormous and would present a flood risk
- Seven mature trees have already been removed. Removal of trees should be part of the planning application

The Applicant's agent made comments including:

- Property sits on large site
- Current building has a negative impact on the Conservation Area
- The Basement application has been amended and is 4m away from neighbours, there is a Basement Impact Assessment
- The Coach house is ancillary to the main property
- There will be no loss of trees, the frontage will be landscaped and additional trees planted
- The Council's Conservation Officer had no objections to the proposal

The Ward Councillor, Hamish Badenoch made comments including:

- Do not underestimate the scale, bulk massing and loss of space of the proposal. It will cause visual intrusion and affect the rhythm of the streetscene
- It is not an appropriate design in the Conservation Area
- It will cause a loss of neighbour amenity
- The proposed façade is one continuous block, but the Coach House should be kept separate

The Planning Team Leader replied to the Objectors Comments:

- Officers are recommending this application for approval because the extension is single storey and the spaciousness is respected. The linkage of the Coach House to the main house is sympathetic and the impact on the Conservation Area is not harmful
- There is a Basement Impact Assessment, and the Council's Flood Risk Engineer has no objections.
- On the plan the building height is the same as existing
- Regrettable that the trees have been removed, but the proposal will add new trees

In reply to Members Questions the Planning Team Leader said:

- The proposed basement follows the footprint of the existing house and the proposed extension.
- The existing chimney is to be retained at the same height, any increase in height would be an enforcement issue.

Members made comments including:

- It is a big house and fills the plot. Spaces are a large part of the Conservation Area
- The proposed Roof is enormous, with a lot of accommodation in it.
- The whole proposed frontage will dominate, the bulk is inappropriate
- The link between the Coach house and Main house is a mistake
- The Coach House is worth preserving, there is nothing to mitigate for it's loss
- In a Conservation Area, Members can impose stricter judgement

The Planning And Development Manager reminded Members that the Council's Conservation Officer did not object to the proposal.

A motion to refuse on the grounds of Bulk, Massing and being detrimental to the character of the Conservation Area was proposed and seconded and put to the vote.

RESOLVED

The Committee agreed to:

1. REFUSE the application for the following reasons:
  - The bulk and massing, of the proposal are too great, contrary to LBM policies.
  - The proposal would be detrimental to the character of its setting in the Conservation Area
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 DOG & FOX, HIGH STREET WIMBLEDON, SW19 5DX (Agenda Item 11)

Proposal: Extensions and alterations to the Dog & Fox Public House including for the amalgamation and change of use of Bayee Village to create additional dining space for the Public House; and extensions at first and second floor level to create 12 additional hotel rooms

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

The Objector, the owner of the adjoining stables raised points including:

- Concern about the scale and size of the proposal – is there the need for this proposal
- The Construction phase will affect the horses – not just the noise but also vibrations
- There has been a blatant disregard of horse behaviour
- There will be issues for Horses and riders exiting and entering the stables during the construction phase, with horses getting trapped in the stationary traffic
- Developers have a casual attitude to Horse and Rider safety

The Applicant's Agent made points including:

- The proposed extension is set back to create a buffer and maintain views
- A key objective has been to minimise impact of construction on the stables. There is no demolition work, and a draft construction management plan has been checked by an equestrian expert
- Young's will appoint contractors to manage and carry out all works.

In answer to Members' Questions, Officers replied:

- Transport Planners have undertaken a study which shows that the overnight parking requirements for the 12 Hotel Rooms can be accommodated on surrounding streets
- A Construction Traffic Management Plan is required by a pre-commencement condition
- The Conditions relating to the Construction phase could be bolstered to take further account of the concerns regarding horses and the stables. These could be considered by an equine specialist and the Stable Owners consulted.
- Officers could investigate if there are suitable alternative accesses to the stables for horses to use during the construction phase.

Members made comments including:

- The proposal will be a vast improvement and far more attractive. It is important that the Pub wants to succeed and provide good quality hotel rooms
- Concerned about the impact of Construction on the Horses, the contractor needs to be considerate

## RESOLVED

The Committee voted:

- A. To GRANT Planning Permission subject to the conditions in the Officer's Report
- B. That relevant Conditions be strengthened in order to minimise the affects of the construction phase on the Horses at the adjoining Stables . The wording of such Conditions is delegated to the Director of Environment and Regeneration.

## 12 STANDOR HOUSE, 284 LONDON RD, MITCHAM (Agenda Item 12)

Proposal: Erection of an additional two floors resulting in a six storey building for the creation of 10 additional flats

The Committee noted the officers report and presentation and additional information in the Supplementary Agenda - Modifications

Members commented that the proposal would improve the appearance of the application block

## RESOLVED

The Committee voted unanimously to GRANT Planning Permission subject to the completion of a S106 agreement and conditions.

## 13 PHOENIX HOTEL, 123-125 MERTON RD, SW19 1ED (Agenda Item 13)

Proposal: Application for outline planning permission for the demolition of the existing hotel and the erection of a five storey building comprising 21 flats (11 x 1 bedroom and 10 x two bedroom) and 1 x two bedroom and 1 x three bedroom detached houses and associated access and parking (Access, site layout and scale of development to be considered, with appearance and landscaping reserved matters).

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation and information ion the supplementary agenda. The Committee received a verbal representation from an objector to the application and the applicant's agent.

The Objector was Abdul Latif who declared that as he had a financial interest in a property in Wesley Court he was speaking as a member of the public and not in his role as Ward Councillor. He declared that he was only representing his own views and would leave the Council Chamber as soon as he had finished speaking. He made points including:

- The application is too tall, hugely overbearing and the massing too great

- Concerned about Block C which will directly impact on Wesley Court as it will be 3.8 m tall and is only 1m away from the rear of properties of Wesley Court. The existing wall is only 2.9m high and has frosted glass blocks to allow light in
- Access to the development is too narrow

The Applicant's agent made points including:

- The site is family owned and the current Hotel is no longer viable
- The proposal will bring benefits to the area and is a good use of the site
- Car parking and noise associated with the hotel will cease, and views from neighbouring buildings will improve
- There is already overlooking in the area, and the flats at number 121 will no longer be looking at an air conditioning unit
- Block A is a similar height to the proposal, Block B is only 2 storey with a mansard roof.

In reply to Members Questions Officers made points including:

- The existing buildings are not attractive and there is no policy to retain hotels. All existing buildings are to be demolished and the site built on including the existing car park
- units are to be offered as affordable housing – the scheme has been through a viability assessment process
- The proposed lightwells are 3m across and there are other windows. Although light to the second bedrooms may be slightly compromised this is not unusual for such a town centre setting
- The proposed block C would only be 3.1m tall behind Wesley Court. The figure of 3.8m include excavation. The wall behind Wesley Court is 2.9m tall and very thick, therefore the 20cm of extra height on block C will have no impact on Wesley Court. This is controlled by Condition and Officers are reasonably confident that it will not have an impact.

Members commented that Block C would have an affect on the light to Wesley Court but also they had concerns regarding the quality of the accommodation provided by Block C.

**RESOLVED**

The Committee voted unanimously to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions.

14     49 MURRAY RD, WIMBLEDON, SW19 4PF (Agenda Item 14)

Proposal: Excavation of basement level extension, erection of single storey rear extension, a first floor rear extension and erection of new front porch.

The Committee noted the officers report and presentation and information in the Supplementary Agenda – Modifications. Members noted that Supplementary Agenda included a Condition recommended by the Council's Flood Risk Engineer, which replaces Condition 12 in the original report, and an additional informative. The Committee received a verbal presentation from a lawyer representing residents and from the Applicant's agent.

The Objector raised residents' concerns including:

- There are deficiencies in the Officers report
- The drawings referenced are not available
- The drawings are not consistent with each other
- The Council's own policy says that there should be 1m of soil above any approved basement but this proposal does not provide this
- The Officer Report is silent on the SPD Basement Construction
- The area is an archaeological Priority Zone,
- Number of these points could trigger a Judicial Review, as policy has not been followed

The Agent made points including:

- The Basement will meet all elements of policy
- There will be a basement construction method statement
- There are already a number of basements in Murray Road
- Building Regs/Party Wall agreements will be complied with
- From the cross- section drawing it can be seen that there is more than 1m of soil above the basement
- The Council's Flood Risk Officer has no objections
- Conditions 10 and 11 will cover the construction

The Planning Team Leader drew the Committees attention to Plan PO8

RESOLVED

The Committee voted unanimously to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions



15 21 RURAL WAY, STREATHAM, SW16 6PF (Agenda Item 15)

Proposal: Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 3 x 3 bed terraced dwellings with car parking

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation

Members commented that the proposed houses appeared to be very small and that three houses on this site was overdevelopment. However Members also noted that the houses met all space standards, and were policy compliant.

A motion to Refuse by reason of overdevelopment was proposed and seconded but was not carried by the vote

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

16 LAND RO 4-10 SOUTH PARK RD, WIMBLEDON, SW19 8ST (Agenda Item 16)

Proposal: Demolition of garages on land rear of 4-10 South Park Road and erection of 4 x dwellinghouses with gardens and 4 x parking spaces.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation.

The Ward Councillor, Abdul Latif, raised residents' concerns including:

- This application if approved would set a precedent in the area for similar developments which would have a future impact on the Borough
- This application is seeking residential units in an already densely populated area
- Local infrastructure is already over stretched
- Object to the layout of the proposed housing – it is cramped, overdeveloped and out of keeping with the area
- The entry road is too narrow

Members asked officers about access for Fire Officers and noted that this was a matter for Building Regulations but that it was very likely that the proposal would be less than 40m from a fire hydrant and therefore the fire services hoses would reach the properties.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to s.106 agreement and conditions

## 17 THE PAVILIONS, WATERMILL WAY, SW19 2RD (Agenda Item 17)

Proposal: Demolition of temporary pavilions and erection of a part 4 part 5 storey building to create office space (class b1a) and ground units for use within class a3 (cafes and restaurants) and class b1a (offices)

The Committee noted the officers report and presentation and information in the Supplementary Agenda. The Committee received verbal representations from an objector to the application, the applicant's agent and the Ward Councillor, Nick Draper.

The Objector made points including:

- The DRP gave it an amber
- The proposal is too big and too tall, it would loom over the traditional heritage area of Abbey Mills
- The proposal does not respect the character of the Conservation Area
- It will obstruct the public realm
- Current businesses say that rented offices will not generate additional footfall

The Applicant's Agent made points including:

- The Applicant was approached by FutureMerton to design a Business Hub
- There is a lack of employment space in the Borough, with businesses on waiting lists for premises
- Since the DRP gave its response the proposal has been reduced in height by one storey
- The proposal is modern and innovative and will act as a destination building. It will have a positive impact on employment in the borough, by providing 200 jobs
- The proposal will enhance the cultural offering in the borough.

Officers confirmed that it was a part 4 storey part 5 storey building.

Councillor Nick Draper made points including:

- Object to this building which is massive, intrusive and inappropriate in the Abbey Mills area
- It is designed to be an office block and community space, but it does not have the 'magic' of the mills area.
- If we want to preserve the heritage of the area then do not build this proposal

Members made comments including:

- Proposal does not compliment the buildings around it, it does not add to the important heritage site.
- This is most historic site in the Borough and it would be damaged by this part 4/part 5 storey building, which has no character, being built next to much lower buildings.
- Clear conflict between this building and the heritage of the site
- The site deserves a much lower building that respects the character of the existing buildings and the heritage
- It would be good to encourage the creative industries into the Borough, but on balance this proposal would harm its setting. Would want a more inspiring and attractive building on this site
- The DRP were enthusiastic about the commercial potential but they did not like the design of this proposal

A motion to refuse was proposed and seconded, and agreed by the vote.

RESOLVED

The Committee agreed to:

1. REFUSE the application for the following reasons:
  - The proposal, by reason of its design and appearance, would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area
  - The proposal has an inappropriate relationship to the smaller historic 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

## 18 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS (Agenda Item 18)

RESOLVED

The Committee noted the Officer's report on Planning Appeal Decisions

## 19 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - SUMMARY OF CURRENT CASES (Agenda Item 19)

RESOLVED

The Committee noted the Officer's report on Planning Enforcement