

Merton Council

Planning Applications Committee

26 April 2018

Supplementary agenda

19 Supplementary Agenda - Modifications

1 - 4

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Applications Committee 26th April 2018 Supplementary Agenda (Modifications Sheet)

Item 6. 8 Lake Road, SW19 – 18/P1052 – Hillside Ward

Drawings (page 33)

Add drawing number Ex_1782

Checklist Information-Design Review Panel was consulted.

Current proposals (page 34)

Para 3.3 Should read 16 x two bedroom flats and 3 x three bedroom flats.

Planning history (page 36).

New Para 4.6 The current proposal was presented to the Design Review panel on 23 November 2017 and received an Amber verdict. The DRP felt that the building ‘sat quite well on the site being very responsive in its scale and massing’. The scheme was subsequently amended to take on board the DRP’s comments prior to submission of the current application.

Planning considerations.

Para 7.10 New text: The applicants Financial Appraisal has been independently audited by a consultant appointed by the Local Planning Authority. The Consultants assessment concluded that it is not financially viable under revised assumptions for the applicant to provide a policy compliant level of affordable housing. The development would also be subject to both the Merton CIL and Mayor of London’s CIL. The Mayor’s Affordable Housing and Viability SPG and draft Merton Development Viability SPD advise that the scheme would require:

- Early stage review, if the development isn’t substantially implemented within 2 years of the grant of planning permission (surplus to be delivered by way of onsite affordable housing units); and
- Late stage review upon occupation/sale of 75% of the units (surplus to be paid to the Council for the provision of off-site affordable housing).

The recommendation should therefore be amended to seek the above to be secured within the S106 Agreement.

Recommendation (page 43)

S106 Heads of Terms – Amend Heads of Terms 1 to outline that the developer is to comply with the above requirements to be set out within the S106 Agreement.

Item 7. 40A Lambton Road, SW20 – 18/P0072 - Raynes Park Ward

Site and surroundings (page 52)

Amend para 2.3. Delete “former”.

Recommendation (page 61)

Replace condition 9 (implement cycle storage in accordance with the approved plans) with the following:

Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, the development hereby approved shall not be occupied until details (including the positioning) of secure cycle storage for the occupants of, and visitors to, the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved facilities shall be fully implemented and made available for use prior to the first occupation of the development and retained thereafter for use at all times.

Item 8. Land R/O 18 Lansdowne Road SW20 – 18/P0072 – Raynes Park Ward.

Proposal description (page 65).

Delete 'to demolition' in line 3.

Drawing numbers: Add PV23

Introduction (page 66).

Para 1.1 To be amended as follows: 15/P3039 dated 10.10.2016 not 2018

Site and surroundings (page 66).

Para 2.1 The application site comprises a group of six garages not 8 as stated. The northern pair of garages are not within the application site.

Current proposals (page 66).

Para 3.2 Should be 'Current application'.

Para 3.2 Line 4, 2.8m should be 2.9m in height and line 5, 4.1 should be 4.4 metres.

Para 3.3 Add to last sentence 'including a small garden to the north of the proposed house.

Para 3.4 Add to first sentence 'with timber cladding to both east and west (long) elevations.

Para 3.5 The two retained garages are not within the application site. A single off-street parking space would be provided for the proposed house (the existing space on the access way within the application site).

Item 9. 74 Leopold Road SW19 – 17/P4426 – Wimbledon Park Ward.

Consultation (page 79)

Additional representation. A joint letter from Councillors Janice Howard, Oonagh Moulton and Linda Taylor has been received raising objection on the following grounds:

- Unacceptable level of built form close to the shared boundary with No.42.
- Overbearing impact despite amendments.
- Express surprise that the Council's Conservation Officer does not object.

Officer response:

The points raised are noted and have been carefully considered. However, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of the impact on the neighbour, due to the 3m separation and provision of a hipped roof and the impact on

the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is also considered to be acceptable for the reasons set out in the agenda.

Item 10. 168 London Road SM4 – 17/P3627 – Merton Park Ward.

No modifications.

Item 11. 168 London Road SM4 – 17/P3630 – Merton Park Ward.

No modifications.

Item 12. 28-30 Ridgway Place SW19 – 18/P0253 – Hillside Ward.

Drawings (page 137)

Amend drawing Nos to read:

640/010 P10, 040 P4, 041 P4, 042 P4, 043 P4, 044 P5, 050 P4, 060 P5, 061 P5, 062(P1), Basement Construction Method Statement (Ref: 3845-ST-ST001 P3) & Flood Risk and SuDs Assessment (Ref: 3845-FR001D).

An additional drawing of the front elevation has also been submitted (Drawing No. 640/062 P1)

Item 13. 62A and B Ridgway Place SW19 – 18/P0761 – Hillside Ward.

No modifications.

Item 14. 18 Spencer Hill SW19 – 18/P0304 – Hillside Ward

Consultations (page 158).

Additional representation: One additional representation has been received from the neighbouring occupier at No.16a, objecting on the following grounds:

- Case Officer has not visited the neighbouring site to view the proposed development.
- The officer's report does not address issues of sunlight, overbearing form and the cumulative impact of the extension being constructed at No.16.
- Concern that loss of light would adversely affect trees at No.16a.
- The submitted Daylight and Sunlight Report does not take account of the two side facing windows at first floor level, only the two at second floor level.
- The loss of light to the garden is not considered in the report.
- Any condition securing obscured glazing should also ensure that the side facing windows cannot be opened other than a small fan light at the top.
- If permission is granted, request that the Council do not allow works to start early than 9am.
- The only blocks with 4 storeys in this and neighbouring streets are on much larger developments where they do not sit between two houses. This point is not recognised by the officer in concluding there is no adverse precedent

Officer response:

- *The assessment has had the benefit of a site visit but the case officer has not viewed from the neighbouring property, as the relationship between the two buildings was clear. The side facing windows have been noted and are shown in the site photographs.*
- *The officer's report concludes that the impact on the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers are acceptable.*

- *The submitted Daylight and Sunlight report does take account of all four side facing windows. In addition, the neighbouring property, No.16a has side facing windows to the southeast facing elevation (facing towards the application site). There are no windows at ground floor level to the side elevation, at first floor level there is a side facing bathroom window and a side facing bedroom window. The bedroom window at first floor level is also served by extensive glazing to the front elevation and as such no concern is raised in relation to any limited loss of light to this window as there is an extensive outlook and light source to the frontage. At second floor level there are two small high level side facing windows serving what was originally granted permission as loft space (under application ref. 02/P1381) but is now used as a bedroom. It is acknowledged that there would be some marginal loss of outlook to these windows. However, these are side facing, high level windows with a limited amount of outlook currently. It is of note that this room is served by a ridge level skylight which provides a significant amount of daylight.*
- *Any loss of light to the garden would be minimal and in the view of officers, would not warrant a reason for refusal.*
- *The side facing windows would be conditioned to be obscurely glazed, which officers consider would mitigate for any potential loss of privacy. However, if members consider that a condition to ensure that these windows are partially non-opening is necessary then that would not be unreasonable to incorporate this condition.*
- *In terms of overlooking it is noted that the side facing windows to No.16a were conditioned to be obscurely glazed and this condition has not been complied with. It is likely that due to the passage of time the fact that this condition has been breached is likely to be lawful (i.e. the condition has been breached for at least 10 years). However, the fact that these windows were conditioned to be obscurely glazed demonstrates that these window were only ever intended to provide a limited outlook to the side of the dwelling and are not the primary windows providing light and outlook to the dwelling.*
- *Standard working hours are 8am-6pm Monday-Friday and it would be unreasonable to restrict the development further than this – these working hours would be the same as those imposed by way of condition for the redevelopment of No.16a under application ref. 02/P1381.*
- *The building would have 4 floors. However, the top floor would be within the roofscape, thereby limiting the impact. Officers consider the streetscene would not be adversely affected. However, this is an area for judgement that members should consider.*
- *Therefore, the marginal reduction in light and outlook is not considered to be materially harmful to the amenities of the occupiers of No.16a.*

Item 15. Flat 4, 74 Woodside, SW19 – 18/P0519 – Hillside Ward

No modifications.

Item 16. TPO – 13 Chester Road SW19 – Village Ward

No modifications.

Item 17. Planning Appeal decisions.

No modifications.

Item 18. Enforcement summary.

No modifications.