

Merton Council
Planning Applications Committee
7 June 2018
Supplementary agenda

12 Modifications

1 - 6

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Applications Committee 7th June 2018 Supplementary Agenda (Modifications Sheet)

Item 5. 94 Aylward Road, Merton Park SW20 – 18/P0775 – Merton Park Ward.

Introduction (page 15)

At Paragraph 1.1 the report should state that the application was brought before committee at the request of now former Councillor Sargeant.

Item 6. The Study, Camp Road Wimbledon SW19 – 17/P4202 and 17/P4184 Village Ward.

Current Proposal (page 29)

Amend paragraph 3.12 – 12 trees are to be planted, not 9 as stated in the report.

Consultation (page 32)

Paragraph 5.6 – third paragraph from the bottom states “selling”, this should read “setting”.

Additional consultations:

The Council’s Tree and Landscape Officer has provided consultation comments and raises no objection subject to conditions relating to:

- Tree Protection
- Site Supervision
- Playground surfacing to be permeable
- Landscaping

The report sets out that Historic England has responded to the formal application to state that it should be determined in accordance with local policies, however, it should be noted that on 15/12/2017, Historic England provided the following, more detailed comments, in relation to the originally submitted scheme (i.e. the scheme prior to the reduction in ridge height and omission of the southern gable):

“Significance of the Historic Environment

The William Wilberforce School is a Grade II listed building located by Wimbledon Common in the Wimbledon West Conservation Area. At its core is a two-storey octagonal brick schoolhouse of 1758-61, which is of substantial historical interest for its origins as a Georgian charity school and associations to that movement in London.

The simple octagonal geometric form of the original building (and its 19 century additions) are of much architectural interest, and remain a focal point and landmark feature in streetscape views, and reflect the village character of the Conservation Area.

The school has been altered and extended at various stages, and although the 1970s extension is contextual in its scale and palette of materials, it is not of any significant architectural quality in our opinion, and it’s monotonous and substantial concrete pantile roof dominates on the approach from the east. Moreover, the utilitarian character of the close board timber fence around the site does little to celebrate the Conservation Area or the setting of the listed School.

The Proposed Development

The Study Primary School who occupy the site are proposing to upgrade the school facilities involving the demolition of the 1970s extension and erection of a large two storey extension which would include a new performance hall, class rooms and associated services.

Some de-cluttering is proposed within the Octagon building improve circulation, however minimal impact on historic fabric would result from these works.

Relevant Policies

In determining these proposals, we would remind your Council of your duties under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings including their setting and any features of interest they possess (Section 66), as well as the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas (Section 72).

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, March 2012), your Council should take account the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, and the desirability of new developments making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness (Paragraph 131). Any harm that would result from development proposals should be clearly and convincingly justified (Paragraph 132), and outweighed by the delivery of public benefits (Paragraph 134).

Historic England's Position

The works to the principal listed building itself are minimal, and so we technically have no remit to comment on the listed building consent application. Nonetheless, we welcome the proposed decluttering to the octagonal building and would encourage any opportunities to reveal or reinstate original proportions and any features of interest as part of this work, as informed by the scholarly research that has been undertaken.

Our main area of interest lies in the design, scale and massing of the proposed extension and its impact on the setting of the listed school as a key building within the Wimbledon West Conservation Area.

Based on the visualisation and plans provided, the extension would appear to be a well-considered, contemporary yet contextual piece of architecture. Whilst significantly larger than the existing extension, the building would sit below the height of the Octagon building to respect its dominance, with its eaves aligning with those of the listed building to maintain a sense of continuity.

The visualisations provided in the Design and Access Statement suggests that the extension would defer to the Octagon building in key Conservation Area views along Camp Road. The exception to this is the view from the east along Camp Road, in which the replacement extension would totally block the view of the Octagon roof form.

As mentioned, the overbearing roof form of the 1970s extension currently dominates on the approach from the east, and so we do not wish to raise major concerns regarding this impact. Nonetheless, it should be acknowledged that the obscuring of

the historic roof form of the Octagon building will cause a small degree of harm to the setting of the listed building as the focal point in this part of the Conservation Area.

We acknowledge the significant challenges in reducing the scale of the extension without compromising the architectural integrity of the building or the internal quality of the performance hall. We therefore consider that a strong case could be made for a building of this scale. However, in accordance with the policies set out in this letter, we consider it important that opportunities to enhance the character of the Conservation Area and the setting of the listed building are provided elsewhere to mitigate this impact.

We consider the proposed boundary railings in place of the unsightly closed board timber fencing around the site to be a significant improvement which would help to mitigate the impact of the extension. However, our preference would be to see these railings replace all closed board fencing along Camp Road, potentially with planting on the playground side to provide the desired security measures. Should your Council be minded to approve the application, we recommend that samples of these railings, as well as the external materials for the extension are provided by condition in consultation with your Conservation Officer to ensure a high quality finish that would complement the surrounding historic environment.

Recommendation.

We would urge your Council to address the above advice, and determine the application in accordance with national and local planning policy, and in consultation with your Conservation Officer. Please note that this response relates to historic building and historic area matters only.”

Officer comment:

A Tree protection and landscaping condition is recommended in the agenda and an additional site supervision and surfacing condition is now recommended.

Historic England has been involved in the pre-application discussions on the scheme and has been supportive of the proposal. Nonetheless, the massing of the proposed extension has been reduced since these comments were provided, which further minimises the harm caused to the setting of the Listed Building.

Additional representations:

A further eight letters of objection have been received (making a total of 111), objecting on the following new grounds:

- There should be controls on the use of the school hall for non-school purposes.

Officer comment:

Ancillary uses of the school hall would not require planning permission, such as school fetes etc. Use of the school hall by third parties outside of school hours is not likely to result in significant levels of traffic and would be a community benefit in and of itself, which is encouraged by central government. The London Plan states at Policy 3.18: “Development proposals which maximise the extended or multiple use of educational facilities for community or recreational use should be encouraged”. Therefore, officers consider that a condition restricting use of the hall would not comply with the relevant policy framework.

Policy Context (page 44)

The following policies are referred to in the report and should be included in the list of conditions: Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (Heritage Assets and Archaeology), Policy CS16 of the Core Planning Strategy (Flooding) and Policies DM D3 (Alterations and extensions to existing buildings) and DM F1 (Flooding) and DM F2 (Sustainable urban drainage systems and waste water infrastructure).

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (page 57)

Amend paragraph 8.1 – This paragraph should refer to The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, not 2011 as stated in the report.

Recommendation (page 58)

Amended condition.

The applicant has requested that the landscaping drawings be omitted from the drawing numbers condition and that the landscaping layout be agreed by condition. Control, regarding the landscape layout, would remain with the Council and no objection is raised to removing these drawing numbers from the condition. Therefore, the revised condition wording would be as follows:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 702-WH-PL-001 Rev 01, 702-WH-PL-002 Rev 03, 702-WH-PL-003 Rev 03, 702-WH-PL-004 Rev 03, 702-WH-PL-010 Rev 05, 702-WH-PL-011 Rev 04, 702-WH-PL-012 Rev 06, 702-WH-PL-050 Rev 00, 702-WH-PL-100 Rev 06, 702-WH-PL-101 Rev 05, 702-WH-PL-201 Rev 02, 702-WH-PL-300 Rev 03, 702-WH-PL-301 Rev 03, 702-WH-PL-305 Rev 01, 702-WH-PL-306 Rev 01, 702-WH-PL-307 Rev 02, 702-WH-PL-400 Rev 02 and 25719-100 Version 2.

Additional conditions:

20. Site Supervision (trees)
21. Playground surfacing to be permeable.

Item 7. Former Sparrowhawk site, 159 Commonside East, Mitcham CR4 – 17/P2574 – Figges Marsh Ward.

The required minimum GIA for three units 1st F5, 2nd F5 and 3rd F4 have been incorrectly shown on the schedule of accommodation at 7.12 as being for units over two storeys when they are actually single level units. All units meet or exceed the minimum internal GIA

Unit	Type	Proposed GIA	Minimum reqd GIA	Proposed private amenity	Min reqd amenity
1 st F5	2B/4P	76m2	70m2	5.5m2	7m2
2 nd F5	2B/4P	73m2	70m2	5.5m2	7M2
3 RD F4	2B/3P	67m2	61m2	5m2+ (The 3 rd floor units have a wrap around terrace area.	6m2

Drawings (page 65) and Recommendation (page 79).

For the list of approved drawings the Proposed Ground Floor Plan 871-GA-00-P6 is amended by 871-GA-00-P10

Item 8. 83 Dora Road, Wimbledon Park SW19 – 18/P0952 – Wimbledon Park Ward.

No modifications.

Item 9. 219 Manor Way, Mitcham CR4 – 17/P4225 – Longthornton Ward.

Current proposals (page 96).

Para 3.5 Insert after first sentence: The garage would be split, with a larger portion fronting Rowan Road to accommodate two vehicles and a smaller section to the west to serve as a garden shed. The proposed building would have a garage door in the east elevation fronting the highway, with a window and door in the south elevation to give access from the garden.

Para 3.5 Last sentence: 4.9m width should be 10.2m width

Item 10. Planning Appeal decisions.

No modifications.

Item 11. Enforcement summary.

No modifications.

This page is intentionally left blank