

**Merton Council**  
**Planning Applications Committee**  
**28 June 2018**  
**Supplementary agenda**

10 Modifications

1 - 4

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Planning Applications Committee 28<sup>th</sup> June 2018 Supplementary Agenda (Modifications Sheet)**

### **Item 5. Central House, 1C Alwyne Road, Wimbledon SW19 – 18/P1411 – Hillside Ward**

It is noted that an additional representation was received on 27<sup>th</sup> June by a previous objector, Mr Antony Senny. In his letter, Mr Senny reiterated points previously made, as well as making the following additional points:

- Material consideration and amenity concern has been disregarded by the case officer;
- In regards to radiation, a faraday cage is applied to use in substations for this very reason. E.g. a dentist steps out of the room when carrying out an x-ray. This principle applies to all constructions and the amenities of the neighbourhood is just as relevant. If the radiology room needs to prevent radiation from leaking out of the room, then the amenities of the neighbourhood are undermined;
- Mr Senny requested that the case is deferred to allow more time to present a case against the proposal.

Material considerations and neighbouring amenity has been fully considered in section 7 of the Officers report (particularly 7.2). As discussed in section 7.4 of the Officers report, the impacts of the radiology equipment is not a planning matter, and any assessment of this lies outside of the planning process. It is governed by the Care Quality Commission (CQC) and the Health and Safety Executive (HSE). As such, there is no reason to defer the case as it is not a matter which the Local Planning Authority can determine the proposal against.

### **Item 6. All England Club Grounds, 215 Grand Drive, Raynes Park SW20 – 18/P1024 – West Barnes Ward** Consultations (page 29)

Paragraph 5.14. Last sentence to be amended to remove reference to reinstating the redundant crossover to Cannon Hill Lane.

Officers note that the crossover and gates adjacent to the application site provide access to land not in the applicant's ownership.

#### Planning considerations (page 39)

Amend paragraph 7.43 as follows:

7.43 In order to create the vehicle access to Cannon Hill Lane, the applicant has suggested that it would be necessary to install double yellow lines on both sides of the access which would result in the loss of 6 on-street spaces. As such, a parking survey was undertaken which found that following the removal of these spaces, Cannon Hill Lane would have a parking stress of approximately 69%, thus the network can accommodate the loss. Transport Planning Officers advise that fewer spaces could be removed without compromising highway safety and the final arrangements would be included in any legal undertaking.

Recommendation (page 43)

Amend heads of agreement 2 as follows:

2. The applicant entering into an agreement under the Highways Act to be consolidated into the planning agreement, to provide for a scheme of works to deliver vehicle crossovers, including any necessary works to the highway to facilitate the crossovers and to provide for the introduction of parking restrictions on the highway.

**Item 7. 14 Highbury Road, Wimbledon SW19 – 18/P1649 – Village Ward.**

Paragraph 3.6 – Line 6: figure should be ‘44%’.

Paragraph 5.1 Consultation.

3 further letters of objection received from occupiers of number 16 Highbury Road 17 and 21 Belvedere Drive in respect of the reconsultation on revised plans confirming dimensions of basement and elevation details of the light well to garden elevation.

16 Highbury Road – No real changes from the original drawings apart from details of the balustrade and light well details. Objections previously made remain in respect of the size of the proposal and impact upon neighbours.

17 Highbury Road – The revisions to the scheme do not alleviate concerns regarding the scale of development and the impact upon neighbour amenity.

21 Belvedere Drive – Have significant concerns relating to the existing formation of the grounds, namely London clay, and the hydrology and subterranean ground water flow as well as the impact of the proposed works and permanent maintenance. In the light of the above, we believe that limits should be applied to the size of basement extension, the total depth of the basement, its volume, the extent of encroachment beyond the existing structure and context and setting.

New paragraph:

7.6 Flood Risk Manager

The Council’s Flood Risk Manager has been consulted and states that Council policy DM D2 (iv) refers to the size and limits of the proposed basements (50% of the garden area and the plans show that the basement is 43.6% of total garden area is proposed) and the requirements of Merton’s SPD on Basements and Subterranean Development should be met.

There is a slight concern that due to the significant size of the proposed basement compared to the red line boundary, there is very limited ‘natural’ ground left in which surface water may infiltrate as it would do with a green space, which is also a requirement of DM D2. However, some mitigation is proposed via the proposed drainage system although there is a lack of detail provided to demonstrate how runoff will be reduced via SuDS. We would seek that significant improvements are achieved to offsite runoff rates and would advise that greenfield rates are achieved.

Furthermore, the Construction Method Statement should address how dewatering will take place in detail. No waste water or construction material shall be discharged or emptied into the highway drainage system.

I am of the view that additional information should be sought regarding the proposed drainage system, compliance with the London Plan policy 5.13, the design and construction SPD and Merton’s Policies DM F2 and Basement SPD.

However, notwithstanding the above advice, if you are minded to recommend approval, then as a minimum I would recommend that the following conditions and informative are applied in respect of sustainable urban drainage systems and ground water ingress.

#### Add Condition 17

No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a detailed scheme for the provision of surface and foul water drainage has been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and in consultation with Thames Water. The drainage scheme will dispose of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) at the agreed restricted rate of no more than 2l/s in accordance with drainage hierarchy contained within the London Plan Policy (5.12, 5.13 and SPG) and the advice contained within the National SuDS Standards.

Reason for condition: To reduce the risk of surface and foul water flooding to the proposed development and future users, and ensure surface water and foul flood risk does not increase offsite in accordance with Merton's policies CS16, DMF2 and the London Plan policy 5.13.

#### Add Condition 18

No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a final scheme to reduce the potential impact of groundwater ingress both to and from the proposed development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall address the risks both during and post construction. Should dewatering be required during construction, the detailed Construction Method Statement will need to address the measures to minimise silt dispersal and where waters will be discharged to.

Reason for condition: To ensure the risk of groundwater ingress to and from the development is managed appropriately and to reduce the risk of flooding in compliance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 5.13 of the London Plan 2011, policy CS16 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies, DM D2 and DM F2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

Amend Condition 14 to replace '5l/s' with '2l/s'.

Amend Condition 13 to replace '14 Highbury Road' with '16 Highbury Road'.

#### Add Informative 19

Informatives:

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).

No waste material, including concrete, mortar, grout, plaster, fats, oils and chemicals shall be washed down on the highway or disposed of into the highway drainage system.

Existing Informative 17 renumbered 20

**Item 8. Planning Appeal decisions.**

No modifications.

**Item 9. Enforcement summary.**

No modifications.