

Merton Council
Planning Applications Committee
16 July 2020
Supplementary Agenda

14 Modifications Sheet

1 - 4

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Applications Committee 16th July 2020 Supplementary Agenda (Modifications Sheet)

Item 5. Abbey Wall Works, Station Road, Colliers Wood SW19 – 20/P1412 and 20/P1672 – Abbey Ward.

Page 21

Insert new paragraph 5.1.4

3 letters of objection received for the List Building Consent application. These include 2 letters from neighbours and 1 letter from the Wimbledon Society.

Neighbours

- Road is too narrow to take all this unnecessary construction of 58 flats and redevelopment of the wall.
- If there could be a development like no 40 that would be fine
- Residents do not want a development like High Path nor cheap materials used.
- Please consider footfall that this road would have to take with so much redevelopment especially as the Harris Academy is not far away.
- We do not need any further shops which will be open from 7am to 11pm, this is a residential road and not an industrial site.
- It is bad enough getting out of our drives at present, never mind when new residents who will have cars or bicycles which will make the road dangerous.
- The Abbey Wall has stood since medieval times, why should a developer come along and destroy it.
- Flats onto Merantun Way won't be able to have open windows for all the noise and pollution from the road.
- Too many developments in the local area.
- Impact on traffic and infrastructure
- Does not meet the local design of houses on Station Road.

Wimbledon Society

- The site lies within the Wandle Valley Conservation Area and adjoins the Scheduled Ancient Monument site of Merton Priory, arguably the principle Heritage Asset of the Borough. It is also in the Stane Street Archaeological Priority Zone and close to the Wandle APZ, both of which would be expected to hold prehistoric deposits. The potential for finding mediaeval material is said to be medium to high (11.4), and for post-mediaeval to be high (11.5).
- Any listed building Consent or planning permission should contain clear conditions that require:
 - a. A full scale archaeological excavation of the whole site, given the importance of the Priory in the national as well as the local history. This should be undertaken before any works associated with the future development, and the results should be published.

- b. Detailed proposal for the careful repair and conservation of the listed wall to be approved.
- c. The future development to be redesigned in accordance with the London Plan Policy 7.8 (A-E), should any features be discovered that they are recommended to be retained.
- As to the actual proposal for development, the scheme is considered well below the standard required. Previous objection letters have already drawn attention to many deficient features of this generally poor standard scheme. These include; overbearing, height and massing, many single aspect flats with internal hotel type corridors requiring extra lighting and ventilation, inadequate provision of social housing, harmful impact on daylight and sunlight to the neighbouring properties on Station Road, shading of PV panels on the roofs of the terrace to the north by this much higher building.
- Instead, of this approach, we recommend that the applicant should be encouraged to design a terrace of houses, with gardens, of a scale and character that reflects that of the terraces immediately to the north.

Pages 43 & 44

Paragraphs 7.3.1 & 7.3.5 updated - The number of dual aspect dwellings is increased from 35 out of 70 to 41 out of 54, an increase of 26% in the proportion of dual aspect units, not 27% as stated.

Page 61

Paragraph 7.8.5 updated - The applicant's report was produced by Calford Seaden (not GIA as stated).

Page 69

Paragraph 7.9.9 updated - The proportion of single aspect units has been reduced by 26%, compared to the refused scheme. Refused scheme (35 out of 70 - 50%). Proposed scheme (13 out of 54 – 24%). (corrected figures underlined)

Page 73

Paragraph 7.11.8 updated - The cycle parking provision now totals 102 spaces. This is reduced from 130 spaces in the refused scheme. This reduction reflects the reduction in total dwellings from the refused scheme, and the resulting reduction in cycle parking requirements, but remains in accordance with the London Plan as confirmed in the report.

Item 6. 300 Beverley Way and 265 Burlington Road, New Malden KT3 – 19/P3085 – West Barnes Ward.

Page 117

Paragraph 6.3 updated – The Council's Transport Planner has provided comments raising no objection subject to a condition to secure a Constructions Logistics Plan (which forms a recommended condition within the agenda)

Item 7. 247 Burlington road, New Malden KT3 – 19/P2758 – West Barnes Ward.

Page 127

Paragraph 3.5 updated - replace '3.7m' with '3.5m'

Page 127

Paragraph 3.7 updated - replace '48m' with '43m'

Item 8. Elm Nursery Car Park, London road Mitcham CR4 – 19/P4047 – Figges Marsh Ward.

Paragraph 7.2.4: Removal of the last incomplete sentence: *"It is also noted Elm Nursery Car Park has historically"*.

This sentence is complete and included in the ending of paragraph 7.2.3.

Item 9. Farm Road Church, Farm Road, Morden SM4 – 19/P4046 – St Helier Ward.

No modifications.

Item 10. Site north of 11-17 Madeira Road Mitcham CR4 – 19/P4050 – Cricket Green Ward.

No modifications.

Item 11. Car Park, Raleigh Gardens Mitcham CR4 – 19/P4048 – Cricket Green Ward.

Clarification of drawing numbers:

Within the Committee Report, the following drawing numbers are listed –
MRT-WWP-RG-00-DR-A-12001 Rev 0.1 (Block B - Ground Floor Flat
Layouts)_Amended 06.07.20

MRT-WWPRG-01-DR-A-12002 Rev 0.1 (Block A - First to Fourth Floor Flat
Layouts)_Amended 06.07.20

MRT-WWP-RG-01-DR-A-12003 Rev 0.1 (Block B - First to Fourth Floor Flat
Layouts)_Amended 06.07.20

However, included within the 'appendices' are the incorrect Rev 0.0 drawings for the 3 flat layouts listed above.

The drawings within the presentation are correct and correspond with the Committee report's drawing numbers.

Clarification of proposal description:

Currently reads: REDEVELOPMENT OF EXISTING CAR PARK TO ALLOW FOR THE ERECTION OF A PART FIVE, PART SIX STOREY DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING 36 SELF-CONTAINED UNITS (29X 1B AND 7X 2B); WITH ASSOCIATED CYCLE PARKING, REFUSE STORE, 3X DISABLED PARKING BAYS AND LANDSCAPING.

To be amended to: REDEVELOPMENT OF EXISTING CAR PARK TO ALLOW FOR THE ERECTION OF A PART FIVE, PART SIX STOREY DEVELOPMENT

COMPRISING 36 SELF-CONTAINED UNITS (30X 1B AND 6X 2B); WITH ASSOCIATED CYCLE PARKING, REFUSE STORE, 3X DISABLED PARKING BAYS AND LANDSCAPING.

Paragraph 3.1, tables under paragraphs 3.6, 7.5.1 and 7.5.4 are correct.

Paragraph 7.2.16 amended as follows -
The scheme provides the following unit mix:

- 30 x 1-bed units (83%)
- 6 x 2-bed units (17%)

Item 12. Merantun Affordable Housing report.

No modifications.

Item 13. Appeals. Summary of recent decisions.

No modifications.