

Merton Council
Planning Applications Committee
22 October 2020
Supplementary agenda

12 Modifications Sheet

1 - 10

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Applications Committee 22nd October 2020 Supplementary Agenda (Modifications Sheet)

Item 5 – Road Bridge Bishopsford Road - London Road, Morden SM4 – 20/P2438

Consultation (Section 5, Page 9):

Additional representations received for Bishopsford Road Bridge in support of the application (ref; 20/P2438).

First Petition 33 Signatures

The comments in support of this planning application state the following “We live along the Road of the Bridge on either side. We want the plans and design for Bishopsford Road Bridge that are going to the Planning Committee on Thursday 22nd October passed”.

Second Petition 8 Signatures

The comments in support of this planning application state the following “As a business for many years the closure has affected us adversely. The new design improves conditions for cyclists with a new cycle lane and improves visibility for pedestrians using the footpath that borders Ravensbury Park”.

In addition; A letter of support signed by Cllr Irons, Cllr Alambritis and Cllr McCabe was received.

Comments received from Councillors highlight the following;

- Councillors had been contacted by many Ravensbury residents and businesses whose priority is to get the bridge reopened as soon as possible. Residents felt cut off by the bus diversions in place and had to add a whole hour to their journey time.
- We support this proposed design, which widens the bridge onto council land to accommodate a segregated cycle lane and aims to make it safer for pedestrians, answers some of the key issues raised during the consultation, whilst also ensuring the bridge is opened in a timely manner.
- We note that by entering into lengthy land negotiations with the National Trust, with the intention of widening the bridge even further to accommodate a second segregated cycle lane, will cause indeterminate delay to the project. It would result in the removal of street trees, parking and space for pedestrians along London Road and see the removal of even more mature trees and disturbance of habitat on what is currently National Trust Land.
- We appreciate the concern caused by removing the wall that borders Ravensbury Park, we believe it is necessary to heed the advice from the Metropolitan Police's Designing Out Crime Officer. With so many young people

using this as their route to school or to access the facilities at Tooting and Mitcham Football Club, it is vital that this design ensures people using the footpath can see and be seen by the road. Although the council has worked hard to install additional lighting and ANPR cameras to deter moped users, this advice chimes with concerns raised to us by residents who have said they felt unsafe using the path as it is today.

- We believe that this design is sympathetic to the surrounding area, answers some key points raised during the consultation and will improve quality of life for our residents.

In addition; Two separate letters of support were received from local residents, the letters outline support for the design of the proposed new bridge with improved/safe pedestrian and cycle provisions.

Item 7. – 101 Hamilton Road, Wimbledon, SW19 1JG – 20/P2547

Page 91 – Current Proposal

Update paragraph 3.4 (page 91) to reflect correct sizes of amenity spaces (small courtyards also added). Replacement table below.

- 3.4 The floor space (GIA) and amenity space standards of individual residential units are as follows compared to London Plan 2016 requirements and Merton planning policy DM D2 (Design considerations in all developments):

Proposal	Type(b)bed (p) person	Proposed GIA	London Plan	Amenity Space (sq m)	London Plan/ Merton requirement
Flat 1	2b4p	70.1	70	27.1	7
Flat 2	3b6p	109.1	102	11.5	9
House 1	5b10p	184.6	152	58.6	50
House 2	5b10p	184.6	152	58.6	50
House 3	5b10p	191.7	152	56.9	50

Page 97 – Consultation

Update paragraph 5.3 (page 97) with replacement Transport Planning Officer comments to reflect amended plans and permit free offer by the applicant (only one permit allowed for each house). Note: Transport Planning Officer comments in the committee report relate to the original scheme.

5.3 Transport Planning Officer

Observations:

The site is currently vacant and comprises a combination of two plots; 99 Hamilton road and 101 Hamilton Road. The scheme proposes to deliver a residential development of 5 residential units comprising the following mix of units:

- 3 x 5 bed houses
- 1 x 2 bed unit

- 1 x 3 bed unit

Hamilton Road is a residential road operating at a 20-mph speed limit. Through the use of bollards, Hamilton Road does not permit vehicular access to / from the south towards Merton High Street.

The site is within a PTAL of 5 which is considered as representing a 'very good' level of accessibility to public transport services.

The local area forms part of Controlled Parking Zone S2. Restrictions are enforced from Monday to Saturday between 8.30am to 6.30pm.

Car Parking:

Due to restricted nature of the development, car parking cannot be accommodated within the site and none is proposed.

Permit free option would be acceptable subject to the applicant enters into a Unilateral Undertaking which would restrict future occupiers of the flatted development from obtaining an on-street residential parking permit to park in the surrounding controlled parking zones to be secured by via S106 legal agreement.

It is considered 1 permit per house is reasonable given the planning history, previous uses of the site and provision of 2 additional street spaces, to be secured by via S106 legal agreement.

The existing dropped Kerb should be reinstated and introduce yellow lines in accordance with the requirements of the Highway Authority to facilitate servicing and turning of vehicles.

Cycle Parking

The London Plan and London Housing SPG Standard 20 (Policy 6.9) states all developments should provide dedicated storage space (secure and undercover) for cycles at the following level:

- 1 per studio and one bed dwellings;
- 2 per all other dwellings

The proposed ground floor layout shows cycle stores providing 2 cycle spaces each for the 3 houses and 4 spaces for the maisonette units. The number provided satisfies the 'London plan' standards.

Recommendation: The proposal is unlikely to have a significant impact on the adjoining highway.

Raise no objection, subject to:

- Cycle parking maintained.
- The applicant enters into a Unilateral Undertaking which would restrict future occupiers of the flatted units from obtaining an on-street residential parking permit to park in the surrounding controlled parking zones to be secured by via S106 legal agreement.
- The applicant enters into a Unilateral Undertaking which would restrict future occupiers of houses to one permit per house to be secured by via S106 legal agreement.

- Demolition/Construction Logistic Plan (including a Construction Management plan in accordance with TfL guidance) should be submitted to LPA for approval before commencement of work.

Page 114 – Conditions

Recommend additional condition:

21 Condition: Demolition/Construction Logistic Plan (including a Construction Management plan in accordance with TfL guidance) to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Item 8. 16-20 Morden Road, South Wimbledon, SW19 3BN – 20/P3772 - Raynes Park Ward:

Consultation (Page 146):

1 additional objection has been received (making 10 objections in total), objecting on the following grounds:

- The design is institutional and prison-like, dated, and certainly does nothing to enhance the area.
- An extremely dour and unpalatable grey facade
- It is brutal and devoid of any character, identity or soul
- Not clear what the proportion of single aspect units is now as the revised plans do not include internal floor layout.
- Residential use at ground floor level remains, which is deemed hostile on this busy road.
- No Energy Statement has been submitted with the application.

Officer comment: Officers note the comments received but the design has been amended and is now considered to complement the character of the area. The revised floor plans are included in the plans and clearly show that the number of single aspect units has reduced. An Energy Statement has been submitted with the application, as detailed in the agenda.

Proposal (Page 140):

Update paragraph 3.15 to include whether London plan minimum floor space requirements are met and to include single/dual aspect breakdown:

	Type	Habitable rooms	GIA sq.m	London Plan GIA minimum requirement*	External amenity space sq.m	Dual Aspect Rating
Ground floor	3b/5p4	4	96	86	15	Fully dual aspect
	3b/5p4	4	92	86	15	Fully dual aspect
	3b/5p4	4	92	86	15	Fully dual aspect

First floor	Studio1	40	39	6	Single aspect
	1b/2p2	60	50	6	Single aspect
	1b/2p2	53	50	6	Dual aspect front and side
	2b/4p3	72	70	6	Dual aspect front and side
	3b/4p4	88	74	6	Fully dual aspect
Second Floor	Studio1	40	39	6	Single aspect
	1b/2p2	60	50	6	Single aspect
	1b/2p2	53	50	6	Dual aspect front and side
	2b/4p3	72	70	6	Dual aspect front and side
	3b/4p4	88	74	6	Fully dual aspect
Third floor	Studio1	40	39	6	Single aspect
	1b/2p2	60	50	6	Single aspect
	1b/2p2	53	50	6	Dual aspect front and side
	2b/4p3	72	70	6	Dual aspect front and side
	3b/4p4	88	74	6	Fully dual aspect
Fourth floor	Studio1	40	39	6	Single aspect
	1b/2p2	60	50	6	Single aspect
	1b/2p2	53	50	6	Dual aspect front and side

	2b/4p3	72	70	6	Dual aspect front and side
	3b/4p4	88	74	6	Fully dual aspect
Fifth floor	1b/2p2	50	50	6	Single aspect
	1b/2p2	56	50	6	Fully dual aspect
	2b/3p3	71	61	6	Fully dual aspect

- All units meet or exceed the minimum GIA floor space figures in the London Plan.

Changes to scheme in response to DRP comments:

Originally proposed scheme	DRP comment	Amendment made	Officer comment
Curved roof and materials (copper sheeting to curved roof, white render, dark grey facing brickwork and copper panels to vertical walls)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of a design narrative for the proposal. • The appearance of the building was likened to a poor 1990s development • The skyline was considered unsatisfactory, mostly due to the curved roof. • the materials palette was too varied and needed to be far more restrained 	Curved roof removed and replaced with a more regular flat roof with parapet. Materials have been altered to light grey and dark grey facing brickwork, with projecting window frames in dark grey coated aluminium.	The original scheme did not relate to the context of the area, whereas the amended scheme is considered to complement the character of the area.
Residential units at ground floor level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about having residential use on the ground floor, as this was a hostile environment for this use. • Deeper defensible space required. 	Residential use on ground floor remains but living space moved to the front part of the building for all proposed ground floor units. Walls added to the frontage of the building to enclose the ground floor units.	As discussed in the report, the principle of a residential use at ground floor is accepted. The revised layout creates better defensible space to the frontage and officers consider that the scheme could not reasonably be

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bedrooms would be better located at the rear. 		resisted on this basis.
Bedroom window at ground floor level facing south	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The south elevation was also considered problematic as it has a bedroom window directly facing onto a secluded, publicly accessible space 	Revised internal layout of flats means that the side facing window serves a living area, which is dual aspect with the front facing window.	The window would face a more secluded side area of the building. However, this creates some degree of natural surveillance and would be a secondary window to the room it serves, so could be kept closed or obscurely glazed if the occupant wished to.
Single aspect units (21 out of 30 units proposed)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> concerned about was the high proportion of single aspect units – 21 out of a total of 30 units 	Revised internal layout now results in 9 out of 26 units being single aspect.	Whilst it would be preferential to have all units being dual aspect the provision of a single lift core cannot facilitate more dual aspect units than that proposed. The only single aspect units are now single bedroom units and now of the single aspect units face north. Therefore, the overall standard of accommodation is considered to be acceptable.
Car park to rear retained	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was also felt that the car park at rear of the building presented a harsh area of tarmac, which could also attract antisocial behaviour. It was suggested that the car park could be re-arranged to provide some ground level 	Area to the rear of the site reconfigured to provide communal amenity space with limited car parking.	This is generally an improvement to the scheme and allows for meaningful communal space and removes the publically accessible car park to the rear of the building, which had raised anti-social behaviour concerns.

	communal open space and provide more conveniently located bin storage.		
Bike store is within the rear entrance foyer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestion that the basement could be expanded slightly to accommodate cycle parking and provide bulky storage for flats. 	No change in this regard	Whilst the bike store is accessed via the rear entrance to the building, it is likely that the front entrance would be the main entrance to the building, given there are only three parking spaces to the rear. Therefore, it is considered that there would not be a significant conflict with users of the bike store and others entering the building.
Building line forward of Spur House	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> uncomfortable with bringing the elevation forward from that of the adjacent Spur House 	Amended plans set the building back to the building line of Spur House	This change makes the building less visually intrusive in the streetscene and is supported by officers.
Front elevation dominated by projecting lift shaft	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unconvinced by the positioning of the lift shaft as it presented a blank frontage to the street. If this was reversed with the stair well a more attractive solution with windows could be presented to the street. 	The projecting lift shaft element has been removed.	The concerns raised are overcome along with the other changes to the front elevation and the pallet of materials.

Officer comment: As set out in the report, the applicant has sought to address the specific concerns of the DRP and overall, it is considered that the amended design responds well to its context and has largely overcome the issues previously raised.

No Modifications for any other Items.

This page is intentionally left blank