

# Merton Council

## Planning Applications Committee

### Membership

#### Councillors

Linda Kirby (Chair)

John Bowcott (Vice-Chair)

David Dean

Abigail Jones

Philip Jones

Andrew Judge

Najeeb Latif

Peter Southgate

Geraldine Stanford

Imran Uddin

#### Substitute Members:

Stephen Crowe

Joan Henry

Daniel Holden

John Sargeant

Laxmi Attawar

A meeting of the Planning Applications Committee will be held on:

**Date: 17 November 2016**

**Time: 7.15 pm**

**Venue: Council chamber - Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden  
SM4 5DX**

This is a public meeting and attendance by the public is encouraged and welcomed. If you wish to speak please see notes after the list of agenda items. For more information about the agenda and the decision making process contact [democratic.services@merton.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@merton.gov.uk) or telephone 020 8545 3357

Press enquiries: [press@merton.gov.uk](mailto:press@merton.gov.uk) or telephone 020 8545 3181

Email alerts: Get notified when agendas are published  
[www.merton.gov.uk/council/committee.htm?view=emailer](http://www.merton.gov.uk/council/committee.htm?view=emailer)

For more information about Merton Council visit <http://www.merton.gov.uk>

# Planning Applications Committee

## 17 November 2016

19 Modifications

1 - 14

### **Declarations of Pecuniary Interests**

Members are reminded of the need to have regard to the items published with this agenda and, where necessary to declare at this meeting any Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (as defined in the The Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012) in any matter to be considered at the meeting. If a pecuniary interest is declared they should withdraw from the meeting room during the whole of the consideration of that matter and must not participate in any vote on that matter. If members consider they should not participate because of a non pecuniary interest which may give rise to a perception of bias, they should declare this, withdraw and not participate in consideration of the item. For further advice please speak with the Council's Assistant Director of Corporate Governance.

### **Declarations of Pecuniary Interests – Members of the Design and Review Panel (DRP)**

Members of the Planning Applications Committee (PAC), who are also members of the DRP, are advised that they should not participate in an item which has previously been to DRP where they have voted or associated themselves with a conclusion reached or recommendation made. Any member of the PAC who has also sat on DRP in relation to items on this PAC agenda must indicate whether or not they voted in such a matter. If the member has so voted they should withdraw from the meeting.



This page is intentionally left blank

## **Planning Applications Committee 17<sup>th</sup> November 2016** **Supplementary Agenda (Modifications Sheet)**

### **Item 5. 6 Beltane Drive SW19 - 15/P4601 – Village Ward**

#### Site description (page 14)

Committee report paragraph 2.5. To clarify the Oak tree (T5) is located in the rear garden of No.44 Queensmere Road (not No.44).

#### Amended Plans

Plans have been submitted with a Revision B reference (no change to proposal just the addition of a revision number) – drawing numbers 106\_D\_01\_B, 106\_D\_02\_B, 106\_D\_03\_B and 106\_D\_04\_B (attached).

A block plan has been submitted showing the proposed development in relation to neighbouring dwellings – drawing number 106\_D\_20\_ (attached).

#### Recommendation (page 27)

#### Amended Condition

2. A.7 Approved plans: 106\_D\_01\_B, 106\_D\_02\_B, 106\_D\_03\_B, 106\_D\_04\_B, 106\_05 and 106\_D\_20\_.

### **Item 6. 40 Dane Road SW19 – 15/P3217 – Abbey Ward**

No modifications.

### **Item 7. 15 Denmark Road SW19 – 16/P1418 – Hillside Ward**

#### Current Proposal (page 49)

Committee report paragraph 3.5. The agent has clarified that the rear elevation would be clad in lead and not zinc.

#### Additional Plans

Additional Computer Generated Images have been submitted to illustrate the proposal (drawing numbers 665/SK017 P3, 665/SK013 P4, 665/SK012 P2, 665/SK011 P4, 665/SK010 P2 and 665/SK018 P4 (attached).

#### Additional Document

Revised Parking Stress Survey submitted (attached). The reference to roads outside of the borough has been removed from the survey. The currently submitted survey indicates overnight parking stress levels of 71-74% in the immediate vicinity of the site.

#### Amended consultation response (page 52)

Committee report paragraph 5.2 – the words “In addition, 2 of the streets are not in the borough” should be deleted.

Recommendation (page 64)  
Amended Conditions

2. A7 Approved Plans. 665/001 P2, 665/100 P2, 665/101 P5, 665/102 P6, 665/103 P3, 665/104 P4, 665/105 P3, 665/106 P4, 665/108 P5, 665/109 P2, 665/110 P3 , 665/111 P2, 665/112 P6, 665/113 P2, 665/114 P9, 665/115 P2, 665/116 P8, 665/117 P3, 665/118 P8, 665/119 P3, 665/120 P8, 665/121 P2, 665/122 P5, 665/123 P2, 665/124 P6, 665/125 P2, 665/126 P4, 665/127 P2, 665/128 P4, 665/201 P1, 665/SK010 P2, 665/SK011 P4, 665/SK012 P2, 665/SK013 P4, 665/SK017 P3 and 665/SK018 P4.
  
13. Condition – rooflights in the southeast and northwest facing roofslopes to have a minimum cill height of 1.7m above FFL, first floor bathroom window and second floor study window to northwest facing elevation shall be fixed shut and glazed with obscured glass up to an internal sill height of a minimum of 1.7m and shall be maintained as such thereafter.

**Item 8. 17 Merton Hall Road SW19 – Dundonald Ward**

No modifications.

**Item 9. 134 Merton Road – 16/P1872 – Trinity Ward**

Additional Plans

Plan showing extent of demolition submitted, drawing number - 16.8705.08A (attached).

Recommendation (page 64)  
Amended Condition

2. A.7 Approved Drawings: 16.8705.01, 16.8705.02, 16.8705.03, 16.8705.04E, 16.8705.05E, 16.8705.06B, 16.8705.07C and 16.8705.08A.

**Item 10. 58 Mostyn Road SW19 – 16/P2148 – Merton Park Ward**

No modifications.

**Item 11. 7 Ridgway Place SW19 – Hillside Ward**

No modifications.

**Item 12. 5 Rushmere Place – 16/P2487 – Village Ward**

No modifications.

**Item 13. Kings College School, Southside Common - 16/P3126 - Village Ward**

Drawings (page 129)

Add drawing Nos. JNY8672-03A & Arboricultural Implications Report (Ref: SJA. Air 15316-01a)

Recommendation (page 143)

Amend condition No. 13 to read: The details for the protection of trees shall include the retention of an arboricultural expert to monitor and report to the LPA not less than every three months all tree works and tree protection measures throughout the course of site works. The works shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved Arboricultural Implications Report and Tree Protection Plans.

Remove condition No. 20

Amend condition No. 25 to read: On Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays, the tennis court numbered 6 on approved drawing No. 604-01-990(P2) hereby permitted shall be used only between the hours of 0900 to 1900. It shall only be used on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays for a temporary trial period of three years starting from the date of this permission or for a period of one year starting from its first use, whichever is the shorter, after which its use on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays shall cease unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

Amend condition No. 27 to read: No development shall commence until the temporary construction access shown in approved drawing No. 604-01-962(P2) has been provided.

Amend condition No. 28 to read: The access shown on approved drawing No. JNY8672-03(A) shall be for emergency vehicles only.

**Item 14. 20 Sunnyside SW19 – 16/P0112 – Village Ward**

Recommendation (page 158)

Extra condition: C.4 (Obscure Glazing) 'First floor windows to master bedroom and en-suite bathroom in west elevation'.

**Item 15. 52-54 Wandle Bank SW19 – 15/P4741 – Abbey Ward**

Drawings (page 163)

Amend drawing numbers

WDB-DS-01-GF-DR-A-P010 Rev P6 replaced by Rev P7

WDB-DS-01-GF-DR-A-P011 Rev P1 replaced by Rev P3

WDB-DS-01-GF-DR-A-P120 Rev P3 replaced by Rev P4

Officers note that the amended plans reflect the proposed car parking arrangement (now includes 2 business spaces, 3 unallocated spaces on East Road and remaining spaces allocated to new residential units) and shows the existing/proposed yellow lines and parking restrictions on East Road and Wandle Bank.

Checklist Information (page 163).

Committee report states DRP were not consulted, this is incorrect, DRP were consulted at pre-application stage.

See DRP comments and the applicant's response on how the scheme has been amended to respond to DRP below:

DRP comments on the pre-application scheme below:

*The Panel liked the site analysis and welcomed the model, though a model of the wider street context would be useful given the height of the proposed building. The level of thought given to the outlook and privacy of the houses on Wandle Bank was also welcomed. They noted the high density of the proposal and the imaginative way this was achieved, but had no problem with this in principle.*

*The Panel noted the applicant's suggested changes to the site layout as a result of pre-application meetings. The Panel generally welcomed the introduction of a clear route through the site, and questioned the 'undercroft' nature of the current access. However, they felt that they really needed to see how the applicant interpreted them in a revised design and cautioned that they might affect the design concept that was achieving the high density.*

*The Panel felt that the operation and character of the internal space was too fluid, unconvincing and needed much more work to manage everything going on within it. Currently it was dominated by parking and there was potential tension between what was public and what was private. The Panel felt that the high level of parking was compromising the ability to achieve a workable layout.*

*Whilst there were benefits to removing the front garden parking and moving the building closer to the street, the Panel felt that there were possible tensions between what is essentially a 4-5 storey building in a street of 2-storey houses. How this was going to be successfully managed needed to be given particular consideration by the applicant.*

*The interlocking duplex flats were felt to be imaginative and were generally supported, but it was felt that they were very narrow – far narrower than the small terraced housing surrounding the site – and that this was reducing their flexibility and ability to provide good quality accommodation.*

*The Panel felt there were potentially too many conflicting issues between the commercial and residential uses in such close proximity. They suggested separating the uses more distinctly but questioned the suitability of the site to sustain a mix of uses and that perhaps the site is not suitable for commercial use if it is accepted there is to be residential on the site. The Panel noted the importance of adhering to relevant requirements relating to flooding.*

*Whilst there were a number of interesting ideas in the design and layout, the Panel felt that the applicant needed to sort out the urban design and layout issues first, before turning to more detailed matters.*

**VERDICT: AMBER**

Applicant's response to DRP comments



DRP - The Panel generally welcomed the introduction of a clear route through the site, and questioned the 'undercroft' nature of the current access. However, they felt that they really needed to see how the applicant interpreted them in a revised design and cautioned that they might affect the design concept that was achieving the high density

Applicant's response - A pedestrian street connecting East Road and Wandle Bank has been created. This street provides an extension to All Saints Road in terms of pedestrian mobility and visibility.

This new 'public' route will improve the connection of the area to Wandle Park and the local public transport network. The route will be secured as a "Permissive Path" through a legal agreement, which will ensure access is maintained in perpetuity.

The vehicular access to the site, initially to the south west of the site has been relocated to the north boundary, along the new pedestrian link.

The current scheme does not include any undercroft layout in it.

DRP - The Panel felt that the operation and character of the internal space was too fluid, unconvincing and needed much more work to manage everything going on within it. Currently it was dominated by parking and there was potential tension between what was public and what was private.

The Panel felt that the high level of parking was compromising the ability to achieve a workable layout

Applicant's response – The new street along the north boundary of the site creates a new pedestrian route through it, improving the permeability of the area and its connection to Wandle Park, the public transport network and other local amenities.

This new public realm area is an important benefit addition to local residents.

The courtyard area has been separated into a public area and a communal amenity area only for residents through the introduction of a separating screen with access control.

A communal amenity space (of 311sqm) is clearly delineated and offers to residents an informal seating area and on-site play area.

Car parking provision has been decreased, the new layout proposes only 4 no. parking spaces in the courtyard. A legal agreement will ensure future residents are unable to apply for parking permits.

DRP - Whilst there were benefits to removing the front garden parking and moving the building closer to the street, the Panel felt that there were possible tensions between what is essentially a 4-5 storey building in a street of 2-storey houses

Applicant's response The building line along East Road has been brought forward, although private amenity space with front garden has been kept for the residential

units with direct access at street level. The footpath along East Road is 1.8 metres wide.

The massing has been further broken down and the height of the main building reduced towards the north boundary and the neighbouring residential unit 44 East Road and the terraced houses in All Saints Road.

DRP- The interlocking duplex flats were felt to be imaginative and were generally supported, but it was felt that they were very narrow – far narrower than the small terraced housing surrounding the site and that this was reducing their flexibility and ability to provide good quality accommodation.

Applicant's response - The design of the interlocking duplex flats was developed further and refined; their width has been increased to improve internal layouts. During the course of the formal planning application, in line with Paul Garrett's comments, the internal layouts were further amended.

It is noted that all the units meet the requirements set in the London Housing Guide and will be designed to be fully compliant with the Building Regulation Approved

Document M, M4(2) Category 2: Accessible and adaptable dwellings

The Planning Application includes annotated drawings with all units' layout demonstrating compliance with Building Regulation Approved Document M (Part M).

The design provides a proposal that can be used safely and easily by all. The layout allows for a flexibility of use for residents and visitors regardless of age or mobility, while at the same time establishing a character that is particular to the site.

DRP - The Panel felt there were potentially too many conflicting issues between the commercial and residential uses in such close proximity. They suggested separating the uses more distinctly but questioned the suitability of the site to sustain a mix of uses and that perhaps the site is not suitable for commercial use if it is accepted there is to be residential on the site.

Applicant's response - The commercial use has been retained to comply with local Policies and the units are an important element in the scheme creating an active front along the new pedestrian route.

DRP - The Panel noted the importance of adhering to relevant requirements relating to flooding.

Applicant's response - A Flood Risk Assessment was included with the original application, and updated to reflect new guidance.

The Environment Agency supports the application and recommends planning conditions to ensure the right drainage measures are carried out.

The new development won't increase flooding risk. It will in fact improve the current situation because there will be less hard surfaces, and more permeable areas, including green roof areas.

DRP - Whilst there were a number of interesting ideas in the design and layout, the Panel felt that the applicant needed to sort out the urban design and layout issues first, before turning to more detailed matters.

Applicant's response - The urban design has been revised and refined as described above, we have liaised and followed the recommendations by the design and case officer, which has lead to a recommendation for approval.

#### Recommendation (page 200)

Add the following conditions to recommendation and committee report:

46. Retention of commercial parking spaces
47. Internal ceiling height of commercial unit no lower than 2.5m.
48. Removal of permitted development rights (extensions)
49. Removal of permitted development rights (windows)
50. Details and retention of green roofs

#### Recommendation Section (S106 Agreement)(page 200)

The applicant has confirmed the acceptability of the following head of term:

Inset head of term 8 -

8. 50% of the residential units shall not be occupied until the proposed commercial floor space has been fitted out to Category A Standard.

#### Consultations (page 171).

#### Late letter of objection

A late letter of objection from Right to Light Consulting, on behalf of 51 Wandle Bank, raises the following objections:

- Breach of BRE 25 degree test (47 & 51 Wandle Bank)
- Breach of BRE daylight distribution test to kitchen at no 47
- Breach of annual and winter sunlight hours test to kitchen and conservatory at no 47
- Breach of annual sunlight hours test to kitchen of no 51
- Right of light infringement to kitchen at no 47
- Right of light infringement to dining room and landing at no 51
- No site inspection of internal arrangement of 51 Wandle Bank, therefore not an accurate interpretation of the anticipated light loss. In particular 47 has a deep kitchen (4.9m), the ground floor side window serves the rear dining room and the first floor side serves a study.
- No decision until site visit carried out.

Applicant's response to the late letter:

Breach of '25 degree test' – This is completely irrelevant. The '25 degree test' is an initial rule of thumb to understand if a scheme merits detailed assessment which is rarely met in urban locations. Our report provides a comprehensive assessment against the detailed BRE metrics which fully supercede the 25 degree line.

Lack of accurate layouts / daylight distribution impact to 47 Wandle Bank - It is wholly impractical to inspect every property prior to production of a D&S report and the primary VSC and APSH metrics do not require accurate room layouts. We have adopted industry standard assumptions and both VSC and daylight distribution tests show full compliance with the targets. There is adequate margin in the daylight distribution results that a deeper room would also comply with the targets. Even if the space did marginally breach the daylight distribution targets because it was particularly deep or unusually arranged, the unusual sensitivity of the neighbour would not justify a refusal where the primary VSC assessment is readily achieved.

Sunlight effects to kitchens at 47 and 51 Wandle Bank – These kitchens are arguably not relevant for assessment as the BRE targets states that 'main living rooms' are to be assessed with kitchens / bedrooms being less important. In any event both properties experience a 5% reduction in APSH which marginally crosses the threshold of 4% APSH considered noticeable under the BRE guide. This 1% difference is acknowledged in our report as a marginal deviation which, particularly given the kitchen use, does not warrant a refusal.

Rights of light – This can be dealt with summarily as not being a planning issue.

Conclusion - It should be noted that the daylight / sunlight effects of the proposal are to be considered in the round given the urban context of the site. Our report does not focus on one or two windows but considers the detailed effects to all relevant neighbours finding an excellent level of compliance with the BRE targets.

**Item 16. Wellington House, 60-68 Wimbledon Hill Road SW19 – 16/P2942 – Hillside Ward**

No modifications.

**Item 17. Planning Appeal Decisions**

No modifications.

**Item 18. Planning Enforcement. Summary of current cases.**

Report attached.

# **Committee: Planning Applications Committee**

**Date:** 17<sup>th</sup> November 2016

**Agenda item:**

**Wards:** All

**Subject:** PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - SUMMARY OF CURRENT CASES

**Lead officer:** HEAD OF SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES

**Lead member:** COUNCILLOR LINDA KIRBY, CHAIR, PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

**Contact Officer** Sam Amoako-Adofo: 0208 545 3111  
sam.amoako-adofo@merton.gov.uk

## **Recommendation:**

---

That Members note the contents of the report.

---

### **1. Purpose of report and executive summary**

This report details a summary of case work being dealt with by the Planning Enforcement Team and contains figures of the number of different types of cases being progressed, with brief summaries of all new enforcement notices and the progress of all enforcement appeals.

<b>Current Enforcement Cases:</b>	<b>547</b>	<sup>1</sup> (563)	<b>New Appeals:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>(2)</b>
<b>New Complaints</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>(24)</b>	<b>Instructions to Legal</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Cases Closed</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>(23)</b>	<b>Existing Appeals</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>(4)</b>
No Breach:	29		<hr/>		
Breach Ceased:	17		<b>TREE ISSUES</b>		
NFA <sup>2</sup> (see below):	-		<b>Tree Applications Received</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>(76)</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>(23)</b>	<b>% Determined within time limits:</b>	<b>95%</b>	
<b>New Enforcement Notices Issued</b>			<b>High Hedges Complaint</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(0)</b>
Breach of Condition Notice:	0		<b>New Tree Preservation Orders (TPO)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>(0)</b>
New Enforcement Notice issued	1		<b>Tree Replacement Notice</b>	<b>0</b>	
S.215: <sup>3</sup>	0		<b>Tree/High Hedge Appeal</b>	<b>1</b>	
Others (PCN, TSN)	0				
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>(0)</b>			
<b>Prosecutions: (instructed)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(0)</b>			

Note (*figures are for the period (4<sup>th</sup> October to 7<sup>th</sup> November 2016)*). The figure for current enforcement cases was taken directly from M3 crystal report.

<sup>1</sup> Totals in brackets are previous month's figures

<sup>2</sup> confirmed breach but not expedient to take further action.

<sup>3</sup> S215 Notice: Land Adversely Affecting Amenity of Neighbourhood.

## 2.00 New Enforcement Actions

- 2.01 18 Morton Road Morden SM4** the council issued an enforcement notice on 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2016 against the unauthorised change of use of an outbuilding to self-contained residential use . The notice would take effect on 10/11/16 unless an appeal is made prior to that date and the compliance date is two calendar months.

### **Some Recent Enforcement Actions**

- 2.02 55-61 Manor Road, Mitcham** An enforcement notice was issued an enforcement notice on 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2016 against the unauthorised change of use of the land from a builder's yard to use as a scrap yard and for the storage of waste and scrap metals, scrap motor vehicles and waste transfer. The notice came into effect on 2/9/16 as no notification of an appeal has been received. The requirement is to cease the unauthorised use and remove any waste and scrap materials including scrap and non-scrap vehicles from the site by 8/10/16.

- 2.03 170 Elm Walk Raynes Park** The council issued a S215 notice on 4<sup>th</sup> August 2016 to require the owner to repair and paint or replace windows and doors to the property as well as clear the weeds and cut back on overgrown bushes in the front and rear gardens. The notice came into effect on 1/9/16 as there was no appeal and the compliance period is one month. **A site visit on 4<sup>th</sup> October 2016 confirmed that the notice has not been complied with and prosecution documents are being prepared for further action.**
- 2.04 Land, at 93 Rowan Crescent Streatham, SW16 5JA** The council issued a S215 notice on 29<sup>th</sup> July 2016 to require the following steps to trim and cut back overgrown bushes from the front and rear gardens, tidy the site, clean, repair and paint the front windows and repaint the front of the proper. **The notice came into effect on 28/08/16 and the compliance period expired on 23/09/16. As the notice has not been complied with, a prosecution document is being prepared for legal proceedings.**
- 2.05 31 Manship Road, Mitcham CR4 2AZ** On 15<sup>th</sup> April 2016, the council issued an enforcement notice against the unauthorised erection of three wooden garden sheds in the rear garden, The notice came into effect on 25<sup>th</sup> May 2016 as there was no appeal prior to that date and the requirement would be to cease the use of the sheds for residential purposes and demolish/remove them from the garden within 3 months. **The rear garden has now been cleared of the demolished materials and resulting debris. Case now recommended for closure.**
- 2.06 117 Haydons Road South Wimbledon SW19.** The Council served a replacement notice on 9<sup>th</sup> February 2016 against the unauthorised conversion of the former public house into eight self-contained flats. The notice came into effect on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2016 as there was no appeal prior to that date and the requirement is to cease using the building as eight self-contained flats within 6 months.
- 2.07 Burn Bullock, 315 London Road, Mitcham CR4.** A Listed Buildings Repair Notice (LBRN) was issued on 27<sup>th</sup> August 2014 to require a schedule of works to be carried out for the preservation of the Building which is listed.
- Listed Building Consent was granted on 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2015 to cover the required works which include the roof, rainwater goods, masonry, chimney render repairs, woodwork, and glazing. An inspection of the building on Friday 29<sup>th</sup> April 2016 concluded that the required works have mostly been carried out to an acceptable standard.

The owner has advised Officers that the archaeological survey of the Tudor part of the building has now been carried out. Officers are still waiting for a copy of the report with recommendations in order to consider the next steps. **The owners have been contacted and further update would be provided for next committee.**

### **3.0 New Enforcement Appeals**

**34 St Barnabas Road, Mitcham** On 30th August 2016, the council issued an enforcement notice against the unauthorised increase in depth of the single

storey rear extension from 5 to 8.4 metre. The notice with a 3-month compliance period would have taken effect on 18/10/16 but an appeal has been received.

### 3.1 Existing enforcement appeals

- **21 Merton Hall Road, Morden** The Council issued an enforcement notice on 9/8/16 against the unauthorised erection of a wooden bike shelter. The notice would have come into effect on 15th September 2016 but the Council has been notified of an appeal. The requirement is to remove the shed within a month. **Council statement has been submitted.**
- **Wyke Road, Raynes Park SW20** The Council issued an enforcement notice on 4th July 2016 against the unauthorised material change in the use of the land for car parking. The notice would have come into effect on 10/08/16 but an appeal has been submitted. **Council statement has now been submitted.**
- **160 Bennetts Close Mitcham CR4 1NS.** An enforcement notice was issued on 20th April 2016 against the unauthorised erection of a fence exceeding 3 metres high. The notice came into effect on 1/6/16 as there was no appeal prior to that date and the requirement would be to demolish the fence and remove the resulting debris all within 3 months. **The notice has been complied with and the appeal has been withdrawn.**
- **Swinburn Court, 32 The Downs SW19** The Council served an enforcement notice on 15th March 2016 against the erection of a single storey outbuilding (garden shed) in the front/side garden of the block of flats. The requirement is to demolish the structure within three months of the effective date of 30/4/16 but for the appeal which was registered with a start date 29/6/16 and is by written representation. **An Inspector site visit date has been set for Tuesday 22/11/16.**
- **32 Cedars Avenue, Mitcham CR4 1EA** The Council issued an enforcement notice on 25th April 2016 against the unauthorised erection of a front garden wall, pillars and gates. An appeal by written representation is proceeding on ground 'A' – that planning permission should be granted for the development. Council's statement has been submitted.
- **3 Aberconway Road Morden SM4 -** The Council served an enforcement notice on 4th February 2016 against the erection of a single storey side extension to the property following a refusal of retrospective planning permission to retain the structure. The owner is required to remove the extension and associated debris within one month of the effective date. An appeal has been registered to proceed under ground 'A' only – that planning permission should be granted for the development. **Final statements have been submitted. We are now awaiting an inspector site visit date.**



### **3.2 Appeals determined –**

**39 Borough Road Mitcham CR4 3DX** The Council served an enforcement notice on 15th April 2016 against the erection of a boundary timber fence with a requirement to demolish the structure within three months of the effective date. The appeal was dismissed on 27/10/16 and the owner has to demolish the structure by 27<sup>th</sup> January 2017.

#### **Prosecution case.**

None

### **3.4 Requested update from PAC**

None

#### **4. Consultation undertaken or proposed**

None required for the purposes of this report

#### **5 Timetable**

N/A

#### **6. Financial, resource and property implications**

N/A

#### **7. Legal and statutory implications**

N/A

#### **8. Human rights, equalities and community cohesion implications**

N/A

#### **9. Crime and disorder implications**

N/A

#### **10. Risk Management and Health and Safety implications.**

N/A

#### **11. Appendices – the following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report Background Papers**

N/A

#### **12. Background Papers**

This page is intentionally left blank