

**Merton Council**  
**Planning Applications Committee**  
**16 November 2017**  
**Supplementary agenda**

13      Modifications

1 - 4

This page is intentionally left blank

## Planning Applications Committee 16<sup>th</sup> November 2017 Supplementary Agenda (Modifications Sheet)

### **Item 5. 12-24 Alwyne Mansions, Alwyne Road Wimbledon SW19 - 17/P2396 - Hillside Ward**

Consultation (Page 16)

Additional representations.

Eight additional letters of objection have been received (a total of 38), raising the following new grounds:

- The proposal is purely driven by profit.
- The build is likely to take longer than six months, resulting in additional disturbance.
- Amendment does not overcome concerns previously raised.
- Query whether legal advice has been taken in relation to the possibility of subsidence – query whether a structural engineer has carried out an independent assessment.
- Perspective drawings are misleading.
- Additional concerns raised in relation to loss of light.
- 20m separation distance is not sufficiently far to avoid overlooking.

Officer comment:

- *The motives of the developer are not a material planning consideration.*
- *It is possible the build would take longer than six months. However, conditions are recommended to minimise these impacts and it would not be reasonable to refuse a planning application on the basis that the building works would cause disturbance.*
- *Issues of subsidence and other structural aspects would be addressed at the Building Control stage.*

### **Item 6. 96-98 The Broadway Wimbledon SW19 - 15/P1569 - Trinity Ward**

Consultation (Page 37).

Insert the following:

Five late letters received from occupiers of properties in Cobden Mews and Printers Yard. The grounds of objection are set out below:-

- Cobden Mews at the rear of the site is an adopted highway and there are 7 businesses in the mews and 7 retailers who place waste at the rear of properties and parking is not monitored. The proposal will compound problems in the mews.
- Construction vehicles would not be able to access the site.
- By increasing the number of people in the mews would contribute to more waste.
- The area is already congested and hazardous and the Council should adopt the mews and take responsibility for what is a lawless space.
- The site is too small for the number of flats.
- The plans remove the one potential parking space at the rear of the site.
- The new building would result in loss of light to 2 Cobden mews.

## **Item 7. 247 The Broadway Wimbledon SW19 - 17/P3135 - Abbey Ward**

### Checklist information (Page 45)

Report checklist – Insert the following - The application was reported to the Design Review Panel.

### Consultation (Page 48)

Insert the following.

### Design Review Panel (30/03/2017)

Overall the Panel were very positive about the design, noting significant improvements compared to the previous proposal. In particular, the Panel noted the quality of the architecture and the introduction of a basement to enable the height of the building to be lowered.

The Panel felt that the front elevation was really good and elegant and the applicant had worked hard to get the proportions right. The elevation was considered to be settled and calm. The slight stepping back of the upper floors and the window reveals were noted as good features.

The Panel welcomed the use of brick and its relevance to similar types of buildings in Wimbledon. Getting the right brick was considered important and better to source locally if that was possible. They also liked the references to William Morris and the subtle way the architect was considering using them in the window reveals and elsewhere. It was important that these were not simply applied but formed part of the materials used.

The Panel felt that it was particularly important to get the vertical/horizontal balance right in the elevation and noted that the analysis of the plot widths had influenced the design of the elevation into five bays of three windows wide, which was well liked. However, the building also had to sit next to the rather plain adjacent hotel with its strong horizontal feel.

Given this, the Panel felt that the architect had not yet got this balance right. There was some discussion about a slightly stronger vertical emphasis could be achieved, such as slightly reducing the presence of the upper cornice, or having projecting windows instead, though the Panel was not expressly recommending anything in particular. They were clear it was a key point, but it was for the architect to address the issue and come up with their own solution to this. This was particularly important as this was the key point preventing the Panel giving the scheme a Green verdict.

The Panel welcomed the improvements to the public realm at the front, but were concerned about the narrow footway behind the bus stop and the presence and activity generated by the building entrance – should this have more emphasis in the elevation? The basement lightwell was presenting a barrier to a wider pavement, although the Panel acknowledged that it was being widened and that the basement was enabling a lower building.

The Panel felt that the entrance needed to have a strong presence and key to this was both its visual presence, which seemed a bit lost in the graphics shown, and in the level of activity. On this point the Panel felt that how the ground floor space was used was important to this. It needed to be welcoming, particularly if it was to be used for co-working, and a degree of socialising space was suggested. The large area of stonework on the frontage was important to get right, including the entrance to the car lift.

At the rear, the Panel noted how the building compared to previous proposals, both consented and not. It was important to ensure that window positions did not impede either privacy of residential properties or the ability of adjacent commercial properties

to expand in the future. Given the current building arrangement and the previous proposals it was considered important for the applicant to tell the story and give reasons for the proposed site layout, building arrangement and massing, including other options considered and rejected. It was also noted that the design theme of the frontage was not very evident in the rear, though it was questioned whether this was important.

The Panel noted that in the CGI images, the building looked to have more mass and presence than in the drawn elevation. It was felt that the size of the building needed to have elements of detailed design that gave human scale, and the ideas for detailing were going in the right direction, but were important to follow through and get right.

Overall the Panel were positive and enthusiastic about the proposal. Some details needed further work, but the issue of getting a slightly stronger vertical emphasis was the key point to address.

**VERDICT: AMBER**

Planning History (Page 47)

Paragraph 4.8 Replace last sentence regarding the DRP. New paragraph: The application has been developed following comments made by the Design Review Panel at the DRP meeting of 30/03/2017 subsequent advice from officers. The Design Review Panels comments have been addressed in the current proposal:-

- Revised design of frontage and façade.
- Vertical/horizontal balance of the façade addressed.
- Detailing of the façade refined.
- Improved spandrel detail.
- A reduction in the extent and visual impact of the plant enclosure

It should also be noted that in 2014 planning permission was granted for a mixed use office and residential scheme for the redevelopment of the site (LBM Ref.13/P0952). This permission had a five year implementation condition and does not expire until March 2019. A second application for office development (LBM Ref.16/P1623) was refused in November 2016 on grounds of design, bulk and massing. The current application seeks to address the reasons for refusal by addressing points raised by the Design Review Panel and officers.

The application has been made by Wimbledon Offices, a family business based in Wimbledon and the proposal would provide a viable and attractive workspace for a range of businesses and responding to an identified need in this part of Wimbledon Town Centre.

**Item 8. 240 Burlington Road, New Malden KT3 - 17/P0833 - West Barnes Ward Consultation (Page 62).**

Insert the following.

Two further letters of comment have been received. One considers that this appears to be a reasonable proposal in the circumstances. The second raises concerns that undergraduate students are more likely to 'party hard' than graduates and that 'graduates in full time employment' does not seem to relate to any particular type of student but persons working in a range of professions.

### Planning considerations (Page 65)

Paragraph 7.10 Replace the third sentence with; with four bedrooms per cluster they would not meet the GIA requirements for four bedroom units whilst the layout of the upper two floors with the central corridors would not lend itself to conversion, the layout having been previously approved by members and changes in tenure will not alter the quality of accommodation.

### **Item 9. 30 Newstead Way Wimbledon SW19 - 17/P3227 - Village Ward**

Consultation (Page 73).

Insert the following.

Paragraph 5.3, replace number 5 with 7: "However, in the interim 7 of these objections have been formally withdrawn following the changes."

Amend the final informative as follows (underlined words to be added):

*You are advised to contact the Council's Highways team on 020 8545 3700 before undertaking any works within the Public Highway to obtain the necessary approvals and/or licences. Please be advised that there is a further charge for this work. If your application falls within a Controlled Parking Zone this has further costs involved and can delay the application by 6 to 12 months. This is currently out for consultation and will be implemented by March 2018. You are advised to contact Council Highways about any additional costs associated with the amendments to the Controlled Parking Zone and construction costs.*

### **Item 10. 3 Orchard Lane Raynes Park SW20 - 17/P3256 - Raynes Park Ward**

Consultation (Page 82).

Insert the following.

2 additional representations have been received:

1) Raised concerns relating to additional vehicle movements, the width of the vehicle access and highway and pedestrian safety. The representation requested that should planning permission be granted, that additional conditions be imposed requiring the development to be permit (parking) free, to remove the front entrance from the gatehouse and to provide additional green screening to screen views from 1 Orchard Lane.

2) Raised concerns relating to the vitality and protection of Tree T4 (subject to a TPO). Stated that the tree has been incorrectly identified as a Swamp Cypress when it is in fact a Dawn redwood *Metasequoia glyptostroboides*. Requested that a planning condition to be added requiring tree protection measures to implemented.

### **Item 11. Planning Appeal decisions.**

No modifications.

### **Item 12. Enforcement summary.**

No modifications.