

All minutes are draft until agreed at the next meeting of the committee/panel. To find out the date of the next meeting please check the calendar of events at your local library or online at www.merton.gov.uk/committee.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

25 MAY 2017

(7.15 pm - 11.05 pm)

PRESENT Councillor Linda Kirby (Chair),
Councillor Laxmi Attawar, Councillor Stephen Crowe,
Councillor David Dean, Councillor Philip Jones,
Councillor Andrew Judge, Councillor Najeeb Latif,
Councillor Peter Southgate and Councillor Geraldine Stanford
and Joan Henry

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Uddin, who was substituted by Councillor Henry.

2 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST (Agenda Item 2)

There were no declarations of pecuniary interest.

In the interest of openness and transparency Councillor Dean declared that the applicant of Item 11 was a friend and therefore he would not participate in that item.

In the interest of openness and transparency Councillor Latif declared that he had been involved in negotiations relating to item 12 and that he would not participate in that item

3 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Agenda Item 3)

Councillor Attawar raised an issue with reported voting for Item 7. This was checked, with the clerk after the meeting and changed to: A vote was taken on the motion, with 6 members voting for the motion and 3 members not voting

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 20 April 2017 are agreed as an accurate record, with the above change being made.

4 TOWN PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Agenda Item 4)

Supplementary Agenda: A list of modifications for agenda items 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14 were published as a supplementary agenda.

Order of the Agenda – The Chair amended the order of items to the following: 9, 8, 13, 14, 10, 7, 5, 12, 11 and 6

5 4 AND 4A COTTENHAM PARK ROAD, WEST WIMBLEDON, SW20 0RZ (Agenda Item 5)

Proposal: Demolition of 2 x existing houses and erection of 3 detached 5 bedroom houses arranged over 4 floors

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation

The Objector raised residents' concerns, including:

- The proposed houses would not match the townscape character of the area, they are identical, square and are inconsistent with other buildings in the area
- A new Church Hall, close to application site, has been required to match the local character in terms of height and gables.

The Agent made points including:

- The application site is not in a Conservation Area, and there are a variety of building styles in the area
- The height of the proposed houses has been reduced during the application process

In answer to Members questions the Planning Officer explained that the architect had taken local character into account with the design and that there were a variety of styles in the area.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

6 32 FLORENCE AVENUE, MORDEN, SM4 6EX (Agenda Item 6)

Proposal: Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of four terrace houses

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation. The Development Control Manager asked the Committee to note that a previous application for this site had been refused and that the applicant had submitted an appeal against this refusal, but that the result of this appeal was not yet known. This previous scheme was higher than the current proposed scheme

The Ward Councillor, Stephen Alamabritis raised residents' concerns regarding the proposed development. Before speaking he declared that he and his wife owned a property on Florence Road. The Ward Councillor made reference to a petition signed by 70 residents against this development on the grounds that it was dominant and overbearing and would result in the loss of a bungalow. He also felt that the current proposal had not addressed the previous reasons for refusal.

Members asked officers about the previous refusal and noted that if the appeal allowed the previous scheme, and the committee allowed the current proposed scheme, it would be up to the applicant to decide which they built, but it would be unlikely that they would start one scheme and then change to the other.

Members noted the officer view that it was not unusual to get different sized houses in this area and so the design of the fourth house on the current scheme was acceptable

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

7 1 HADLEIGH CLOSE, MERTON PARK, SW20 9AW (Agenda Item 7)

Proposal: Erection of a two storey side extension

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation and information in the Supplementary Agenda

In response to Members comments, officers said that the proposed extension followed good design principles and was sufficiently subservient to the main house to give no reasons for refusal.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

8 HATTON HOUSE, 81 HARTFIELD ROAD, WIMBLEDON, SW19 (Agenda Item 8)

Proposal: Application for change of use of commercial spaces on lower ground floor only to classes D1 (non-residential institutions) and D2 (assembly and leisure) for the provision of gymnasium

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation and information in the supplementary agenda.

The Objector raised residents' concerns including:

- This is an entirely residential area, and Hatton House is opposite a Conservation Area.
- Possible security issues linked to the disabled access
- The Gym will cause a noise nuisance and disturbance for residents
- The original use as offices would have resulted in much shorter times of usage than the 6am -8pm, 7 days a week usage of the gym in this proposal

The Agent raised points including:

- This has been a difficult site to market as there is no natural daylight
- The proposal is not for a fully functional gym and would create limited footfall
- Signage will be restricted in size

The Ward Councillor, Michael Bull raised points including:

- A large number of residents have objected to this application
- The Gym will cause noise and disturbance from early in the morning until late in the evening, and the disabled access is a security risk to residents
- There are parking issues in this area, there is a CPZ and it is some distance from the town centre car parks
-

In answer to Members questions the Planning Development Manager explained:

- There had been no interest in the site whilst it had been marketed as offices
- Members could decide to restrict the opening hours by condition
- Members could ensure, by condition, that there is controlled entry to protect the security of residents– this would be relevant to the disabled access.
- There are conditions to control noise
- If noise is a nuisance to residents and they believe noise conditions are being breached then Environmental Health could be called upon to conduct a survey to collect quantitative evidence of this breach

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to the conditions in the Officers report and also two additional conditions:

1. The applicant must implement a controlled entry scheme for disabled users so as not to compromise the security of residents
2. The opening times for all activities shall be 7am – 8pm on a Monday to Saturday and 9am – 8pm on a Sunday.

9 162 - 164 HARTFIELD ROAD, WIMBLEDON, SW19 3TQ (Agenda Item 9)

Proposal: Demolition of a two semi-detached dwellings and erection of a three storey building (with basement) comprising 4 x 2 bedroom flats and 3 x 1 bedroom flats and 1 x studio flat together with associated landscaping.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation and additional information in supplementary agenda

The Objector raised residents' concerns including:

- The Victorian houses on the site should not be demolished
- The proposed scheme is overdevelopment

- It does not respect the character of the road
- The new development will have an adverse affect on neighbours
- There are no family units in the proposed development
- The basements are inappropriately large
- There are vibration issues with the road outside
- The developer has made amendments during the planning process,

The Agent made points including:

- We have made reductions to the scale and massing
- Objectors have misinterpreted the application and its amendments
- Hartfield Road includes a variety of styles of housing.
- This design is modern but sympathetic to the Victorian style, did not want to design a poor quality copy of a Victorian building
- Other houses have been extended to be larger that the proposed development
- The basement flats are large enough to be classed as family units

The Ward Councillor made points including:

- The proposed design is inconsistent with this central section of Hartfield Road
- It is overdevelopment
- The development would lead to the loss of family homes
- The development would lead to the loss of parking for residents
- Concern with process and amendments made

The Development Control Manager reminded Members that the Victorian houses on the site have no protection as they are not listed or in a Conservation Area. In reply to Member questions about applying policy DMD4 to declare the buildings as a heritage asset, he cautioned that this would still not give them adequate protection to justify a refusal.

In reply to Member questions, the DC manager commented:

- That in relation to potential loss of daylight the applicant had replicated the wing of neighbouring properties.
- The Structural Engineers have approved the basement
- Late objections were received (detailed in the supplementary agenda)
- The drawings shown at the meeting are the most up-to-date versions

- Engineers have done work to resolve the vibration issues on the road
- Two bedroomed basement flats are not ideal as family units but they are generously sized and do have access to gardens
- The dormer design is acceptable

Members of the Committee commented that this part of Hartfield Road does have a distinctive character and uniformity and that any redevelopment should respect this character, they felt that this development did not respect this character. A Motion to refuse on the grounds that the development does not meet the requirements of policy DMD2 and does not respect the character of the surrounding properties

RESOLVED

The Committee agreed to:

1. REFUSE the application for the following reason:
The design of the application is out-of-character with the surrounding properties, and does not respect the scale and materials of the surrounding properties. The application does not meet the requirements of policy DMD2
2. DELEGATE to the Director of Environment & Regeneration the authority to make any appropriate amendments in the context of the above to the wording of the grounds of refusal including references to appropriate policies

10 7 LAMBOURNE AVENUE, WIMBLEDON PARK, SW19 7DW (Agenda Item 10)

Proposal: Demolition of existing detached house and erection of 2 x two storey detached houses with accommodation at basement and roof level .

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation and information in the Supplementary Agenda

The Objector raised residents' concerns including:

- This new scheme still presents a very wide street frontage and is still twice the depth of the existing house

The agent explained how the new scheme now consisted of two houses with the stepping down clearly shown, in response to the Inspectors comments

The Planning Officer explained that the appeal on refused scheme was dismissed on grounds of over dominance on the streetscene. She asked members to note that the inspector did not express any concern about the impact on neighbours of the refused scheme.

In response to members questions the Planning Officer explained that the houses in Lambourne Avenue were generally wider than those proposed but not to a degree that the proposal was considered to be out of character.

Members requested that low vibration piling be conditioned.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted unanimously to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

11 91 THE QUADRANT, WEST WIMBLEDON, SW20 8SW (Agenda Item 11)

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension plus erection of a single storey self-contained dwelling to side of existing house

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation

The Objectors raised residents' concerns including:

- Loss of privacy resulting from move of the front door to the side of the proposed property
- Proposal does not meet requirements of 'Designing out Crime' officer
- Proposal does not meet minimum planning space standards
- Proposal will compromise security of neighbouring property

The applicant raised points including:

- There is already permission to build a similar property.
- The change to the position of the front door has been approved by planning officers
- There is currently no security on this side access. The proposal will improve security

In response to objectors comments the Development Control Manager explained that 'secured-by-design' is not an issue for a one person dwelling. This scheme already has permission, but with the front door in a different position. The floorspace is less than standards require for a one bedroomed flat but is well above the floorspace required for a one person studio.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

12 8 ST MARY'S ROAD, WIMBLEDON SW19 7BW (Agenda Item 12)

Proposal: Application for variation of Conditions 2 (Approved Plans) and 14 (Landscaping) attached to LBM Planning Permission Ref.15/P3969 (Dated 25/02/2016) relating to the demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a new four storey dwelling house comprising a basement level and landscaping (Amendments to approved scheme comprising additional oval window to front elevation, revisions to design of dormer windows, removal of rear lantern light, revisions to fenestration, roof light to rear bedroom omitted and roof light facing 10 St Mary's Road omitted and roof light facing 6 St Mary's Road repositioned, together with revisions to landscaping scheme).

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation and information contained in the supplementary agenda.

The Objectors raised residents' concerns including:

- Loss of privacy from windows installed without obscure glazing
- Many changes have been made by the developer, after permission was granted

Officers commented that issues raised by objectors relating to boundaries were not covered by the scope of this application.

Members asked officers to ensure that there was no infringement of privacy caused by the lack of obscured glass in the windows.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

13 23 STREATHAM ROAD, MITCHAM, CR4 2AD (Agenda Item 13)

Proposal: Demolition of existing building and erection of a single storey Lidl foodstore with associated car parking, cycle parking and landscaping.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation and additional information in the Supplementary Agenda.

The Objector raised residents' concerns including:

- Do not object to the principle of a Lidl store on this site but object to the position of this proposal as it is only 6m away flats in Tudor House
- This proximity would cause noise and pollution nuisance for residents and would affect the right to light of residents
- Pity that Lidl did not engage with residents by following up on original consultations

The Agent made comments including:

- This is an opportunity to redevelop a Brownfield site and is important for the local community
- Changes have been made to the application to improve the movement of vehicles, and a right turn lane from Streatham Road is part of the proposal
- The application contains landscaping to retain TPO trees, add 10 new trees, a green living wall and bird boxes to retain the feel and biodiversity of the current site
- It will provide 40 retail jobs

In answer to Members questions the Planning Officer explained:

- The Previous appeal in 1998 is a material consideration, but Officers do not know how much weight it would carry now.
- Officers were satisfied that the proposal will not have an impact on natural light to Tudor House
- Hours of servicing and deliveries could be further controlled by more detailed conditions. This could include specific requirements for chiller lorries

Members made comments including:

- There is no objection to the principle of a Lidl Store on this site
- The design and siting of this proposal is unneighbourly to Tudor House
- If accommodation had been incorporated into this design it would have softened the connection with Tudor House.
- The amount of parking could be reduced to encourage sustainable forms of transport to be used
- The traffic in this area can be very heavy
- If the building was moved forward on the site it would have less impact on residents in Tudor House and Graham Avenue
- Don't understand why there needs to be so much parking at the front of the development
- Loading Bay is in the wrong place – it could be in the middle of the site

A recommendation to Refuse was proposed and seconded, for the reasons of the design and siting of this proposal is unneighbourly to Tudor House and does not respect the streetscene of Streatham Road.

RESOLVED

The Committee agreed to:

1. REFUSE the application for the following reason:

The application by its siting and design, does not present an active frontage to Streatham Road, it does not maintain the rhythm and existing pattern of Streatham Road and it unduly affects the outlook from Tudor House and Graham Avenue.

2. DELEGATE to the Director of Environment & Regeneration the authority to make any appropriate amendments in the context of the above to the wording of the grounds of refusal including references to appropriate policies

14 WELLINGTON HOUSE, 60-68 WIMBLEDON HILL ROAD, SW19 7PA
(Agenda Item 14)

Proposal: Refurbishment of the existing commercial building including the recladding of the exterior of the building, erection of one additional floor and infilling of the surface level car park to create an additional 1,795sqm Gross Internal Area (GIA) (1,935sqm Gross External Area (GEA)) of office use (Class B1). Amalgamation of two ground floor class A2 units into a single class A2 unit. Reduction in the number of on-site car parking spaces from 34 to 7 and reduction in number of on-street parking bays currently located outside Mansel Court on Mansel Road from 4 to 3. Terrace to be located at level 4.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation and information in supplementary agenda.

Members were pleased to note that the DRP (Design Review Panel) had given this new scheme a green light rating as it would make huge improvements to the current building. They were also pleased to see that their reasons for refusing the previous application had been acknowledged by the developers in this new scheme. The Committee noted that the revisions to the existing parking bay arrangement would result in two full sized parking bays.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

15 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS (Agenda Item 15)

The Committee noted the report on recent Planning Appeal Decisions

16 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - SUMMARY OF CURRENT CASES (Agenda Item 16)

The Committee noted the officers report on Enforcement cases, and one member asked about the progress of enforcement action in Cedars Avenue. The Development Control Manager said he would report back to the Councillor on this matter.