

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](http://www.merton.gov.uk/committee).

## PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

14 DECEMBER 2017

(7.15 pm - 9.35 pm)

PRESENT Councillor Linda Kirby (in the Chair), Councillor Philip Jones, Councillor Laxmi Attawar, Councillor Peter Southgate, Councillor Stephen Crowe, Councillor David Dean, Councillor Andrew Judge, Councillor Geraldine Stanford and Councillor John Dehaney

ALSO PRESENT Ward Councillors John Bowcott, Gilli Lewis Lavender, Brian Lewis Lavender  
Neil Milligan – Development Control Manager  
Jonathan Lewis – Planning Team Leader  
Sarath Attanayake – Transport Planner  
Lisa Jewell – Democratic Services Officer

### 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Jerome Neil and Councillor Najib Latif

Councillor John Dehaney attended as substitute for Councillor Neil.

### 2 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST (Agenda Item 2)

There were no declarations of interest.

### 3 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Agenda Item 3)

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 16 November 2017 are agreed as an accurate record.

### 4 TOWN PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Agenda Item 4)

The Chair announced that items 5 and 12 had been withdrawn from the Agenda.

Supplementary Agenda: Amendments and modifications to the Officer's report were published in a Supplementary Agenda. This applied to items 7, 8, 9 and 11

Order of the meeting – The Chair announced that the order of items taken at the meeting would be: 6,7,8,9,10,11,13,14

### 5 DEACON HOUSE, 10 ATHERTON DRIVE, WIMBLEDON SW19 5LB (Agenda Item 5)

This application was withdrawn from the Agenda prior to the meeting

6 R/O 218 MORDEN ROAD, SOUTH WIMBLEDON, (Agenda Item 6)

Proposal: Outline application for the demolition of existing garages and the erection of 3 x 3 bedroom two-storey terraced houses. Approval is being sought for access, layout and scale with landscaping and appearance reserved matters

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation. The Committee received verbal representations from an Objector and the Agent to the application

The Objector raised points including:

- This proposal does not address residents concerns it is intrusive and will cause a loss of privacy for residents and will have a negative impact on existing properties
- There are concerns regarding parking, there will not be enough space for visitors and delivery vehicles
- There are issues with the removal of trees

The Agent made points including:

- This is a detailed proposal that has taken account of the Planning Inspectors views on the previous proposals for the site
- The development is sustainable and close to Morden
- The majority of the existing houses in the area are 3 storey but this development will only be 2 storey. The development will change the outlook of the existing houses but will not cause material harm
- There are currently 15 garages on the site which can be accessed by cars at all times of the day, therefore the proposal will be an improvement on this situation

In answer to Members questions, the Planning officer made points including:

- The access to the site was considered by the Planning Inspector during the appeal process on a previous application, and the Inspector did not identify access as an area of concern
- Access for emergency vehicles is covered under building regulations and it will be for the developer to ensure that these regulations are met.
- Housing in the area is mainly inter-war but there is also some late 19<sup>th</sup> Century.
- The application is for reserved matters, so the decision tonight is if the buildings are appropriate, details are limited at this stage but will be worked up if approved.

Members commented that as the design and siting shown were disappointing and unimaginative and there were concerns regarding the obscured glazing. The

Planning Officer commented that design issues will be revisited once reserved matters were granted, but not siting and layout.

Members asked for the reserved matters application to be brought before Committee for determination in the event that officers are minded to approve

## RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

7 1 AMBER COURT, 100 RICHMOND ROAD, WEST WIMBLEDON, LONDON, SW20 0PD (Agenda Item 7)

Proposal: Erection of a two storey side extension

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation and the additional information and planning conditions published in the supplementary agenda. The Committee received verbal representations from two Objectors to the application

The Objector on behalf of a Richmond road resident raised concerns including:

- The proposal does not respect the massing and rhythm of the properties on Richmond Road
- Amber Court was built in a sympathetic way with no windows in the flank wall facing Richmond Road, this proposal introduces windows to that flank wall
- Privacy will only be maintained by the trees between properties, but the applicant wants to prune these, they are not dense and are not evergreen. If one dies then screening will be lost.

The Objector from Amber Court raised concerns including:

- Insufficient care taken with the Officer's Report – the access road is 2.5m not 2.8m. Construction Vehicles will not be able to access the site
- The proposal is contrary to existing Merton Planning Policies
- The proposed extension is not subordinate to the main building
- The original planning permission allowed for a garage use only. If converted a parking space will be lost forever

The Planning Officer commented that the planning conditions had been attached that considered the objectors concerns including tree protection and requesting further details of windows in the flank wall.

In answer to Members questions the Planning Officer made comments including:

- One parking space will remain and that is considered adequate
- Covenants are not a planning issue

- The Applicant will need to provide more details on the flank wall windows, and this is requested by condition

## RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions in the published report, additional conditions in the supplementary agenda, and an additional condition regarding hours of work for the construction phase.

### 8 18 RIDGWAY PLACE, WIMBLEDON SW19 4EP (Agenda Item 8)

Proposal: Demolition of existing dwelling house and erection of a pair of semi-detached houses together with off-street parking and associated landscaping

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation and the late representation in the Supplementary Agenda. The Committee received verbal representations from two Objectors and the Agent to the application

The two Objectors raised residents' concerns including:

- This proposal is too big and too high and will reduce light to its neighbours. It is overdevelopment
- A tree specialist has recommended that trees should be protected
- 3 trees are to be cut down
- Want clarification on parking provision, use of opaque glass
- Residents do not feel consulted
- There is no mention of the specialist report commissioned by residents

The Agent to the application made points including:

- That the principle of two dwellings is established by the existing planning permission
- The development causes no loss of trees, one will be removed and replaced in the front garden
- The proposal will not cause daylight and sunlight issues to the neighbours, and the angles are such that outlook will not be affected.

In answer to the Objectors' points The Development Control Manager explained; that the Merton Tree Officer had no issues with the application, that Party Wall agreements were not relevant planning matters and were outside of Council control, and that the statutory duty to consult had been complied with.

In answer to Councillor Questions the Development Control Manager stated that the proposal was higher than its neighbours but that there was a mix of heights on the

road, and that this proposal was slightly bigger than the previously approved application.

Members commented that it was an attractive design

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions.

(Note: Councillor David Dean did not participate in this vote as he was absent for part of the item's discussion)

9 10 ST MARY'S ROAD WIMBLEDON SW19 7BW (Agenda Item 9)

Proposal: Demolition of existing garden shed and erection of office in rear garden.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation and additional condition in the supplementary agenda. The Committee received verbal representations from an Objector and the Ward Councillor.

The Objector raised points including:

- Development is out of keeping with the character of area
- Withdrawal of permitted development rights
- Misrepresentation of visual appearance of context
- Unacceptable increase in the living area of the house
- Overdevelopment on plot
- Overlooking and intrusion on privacy
- Possible archaeological issues have not been investigated by the Council

Councillor John Bowcott, Ward Councillor, made points including:

- The proposal is too large and intrusive. The property had permitted development rights withdrawn because it was already so large. This proposal is 22 m<sup>2</sup> and then has decking and a jacuzzi
- It will blight its neighbours and cause light and noise pollution to them.
- It will cause a loss of amenity and harm to neighbours, and is un-neighbourly

The Development Control Officer explained to the Committee that this proposal could be built without planning permission at other properties under permitted development, but because of the planning and development history at this site permitted development rights had been removed

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

10 PARK GATE HOUSE, 356 WEST BARNES LANE, NEW MALDEN, KT3 6NB  
(Agenda Item 10)

Proposal: Construction of an additional floor (3rd Floor) to provide 3 x new self-contained flats

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation. The Committee received verbal representations from an Objector and two Ward Councillors.

The Objector spoke on behalf of residents of Marina Avenue and made points including:

- The Planning Inspector dismissed the previous application saying that it was "prominent and visually jarring" and "overdominant and overbearing"
- The current building already "looms"
- The Inspector's comments and reasons for dismissing the appeal on the previous application could still apply to this current application
- The Inspector also made comment about the negative impact of the previous application on the living conditions of residents on Marina Avenue.

The Ward Councillors Brian Lewis Lavender and Gilli Lewis Lavender both spoke and made points including:

- Shocked to see this application back at Committee following the Planning Inspector's criticism of the previous scheme.
- This scheme does not address the issues raised by the planning inspector
- The Inspector has already said that an extra floor is overbearing on Marina Avenue
- It is bulky and overdominant
- There is no amenity space

Members commented that the Planning Inspector's comments on the previous application could also apply to this application, the current application is bulky, at odds with the appearance of the surrounding buildings, prominent and visually jarring, the building would be bulky, overly dominant and overbearing and would fail to respect the other buildings in the locality, the development would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area. Councillor Judge commented that the existing building is ugly and the additional storey does nothing to improve this.

A Refusal was proposed based on the Bulk, Size, lack of respect for the street scene and lack of symmetry of the proposal

## RESOLVED

The Committee agreed to:

1. REFUSE the application for the following reasons:
  - The bulk and massing, of the proposal are too great, contrary to LBM policies.
  - The proposal does not respect the streetscene and neighbouring buildings
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

### 11 49 WHITFORD GARDENS, MITCHAM CR4 4AB (Agenda Item 11)

Proposal: Conversion of existing dwellinghouse to form 1 x 3 bed flat and 1 x 1 bed flat, involving the demolition and replacement of single storey rear extension, erection of first floor rear extension and rear roof extension.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation and amendment to the recommendation contained in the Supplementary Agenda. The Committee received verbal representations from an Objector and the Agent to the application.

The Objector raised points including:

- There are many similar three bedroomed family homes being converted and lost
- The area is losing its character as a result
- Local infrastructure cannot cope with the additional residents living in such conversions
- Parking is a serious issue, even with the CPZ there are still difficulties in parking for local residents

The Agent for the application made comments including:

- The description is misleading, this application is only requesting a single storey rear extension of less and a loft conversion, both could be built under permitted development in other locations.
- Both proposed units exceed national space standards and one unit is a family unit.
- The development meets policies and is not detrimental

Members asked officers about garden space for the upstairs family unit. Officers reported that there is a small external side passageway that gives access to the garden for the family unit.

Members expressed regret at the loss of this and other family homes in Mitcham. As this application was smaller than most they felt that it was difficult to find reasons for refusal.

#### RESOLVED

The Committee voted to Grant planning permission subject to the completion of a S106 agreement/unilateral undertaking and planning conditions.

#### 12 LAND R/O 1 YORK ROAD, SOUTH WIMBLEDON SW19 8TP (Agenda Item 12)

Application was withdrawn from this Agenda prior to the meeting.

#### 13 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS (Agenda Item 13)

The Committee noted the report on recent Planning Appeal Decisions

#### 14 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - SUMMARY OF CURRENT CASES (Agenda Item 14)

The Committee noted the report on current enforcement cases.

#### 15 ADDITIONAL DATE FOR PAC - THURSDAY 8 MARCH 2018 (Agenda Item 15)

The Committee noted the additional date for the Planning Applications Committee on Thursday 8 March 2018.