

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

22 FEBRUARY 2018

(19.15 - 21.50 pm)

PRESENT Councillors Councillor Linda Kirby (in the Chair),
Councillor Najeeb Latif, Councillor Philip Jones,
Councillor Peter Southgate, Councillor Stephen Crowe,
Councillor David Dean, Councillor Andrew Judge,
Councillor Geraldine Stanford and Councillor Joan Henry and
Councillor John Dehaney

ALSO PRESENT Ward Councillors Suzanne Grocott and Michael Bull
Jonathan Lewis – Planning Team Leader
Tim Bryson – 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 Laxmi Attawar.
Councillor John Dehaney attended as Substitutes for Councillor Attawar.

2 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST (Agenda Item 2)

There were no declarations of pecuniary interest.

In the interest of openness and transparency Councillor David Dean declared that he would not vote on Item 10 – 579-589 Kingston Road as he had represented his ward residents in discussions with the applicant regarding a public exhibition.

3 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Agenda Item 3)

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 18 January 2018 are agreed as an accurate record.

4 TOWN PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Agenda Item 4)

Supplementary Agenda: Amendments and modifications to the Officer's report were published in a Supplementary Agenda. This applied to items 5,7,9,10,11, and 15.

The Chair reminded the Committee that items 6 (Deacon House, Atherton Road) and 12 (49 Murray Road) had been removed from the Agenda

Order of the meeting – The Chair announced that the order of items taken at the meeting would be: 5, 10, 8, 11, 7, 9, and 13

5 18 ARRAS AVENUE, MORDEN, SM4 6DF (Agenda Item 5)

Proposal: Conversion of Wyvern Youth Centre into 6 x residential units (comprising 2 x 1 bed, 1 x 2 bed and 3 x 3 bed flats) involving re-roofing, installation of skylights, new door and window openings, with associated parking, refuse, landscaping and cycle storage.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation and additional information in the Supplementary Agenda. The Committee received verbal representations from two objectors to the application and the Agent to the application

The Objectors made points including:

- The application is against Council Policy
- The application is overdevelopment, providing 6 units
- It does not provide enough parking spaces in a low PTAL area
- The application is a security risk to neighbours
- The Council has an added responsibility to protect residents as the application building was previously Council owned
- The applicant made a false declaration on the application form by saying that there were no trees on the application site – 14 mature trees have not been included
- A full tree survey is required

The Agent for the application made points including:

- The existing building is an eyesore
- The 6 units will exceed space standards
- Fencing and landscaping have been re-worked to protect trees, trees are important and none are to be removed
- The applicant has worked with Case Officer to accommodate neighbour's points regarding trees and their protection
- The applicant has talked to The Scouts who have now withdrawn their objection

The Planning Team Leader confirmed that the applicant had remodelled the path to protect the existing trees. He confirmed that no trees on the application site would be removed. Members asked the applicant to confirm if any trees would be removed. The Agent replied that no trees on the application site would be removed - one tree currently on the pavement would be removed and replaced with all costs to the applicant

The Planning Team Leader explained that the number of parking spaces available was satisfactory under current guidance. He advised Members not to put undue weight on the fact that the scheme did not provide 1 space per unit as more up to date information was available on car ownership across the borough which showed that generally car ownership across all households was between 60 and 70%.

When asked about the possibility of making the development permit free via a s106 agreement, the Planning Team leader advised against this; as there was no current CPZ in the area and that there was currently some on-street capacity to park such an

agreement comprising a future restriction on occupiers should not be imposed on the developer.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted unanimously to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

6 DEACON HOUSE, 10 ATHERTON DRIVE, WIMBLEDON SW19 5LB
(Agenda Item 6)

Item withdrawn from Agenda before meeting

7 27 BELVEDERE AVENUE, WIMBLEDON SW19 7PP (Agenda Item 7)

Proposal: Erection of ground, first and second floor front extensions, alterations to fenestration, including replacement of windows.

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

Members noted that the amended plans issued showed the proposal in the context of it's neighbouring buildings. The amended plans were not consulted on as the scheme itself remained unchanged.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

8 8-10 EDWARD AVENUE, MORDEN, SM4 6EP (Agenda Item 8)

Proposal: Demolition of both detached properties and redevelopment of the sites to provide two semi-detached pairs of dwellings (total of 4 new dwellings), each comprising 4 bedrooms, 2 storeys, accommodation at roof level and onsite vehicle parking.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation and received a verbal presentation by an objector to the application and the applicant's agent.

The Objector raised residents' concerns, including:

- This area is prone to subsidence, there are ongoing subsidence claims for neighbouring properties
- Building work could affect foundations
- Object to windows on the side of the upper floor
- Concerned about drainage in the vicinity
- Will the trees be removed?
- Bungalows have 2 residents, these new houses will total 16 residents.

The Applicant's agent made points including:

- The proposal is designed to respect the character of the area
- Car parking spaces are provided
- The proposed houses exceed minimum space standards
- Most of the bungalows in the area are being enlarged and are not in their original state.
- None of the trees are to be felled. One tree on the pavement will be removed and replaced

The Planning Team Leader explained that in the context of any nuisance arising from water draining from one plot onto another, this was a civil matter, not a planning matter.

Members commented that this area was made up of individual plots and so did not have a distinctive character. The bungalows were vulnerable to development, but there were no laws, guidance or policies to protect them.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

9 GARAGES R/O INGLEMERE ROAD & GRENFELL ROAD, MITCHAM, CR4 2BT (Agenda Item 9)

Proposal: Demolition of existing garages and buildings rear of Inglemere Road and erection of 10 x residential dwellings and a part single part three storey block comprising 4 flats and the provision of associated landscaping and parking

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation and the amended heads of terms presented in the Supplementary Agenda, that now contains reference to a review of the provision of affordable housing, and an undertaking to assist the current commercial occupants find alternative accommodation.

In answer to Members Questions, The Planning Team Leader made points:

- Access to backland sites is often a challenge. Rights of access have to be resolved between property owners and land owners.
- The Site is within a CPZ and the development is permit free
- Building Regs. will cover the installation of Fire Hydrants in the development
- Planning Policies do try to retain employment land but in this case an all housing development is a good deal

Members commented that this was an appropriate use of the site.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

10 579-589 KINGSTON ROAD, RAYNES PARK, SW20 8SD (Agenda Item 10)

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of site to provide offices (1,201 sq.m - class b1) and residential (99 units - class c3) accommodation in buildings of two - six storeys, provision of car parking (24 cars, 12 disabled spaces), cycle parking (224 spaces), vehicle access, landscaping, plant and associated works

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation and additional information in the supplementary agenda including a statement from Children Schools and Families and a summary of late letters of representation. The Planning Team leader asked the committee to note that 10 late letters of representation had been received on the day of committee and placed on the planning explorer system one of these was in support of the application and 9 were objecting to the application.

The Committee received representations from two Ward Councillors.

Councillor Suzanne Grocott made points including:

- The housing is badly needed and pleased to see affordable housing
- But object to bulk and scale of this application
- It increases the flood risk, flooding is an annual event in this area
- 5 stories is overdevelopment
- It will overpower and overshadow The Apostles area, residents of this area are disappointed with the lack of time before committee.

Councillor Michael Bull made points including:

- Agreed with previous points about height and appearance, and flood risk
- Concern regarding infrastructure – Schools and Health provision
- A major concern for many local residents is that there are only 24 parking spaces for 99 properties, and that the local CPZ is only from 8.30am to 6.30pm. Predicted that many residents of the proposed building will park on local roads after 6.30pm.
- Need to consider the impact of the new Dundonald Church next to this and other new accommodation on the site of Southey Bowls Club

Members asked officers about the height of the proposal compared to the height of the previously allowed commercial block, and also if any part of the proposal was 7 storeys high?

The Agents were asked to answer these questions, and they confirmed that there was no part of the proposal that was 7 storeys – the wording in the report was an administrative error. Compared to the allowed commercial building the front of the proposal was a very similar height, within 1m.

The Agent also stressed that the front of the proposal was not one continuous block.

In reply to Member's questions about flooding, the planning team leader replied that the Council's Flood Risk Engineer, had assessed the application site as low risk of flooding but the surrounding roads were at medium risk of surface water flooding. Therefore a detailed drainage condition requiring a Sustainable Drainage system (SuDS) to remove surface water is attached to the recommendation.

Member's asked if officers agreed that the car parking spaces were sufficient given that car ownership across the borough was 0.67%, which would suggest that 67 spaces were needed at this site. The Planning Team Leader replied that car ownership across the borough was 64% for all types of properties and incomes. This development would have lower car ownership as it included affordable housing, was not all family housing and had a high PTAL score – all of which reduce car ownership. The permit free nature of the development would further reduce the demand for parking.

Members asked if there was any parking for the Businesses in the commercial section of the proposal. Officers noted that there would be loading bays across the Kingston Road frontage, as the building was set back there was sufficient space for these and a footpath .

Members asked if it could be conditioned that all parking spaces should have electric charging points. Officers replied that the application provides sufficient to meet London Plan standards and requiring additional charging points by condition would therefore be unreasonable and was not recommended.

Members asked what would happen if Planning Permission was granted, with the proposed level of affordable housing, but the applicant were to sell the land on with the valid planning permission – could the new owner submit a new viability assessment supporting a lower level of affordable housing?
Officers replied that in such a situation the agreed heads of terms would form the starting point of negotiations with a new developer, but that all information submitted by a new developer would be scrutinised by Officers, and any such developer could not permit different occupation arrangements of the build without an amended S106 agreement being in place.

Members asked if the provision of cycle parking was correct and would the cycle parking be secure and noted that Officers reply that it met London Plan Standards and that by splitting up the cycle stores this was more likely to encourage their take up by residents.

Members commented that they liked the 'Build to Rent' plan for the development, with affordable housing peppered throughout, which is good news for key workers and will prevent units being left empty
Other members said that they were concerned about the parking provision being too low.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

Councillor David Dean did not vote on this item.

11 50 MARRYAT ROAD, WIMBLEDON SW19 5BD (Agenda Item 11)

Proposal: Demolition of existing building and erection of a three storey dwelling house with additional accommodation at basement level together with associated car parking, landscaping and front boundary treatment.

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

The Committee received a verbal objection from an Agent acting on behalf of the residents at 48 Marryat Road, who raised points including:

- The Scale and massing of the proposal are too great
- The proposal will cause overlooking and loss of light to the neighbouring properties
- Mature Trees will be lost
- The Basement Method Statement submitted by the applicants does not meet Merton policy. This method statement is not site specific
- A review of the submitted sunlight and daylight study shows that the proposal will infringe 48 Marrayat Road's right to light. This is not mentioned in the Officers report.

The Applicant made points including:

- The proposal will be an upgrade to the current house
- The mature tree was lost in August 2017 when it was de-rooted by a storm. It is incorrect to say that it was cut down
- The daylight and sunlight report is totally BRE compliant
- There is a technical basement report – but the document was too big to successfully load on the Council's planning portal
- The proposal is 1.20m from the fence to allow more light to the neighbours

The Planning Team Leader made comments including:

- The size of the basement in relation to the plot is policy compliant
- The proposal is larger than existing but most of this additional bulk is at the rear of the property
- There are properties of various scale on the street
- The Daylight and sunlight report shows a slight reduction in light to two side facing ground floor windows but these are in a dual aspect room.
- The Basement Method Statement has been informed by a detailed site visit

When asked about the actual reduction of daylight to the windows of the ground floor of No.48, the Planning Officer said he did not have the exact figures to hand but that 9 windows were tested. 7 passed BRE guidelines, and 2 did not meet the 20% target value. The officer's report does provide this information and right to light is not necessarily a planning issue.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

12 49 MURRAY ROAD, WIMBLEDON SW19 4PF (Agenda Item 12)

Item withdrawn from Agenda before meeting

13 37-39 ROOKWOOD AVENUE, NEW MALDEN, KT3 4LY (Agenda Item 13)

Proposal: Demolition of office building and erection of a new 3x bedroom house

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

14 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS (Agenda Item 14)

The Committee noted the report on recent Planning Appeals

15 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - SUMMARY OF CURRENT CASES (Agenda Item 15)

The Committee noted the report on recent enforcement cases.

The Committee asked for clarification of the situation at 9 Albert Road Mitcham.