

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

7 JUNE 2018

(7.15 pm - 9.35 pm)

PRESENT Councillors Councillor Linda Kirby (in the Chair),
Councillor Najeeb Latif, Councillor Laxmi Attawar,
Councillor David Chung, Councillor David Dean,
Councillor Simon McGrath, Councillor Peter Southgate and
Councillor Marsie Skeete

ALSO PRESENT Councillor Geraldine Stanford
Neil Milligan
Jonathan Lewis
Tim Lipscomb
Sarath Attanayke
Lisa Jewell

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dave Ward and Russell Makin.

Councillors Dennis Pearce and Rebecca Lanning were present as substitute members.

Councillor Latif was present at the start of the meeting but apologised that he would have to leave at 8.15pm.

2 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST (Agenda Item 2)

There were no declarations of pecuniary interest.

Councillor Latif declared that as he had been involved in discussions between residents and the applicants he would not participate or vote on Item 6 – The Study Camp Road.

3 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Agenda Item 3)

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 26 April 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, 6, 7 and 9.

Order of the meeting – The Chair announced that the items would be taken in the following order 6,7,8,9,5,10 and 11

5 94 AYLWARD ROAD, SW20 9AQ (Agenda Item 5)

Proposal: Demolition of existing double garage in the rear garden and the erection of a garden studio comprising basement and mezzanine levels.

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

Members asked officers if it was possible to prevent the rear access from being opened up in future. The Planning Team Leader explained that it would be unusual to try to achieve this by condition. If in future there was evidence of the site being used as a place of employment then this would be against the Planning Permission. If in future there was evidence that the building was being used as a separate dwelling then this could be dealt with and stopped by enforcement action.

Members asked about the lighting in the proposal and officers explained that as this is not a proposal for a dwelling such standards do not exist. If approved a construction method statement will be required, which will control the basement construction.

The Planning Officer explained that the term 'ancillary to the main dwelling' covered a wide range of uses of outbuildings, and that this was the correct way to describe this proposal.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

6 THE STUDY, CAMP ROAD, WIMBLEDON, SW19 4UN (Agenda Item 6)

Proposal: Partial demolition of existing single storey extension and erection of a two storey extension (and associated Listed Building Consent application 17/P4184).

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

The Objectors raised point including:

- There is already dangerous parking at the school, the 'Stop and Drop' will make this worse and will jeopardise highway safety
- School does not demonstrate any public benefit from this proposal as it is a private fee paying school
- The proposal is not compliant with Merton's own policies or the NPPF
- The proposal is not in accordance with the council's own Conservation Area Appraisal, and would lead to substantial harm to the Conservation Area.

The Applicants made points including:

- We have received several years of pre-application advice and have listened to all comments and made amendments

- Urgent need for more teaching space. This 2 storey design gives more space without losing important playground space
- The design meets the requirements of the Council's Conservation Officer and Historic England
- Pupil numbers will not be increased

In reply to Members' questions Officers made points including:

- Officers believe that amendments made by the applicants are an improvement to improve the original application
- The Council's conservation Officer and Historic England have been involved in assessing the application and raise no objections
- The proposed CPZ will be subject to a public consultation process
- The proposed materials will better retain the Octagon as the main focal point as it allows the older buildings to be visually distinct.
- The area is not subject to flood risk and drainage measures are considered for all applications. This site raises no concerns.

Members made comments including:

- It is important that the proposed extension does create a gap between the octagon building and the new building, and the question is whether the gap created by this proposal is big enough to preserve the integrity and setting of the Octagon.
- The new extension is not subordinate to the Octagon in one view
- The current building is very ugly but this proposal is too close to the Octagon

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent subject to conditions

7 FORMER SPARROWHAWK SITE, 159 COMMONSIDE EAST, MITCHAM, CR4 2QB (Agenda Item 7)

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and the erection of a building to create x 28 self-contained residential units with associated parking and landscaping

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation. The Planning Team leader drew members' attention to the additional information in the Supplementary Agenda which included corrections to the table showing floorspace of the proposed units, which show that all units do meet minimum standards.

Objectors made comments including:

- We do want this area to be regenerated but this proposal is overdevelopment with a very high density
- Notification by Council not adequate and some representations missing from council website
- There are four major objections:

- Size and inappropriateness of building
- Too high – will cut light and spoil outlook
- Parking in the area already intolerable – 18 places insufficient
- Risk from dust borne contaminants during construction

The Agent to the application made comments including:

- The development will provide 28 high quality units in a sustainable development
- Planning policy supports the change to the use of the land
- Comments of the DRP taken on board and the number of units reduced
- Will offer wider benefits to surrounding area
- The Highways officer confirms that the proposal is acceptable
- No sign that there would be a negative impact on residential amenity
- The Developer is keen to bring forward as soon as possible

The Ward Councillor, Geraldine Stanford made comments including:

- Appreciate modifications have been made to the original proposal, but not enough
- The Committee should reject this application on height bulk and massing as it does not compare to existing buildings
- It is adjacent to Cricket Ground Conservation Area.
- Local streets are narrow and there are existing problems with parking, also there is a local Primary School that makes situation worse. This development would exacerbate these problems

The Planning Team Leader answered Councillor Questions regarding the following issues:

Employment Land:

Land is not designated as a Strategic Industrial Area, but it is covered by the Council's policy on scattered employment. However Planning Officers have to balance this against the demands for housing in the borough and apply policies with some flexibility.

Design of proposed building:

The development does contain units with no amenity space and, owing to its 'L' shaped design, units without a dual aspect. However Officers feel that given recent Supplementary Planning Guidance from the Mayor of London that this is acceptable

Parking:

The decision on Parking should be based on Council Policy and analytical evidence. Up to date evidence from TFL says that car ownership in Merton is 64%. This development provides parking for 66% of residents. And provides 6 formal undesignated spaces

The actual number of parking spaces provide by the proposal would be 17 + 2 disabled spaces, making 19 in total. The PTAL rating is 3, and levels of car ownership do vary with accessibility to public transport. Also the units are not family

units which may further reduce the car ownership rates. Officers have to base their assessment of parking on the evidence and balance all factors – in this case they are content that 2/3 parking is adequate for the development. Officers would not suggest allocating space or putting any further regulation on the parking as this could result in unused spaces which would be an inefficient use of the land. Car owners can make their own choice about whether the proposed development meets their needs.

Planning Policies seek not to maximise parking but to promote sustainable forms of transport.

At both strategic and local level there is commitment to promote policies that stop the use of cars and promote sustainable forms of transport. This development provides a charging point for electric cars and generous cycle storage. Whilst the Mayor of London and Merton Council cannot enforce a move away from car usage we can do our best to promote sustainable transport.

Contaminated Land:

In reply to a question on potential contamination of the site, the planning team leader replied that the site was clearly used in past for commercial purposes, and there are conditions included to safeguard local environment if contamination is found. Planning Officers have taken advice from Council's Environmental Health Officers and assume that the conditions they propose are adequate.

Viability Assessment

The viability of the development was assessed by expert viability consultants who were satisfied with it but have placed a recommendation in the heads of terms for the S106 agreement to ensure that the Council can capture any uplift in viability /profitability of the site in the future. There is currently a cash contribution offered. Planning Officers are engaged in robust negotiations to get affordable units on this site or receive a larger cash contribution. if subsequent reviews of viability enable this to be delivered.

Design Review Panel (DRP)

Officers reminded the Committee that the DRP gave a red to a different scheme that was 38 units. The application before Committee now has only 28 units

Officers consider the housing mix of this scheme to be appropriate.

The Committee then made comments on the application and noted that there was clear unease with this proposal on several grounds:

- Local roads are old, narrow and residential.
- It is a compact streetscape and this development would loom over it.
- It is too big and too dense. 3 times standard density is brutal
- There will be no mechanism for controlling parking on local streets and this development will exacerbate the existing problems.
- We do need flats but this development does loom large, and local parking is an issue.

A refusal was proposed and seconded on the grounds that the bulk and massing of this development was too great. The Committee then added that they had concerns about the design of the development in that it provides a number of units with only a single aspect and a number of units with no amenity space. The Committee also stated that the proposal would exacerbate local parking problems in the surrounding streets. The Committee voted unanimously to refuse the application for these stated reasons.

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 design of the building provides single aspect units and units with no amenity space.
 - The development would exacerbate existing local parking problems.
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

8 83 DORA ROAD, WIMBLEDON, SW19 7JT (Agenda Item 8)

Proposal: Expanding the roof to the rear to create a flat top, with hip to gable conversion, rear dormer with 2x Juliet balconies and 4x rooflights on the front roof slope; accompanied with a double storey rear extension, single storey ground floor extension and various window alterations on the side elevation.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation.

The Objector raised residents' concerns which include that the two storey extension to the rear proposed roof structure was too bulky and over dominant, and that no other neighbours' properties had three windows and two Juliette balconies at the rear. Neighbouring properties were required to restrict the size of windows in their rear extensions. The objector was concerned that trees had already been removed from the garden of the application property and encouraged the applicant to look after the remaining mature trees.

The Applicant explained that they had sought to engage with Council Planning Officers and had received pre-application advice. The rear 2 storey extension did not extend past the rear building line of either neighbour.

One Member commented that this proposal was too big.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

9 219 MANOR WAY, MITCHAM, CR4 1EN (Agenda Item 9)

Proposal: Erection of a part single, part two-storey end of terrace dwelling and extension of garage to rear of 219 Manor Way to front on to Rowan Road.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation. The Planning Team leader drew members' attention to additional wording and a correction to the dimensions in the Supplementary agenda.

The Objector raised concerns related to the garage and driveway of the proposed property and its lack of access to the alleyway. The objector was concerned that the proposal would also block access to the alleyways for neighbouring properties also the residents of the proposal would have difficulties access their own external storage. She was also concerned about additional vehicular access to Rowan Road.

The Agent to the Application explained that the proposal met space standards, was not too bulky, was set back, provided adequate parking and would be suitable for a small family or couple.

The Planning Team Leader explained to members that the Boundary Treatment Condition could be modified to in order to provide rear access to the storage shed. Members agreed that they would like to see this modified condition added to the proposal.

Members commented that there was a traffic speeding problem in this area.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to the conditions on the officer's report and a modified condition regarding rear access.

The Director of Environment and Regeneration be given delegated authority to agree the detail and wording of the amended condition

10 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS (Agenda Item 10)

The Committee noted the Planning Appeal Decision Report

11 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - SUMMARY OF CURRENT CASES (Agenda Item 11)

The Committee noted the Planning Enforcement Report.

Members asked Enforcement officers to investigate the situation at 55-61 Manor Way.