

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

29 APRIL 2021

(7.17 pm - 11.29 pm)

**PRESENT:** Councillor Dave Ward (in the Chair),  
Councillor Stephen Crowe, Councillor Stephen Alambritis,  
Councillor Billy Christie, Councillor David Dean,  
Councillor Nick Draper, Councillor Joan Henry,  
Councillor Simon McGrath, Councillor Carl Quilliam and  
Councillor Peter Southgate

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Sarath Attanayake (Transport Planning Project Officer),  
Tim Bryson (Development Control Team Leader (North)),  
Amy Dumitrescu (Democratic Services Officer),  
Jonathan Lewis (Development Control Team Leader (South)),  
Neil Milligan (Development Control Manager, ENVR) and  
Farzana Mughal (Democratic Services Officer)

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

There were no apologies for absence.

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

Councillor David Dean declared an interest in respect of item 7 – Dundonald Recreation Centre, Wimbledon, SW19 3QH, in that he was acting Vice-Chair of The Friends of Dundonald Park. He did not take part in the debate and did not vote.

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

**RESOLVED:** that the minutes of the meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> March, 2021 were agreed as an accurate record, subject to amendment to the inclusive of Sarath Attanayake (Transport Planning Project Officer) in the list of 'in attendance' of the meeting.

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

The Committee noted the amendments and modifications to the officers' report (see item no. 17). This applied to items no. 7, 9, 12, 13 and 14.

Furthermore, the Chair advised that the order of the agenda was changed and would be considered in the order as follows: items no. 11, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14 and 10. For the purpose of the minutes, items were minuted in the order they appeared in the published agenda.

5 94 THE BROADWAY, WIMBLEDON, SW19 1RH (Agenda Item 5)

Proposal: Erection of a four storey rear extension and internal reconfiguration of existing residential unit to create four additional residential dwellings.

Further to Minute No. 5 on 11<sup>th</sup> February, 2021, the Committee noted that the Daylight and Sunlight Assessment had been out. The Committee noted the report and the plans presented by the Development Control Team Leader (North).

A resident had registered to speak in objection to the proposed scheme, and at the request of the Chair, had raised a number of points, including:

- not satisfied by the daylight and sunlight report as the proposed scheme would cause loss of light;
- overlooking of overbearing brick wall;
- the proposed scheme was not in keeping with the property and would harm the overall look and character of the site;
- the plans did not indicate where waste with a commercial unit would be located. Space for only four bins had been allocated, but there was no proposals for commercial waste and recycling. This would potentially have a huge waste disposal problem, as well as limited access for bin lorries. This did not comply with Merton Sustainable Waste Management Policy.

The applicant's agent had registered to speak, and at the request of the Chair, addressed the following points:

- the proposal sought the erection of a four storey rear extension to provide a more high quality self-contained residential dwelling;
- on the recommendation of Committee, the applicant appointed a chartered rights licence and pre Farwell and daylight and sunlight assessment was carried out, 52 windows were assessed, and it was found that there would be a 1% loss of light to the kitchen window of property of no. 92 kitchen and no loss of light on the second floor windows.

In response to a member's question, the Development Control Team Leader clarified that the right to light legislation was not a material planning consideration. Nonetheless, the Committee was satisfied with the Daylight and Sunlight Assessment report.

The Chair moved to the vote on the officer's recommendation and it was

**RESOLVED** that the application number 20/P3088 be GRANTED planning permission, subject to s106 obligation or any other enabling agreement.

6 57 COOMBE LANE, RAYNES PARK, SW20 0BD (Agenda Item 6)

Proposal: Erection of a two storey rear extension, hip to gambrel and rear roof dormer extensions and garden annex.

The Committee noted the report and the plans presented by the Development Control Team Leader (South).

A resident had registered to speak in objection to the proposed scheme, and at the request of the Chair, had raised a number of points, including:

- the proposed extension would be excessive and not within the scale of the neighbouring properties;
- the proposal was misleading and were out of character with the surrounding properties.

The applicant had submitted a speech which was read out by Democratic Services Officer addressing the objectors concerns. It was further stated that the proposed scheme had been developed with an appreciation and sensitivity to the site context and local planning policies. The architecture was of a high quality and would respect the form, appearance, and materials of the existing house.

In the ensuing debate, Members' raised a number of points and in response to Members' questions and comments the Development Control Team Leader (South) stated the following points:

- it was clarified that the garage will be converted as a habitable room with an additional office space behind the garage;
- the proposed development would be more than two metres away from the boundary, and would not cross that threshold.

Members' were concerned that the proposal would be used as a granny annex the property and asked whether a condition could be included to prevent it being used as a permanent bedroom. Furthermore, concerns were raised in relation to the height of the building and members requested that the outbuilding be reduced from three metres to 2.5 meters.

The Development Control Team Leader (South) advised the Committee that if Members' were minded to defer the decision due to concerns in relation to the height of the building, that officers' could suggest to the applicant that the Committee would be minded to support the proposal if the height of the outbuilding was reduced to 2.5 metres.

A motion for refusal was put forward by the Committee for the reason that there were concerns in relation to size of the development. However, being put to the vote the motion was lost.

The Committee recommended that the application be deferred, pending amendments to the current application being submitted, addressing the concerns in relation to height of the development and a condition to protect the mature tree in the back garden and advice as to whether it warrants a Tree Protection Order (TPO).

**RESOLVED** that the application number 20/P1046 be DEFERRED, pending submission of a revised application.

7 DUNDONALD RECREATION GROUND, DUNDONALD ROAD,  
WIMBLEDON, SW19 3QH (Agenda Item 7)

Proposal: Erection of a temporary building to provide community space, Tennis Club and Café and erection of separate temporary toilet facilities.

The Committee noted the report and the plans presented by the Development Control Team Leader (North). The Committee also noted the modification sheet contained in the supplementary agenda. An update on various matters relating to the amendments was also provided to the Committee.

A resident had registered to speak, in support, to the proposed scheme, and at the request of the Chair, stated that the proposed scheme would benefit the community, and their health and wellbeing. The proposed facilities where residents could go out and meet with other people was much needed. This would provide a vibrant and healthy sense of community spirit and potentially reduce anti-social behaviour.

In response to Members' questions and comments, the Development Control Team Leader (North) stated that it appreciated that this application took longer than expected to be progressed, however, it was prudent that the application was carefully considered given it was an open space, particularly, there would be a policy, in terms of, demonstrating the need for the building. Furthermore, consultation had been undertaken with the Green Space Manager.

Clarity was sought that the proposal would be a temporary building for five to seven years and would also be used for the wider community as well as the tennis club. Members' requested further clarified from the Green Space Officer in terms of the use of the existing building.

In response to a Member's question, The Development Control Team leader (North) informed the Committee that there had been no proposed restrictions in use of the building, therefore, potentially, the facilities could be used seven days a week.

Members' raised concerns with regards to the temporary proposal, and deemed it to be inappropriate to the area. This was a Holocaust Remembrance Garden and believed it should remain in this way. Furthermore, the Rose Garden was unique and valuable to the community and wouldn't wish it to be substandard in any way by a temporary building.

The Chair moved to the vote on the officer's recommendation to refuse the application, however, on being put to vote the motion was lost.

The Committee had requested to defer the application pending further information and a site visit.

**RESOLVED** that the application number 19/P4183 be DEFERRED, pending a site visit and further information.

*(Councillor David Dean declared an interest in respect of this item. He did not take part in the debate and did not vote)*

## 8 9A THE GRANGE, WIMBLEDON, LONDON, SW19 4PT (Agenda Item 8)

Proposal: Side and rear extension of existing building and single basement development to create two number of semi-detached houses by consolidate existing four flats into a single dwelling house and create a new unit to the side, partial demolition of existing building to the side and rear, front façade retention, full demolition of single storey garage and outbuilding. New crossover and boundary was proposed.

The Committee noted the report and the plans presented by the Development Control Team Leader (North).

Two residents had registered to speak in objection to the proposed scheme, and at the request of the Chair, had raised a number of points, including:

- concerns in relation to the impact of the conservation area, overdevelopment, immunity impact and loss of housing;
- the proposal would irreversibly disrupt the established character significantly reduced the openness by closing important visual gaps;
- loss of mature landscaped garden and further loss of traditional fruit gardens;
- the proposal would fail to serve and enhance the heritage assets contrary to local policy, and in conflict areas specific areas of guidance;
- the proposed scheme conflicts with basic planning policy, which was keen to keep visual green space between the houses.

The applicant' agent had registered to speak, and at the request of the Chair, addressed the following points:

- the applicant had worked collaboratively with officers over the last 18 months through a pre-application process, and submission of this planning application;
- the proposal removes poorly designed rear and side extensions and would be replaced with a side extension that is significantly set back from the existing façade, which would be maintained;
- In response to other objections, the officer had confirmed that the proposal would not unacceptably advance upon the neighbouring boundary line. Also,

the development would remove garages and hardstanding and replace these with areas of soft landscaping, which would visually improve the character and appearance of the property;

- the proposal would return to a family sized-unit, reflecting the area's prevailing property type, whilst also creating a new family home. The proposed design would be a sympathetic addition to a locally listed building and would be in keeping with the prevailing pattern of development in the conservation area.

Councillor Thomas Barlow (Ward Member for Village) had registered to speak and at the request of the Chair addressed number of key issues, including; the property was locally restricted in a conservation area and the proposed scheme could have a detrimental effect to the area. Contrary to Merton's local plan, and the London local plan was the loss of two units may seem a minor concern at the time of housing shortage this sets a dangerous precedent, as does the loss of garden space.

A Member raised concerns in relation to the building on the garden and the reduction in accommodation housing from four flats to one.

The Committee welcomed the proposal and considered the design and scale of the proposal to be acceptable.

The Chair moved to the vote on the officer's recommendation and it was

**RESOLVED** that the application number 20/P2882 be GRANTED planning permission, subject to conditions.

*(The meeting was adjourned for a short break at 21:13 and resumed at 21:25)*

## 9 3 HAMILTON ROAD, SOUTH WIMBLEDON, SW19 1JD (Agenda Item 9)

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear and side infill extension and excavation of a basement level extension with installation of 1x light well grille to front of property and 1x glazed to rear.

The Committee noted the report and the plans presented by the Development Control Team Leader (North). The Committee also noted the modification sheet contained in the supplementary agenda. An update on various matters relating to the amendments was also provided to the Committee.

A resident had registered to speak in objection to the proposed scheme, and at the request of the Chair, had raised a number of points, including:

- the potential risks to this development due to previous flood risk which impacted on the community;
- concerns to loss of trees;
- impact on the character of the area;
- this development would not increase the housing stock in Wimbledon.

In the ensuing debate, Members' raised a number of points and comments. The Chair moved to the vote on the officer's recommendation and it was

**RESOLVED** that the application number 20/P2774 be GRANTED planning permission subject to conditions.

10 GARAGES R/O 38 INGLEMERE ROAD, MITCHAM, CR4 2BT (Agenda Item 10)

Proposal: Demolition of garages and erection of 7x self-contained flats with associated parking and landscaping.

The Committee noted the report and the plans presented by the Development Control Team Leader (South).

The Chair moved to the vote on the officer's recommendation and it was

**RESOLVED** that the application number 20/P1722 be GRANTED planning permission subject to relevant conditions and s106 agreement for a permit free development.

11 52 PARKWAY, RAYNES PARK, SW20 9HF (Agenda Item 11)

Proposal: Erection of raised timber decking in the rear garden with privacy screen.

**RESOLVED** that the application number 20/P3898 be DEFERRED.

12 19A - 19F PRINCE'S ROAD, WIMBLEDON, SW19 8RQ (Agenda Item 12)

Proposal: Application to determine whether prior approval is required in respect of erection of second floor extension in connection with creation of two self-contained flats (2 x 1 bedroom)

The Committee noted the report and the plans presented by the Development Control Team Leader (North).

Two residents had registered to speak in objection to the proposed scheme, and at the request of the Chair, had raised a number of points, including:

- the residents would be directly affected by the proposed development from a visual perspective;
- loss of outlook and light;
- the proposal would be damaging the character of the conservation area;
- impact on the immunity of the existing building and neighbouring properties;

- scale and design would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area and have a harmful effect in the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers;
- concerns with the proposed design of the development.;
- it would be incongruous to the surrounding buildings;
- the roof colour was not in keep with the existing building when the existing buildings all had traditional sloping tiled roofs, and the grey rendering would also be visually, unlike any other building in the vicinity.

The applicant had registered to speak, and at the request of the Chair, informed that Committee that the proposal was for a one storey, to create two one bedroom flats on the roof space of 19 Princes Road. This site was located close to buses, trains, and underground. The proposed design was carefully considered to improve and modernise the overall building. Furthermore, there was no overlooking a property to the side due to there being no windows, daylight the sunlight report was submitted, past the nearest properties to the rear over 60 metres away, and 27 metres away, on the other side of the road.

At the request of the Chair, Councillor Paul Kohler (Ward Member for Trinity) addressed the Committee and reiterated the objectors concerns. He further stated that the development was excessive in height and would have a detrimental effect on neighbouring properties in the South Park Gardens Conservation Area. There were also concerns regarding the external appearance and impact on immunity.

In the ensuing debate, Members' raised a number of points and in response to Members' questions and comments the Development Control Team Leader (North) stated that, in terms of, parking, the plan proposed two parking space at the rear. It was further concluded that the scheme would be acceptable in terms of its impact on neighbouring immunity. Members' attention was drawn to the to the officer's assessment within the report.

A Member raised concerns regarding the appearance of the building and concerns that effects on the neighbours.

The Chair moved to the vote on the officer's recommendation and it was

**RESOLVED** that the application number 21/P0197 be GRANTED planning permission subject s106 agreement and conditions.

13 18D RIDGWAY, WIMBLEDON, LONDON, SW19 4QN (Agenda Item 13)

Proposal: Conversion of existing Class E Office into a single dwelling house C3.

The Committee noted the report and the plans presented by the Development Control Team Leader (North). The Committee also noted the modification sheet contained in the supplementary agenda. An update on various matters relating to the amendments was also provided to the Committee.



Two residents had registered to speak in objection to the proposed scheme, and at the request of the Chair, had raised a number of points, including:

- extensive work had been undertaken prior to planning permission being granted;
- this proposal would not be for affordable housing for keyworkers for which there's a genuine need in the area;
- concerned in relation to the the safety of the vehicles moving on and off the site;
- the entrance off the ritual was very narrow gated alley, the battered walls on either side, or testimony to the number of vehicles, which had struggled to negotiate the entrance;
- concerns in relation to safety issues as it was difficult to see pedestrians on this very busy section of pavement;
- the property only had one small parking space, and no cycle storage facilities.

The applicant had registered to speak, and at the request of the Chair, addressed the objectors concerns. It was further stated that the proposal would be better as a small residential enclave, rather than a mixed use, with the conflict that brings about from residential units and commercial visitors. In conclusion, the change of the way of living, which the pandemic had brought problems were part of a change working patterns and reduced demand for commercial units. The proposal would provide a much needed housing accommodation with a good life work balance.

In response to Members' questions and comments the Development Control Team Leader (North) stated the previous application was refused, to extend this building, upwards with additional story, and convert it to a residential unit to a two story house, the refusal was not for a loss of existing use.

Members' welcomed the proposal, however, had concerns with regards to the access to the route.

The Chair moved to the vote on the officer's recommendation and it was

**RESOLVED** that the application number 21/P0008 be GRANTED planning permission subject to conditions.

14 51 STREATHAM ROAD, MITCHAM, CR4 2AD (Agenda Item 14)

Proposal: Change of use from single dwelling house to an HMO to provide seven rooms, including demolition of existing conservatory.

The Committee noted the report and the plans presented by the Development Control Team Leader (South). The Committee also noted the modification sheet contained in the supplementary agenda. An update on various matters relating to the amendments was also provided to the Committee.

In the ensuing debate, Members' raised a number of points and in response to Members' questions and comments, the Development Control Team Leader (South) stated in order to alleviate Members' concerns, a number of conditions had been attached to regulate the proposal.

In addition, if the applicant was granted, the applicant would have three months to carry out various remedial works to the property, including, the CCTV provision of external lighting. If the work had not been implemented by the date, then the proposed conditions would require the use to cease.

The Chair moved to the vote on the officer's recommendation and it was

**RESOLVED** that the application number 19/P1798 be GRANTED planning permission subject to conditions.

15 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS (Agenda Item 15)

The Committee noted the report.

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

The Committee noted the planning enforcement report.

17 MODIFICATIONS SHEET (Agenda Item 17)

Members' noted the modifications sheet.