

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

28 MAY 2020

(7.23 pm - 8.38 pm)

PRESENT: Councillor Linda Kirby (in the Chair), Councillor Najeeb Latif, Councillor David Dean, Councillor Russell Makin, Councillor Simon McGrath, Councillor Peter Southgate, Councillor Billy Christie, Councillor Rebecca Lanning, Councillor Joan Henry and Councillor Dave Ward

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors Eloise Bailey, Nigel Benbow and Ben Butler

Neil Milligan (Development Control Manager, ENVR), Sarath Attanayake (Transport Planning Officer), Tim Bryson (Development Control Team Leader (North)), Amy Dumitrescu (Democratic Services Officer) and Louise Fleming (Senior Democratic Services Officer)

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

There were no apologies for absence.

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

There were no declarations of Pecuniary interest.

The Vice-Chair, Councillor Najeeb Latif advised that he would not be voting on item 6 as he had held meetings with both the applicant and the objectors.

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

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 14 May 2020 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 item 5.

The Chair announced that there would be no change to the order of items in the published agenda.

### 5 2 MADISON HEIGHTS, 2A MILNER ROAD, WIMBLEDON, SW19 3AA (Agenda Item 5)

Proposal: Erection of a 2 storey roof extension comprising of 5 self-contained units (1 x studio 2 x 1 bed & 2 x 2 bed flats)

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

The Committee received a verbal representation from an objector who raised points including the bin storage, the accuracy of the drawings submitted, disruption to existing residents and structural integrity.

At the invitation of the Chair, a statement was read out on behalf of another objector who raised points covered by the first objector in addition to the lack of energy statement and the risk to the TfL tunnels below.

The Committee received a verbal presentation on behalf of the applicant, who addressed points raised by the objectors and advised that the owners were working with residents to address some of the building management issues raised. He asked the Committee to note that many issues raised by the objectors were not planning considerations. He outlined the effort made by the applicant to create a design that would enhance the building and felt that the proposed height would not be out of keeping with the area.

The Development Control Team Leader (North) responded to the points raised and advised the Committee that the building maintenance issues and the disruption caused to residents during construction were not planning considerations or reasonable grounds for refusal. He drew Members attention to the supplementary agenda which addressed the issue of the bin storage.

At the invitation of the Chair, Councillor Ben Butler addressed the Committee on behalf of the residents and outlined concerns including the disrepair of the current building, bin storage, and the impact of the construction process on existing residents.

At the invitation of the Chair, a written statement was read out on behalf of Councillor Nigel Benbow, who outlined concerns on behalf of the residents including the failures of the owner in relation to the maintenance of the building, the lack of an energy statement and the height of the proposed building.

In response to questions from Members, the Development Control Team Leader (North) advised

- that issues relating to emergency exits would be covered under Building Control regulations and building construction would be dealt with by condition requiring a construction logistics plan and additional conditions recommended by TfL.
- TfL had not raised an objection to the application but had recommended a number of conditions and informatives which had been included in the officer recommendation.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7.58pm for Clap for our Carers and resumed the meeting at 8.05pm.

The Chair drew Members attention to the planning considerations on page 18 of the agenda and invited further questions. In response, the Development Control Team Leader (North) advised

- that the references to roof terraces were for a previous application.
- Fire safety would be a Building Control matter and could not be covered by planning condition.
- No affordable housing had been included in the previous application, and the application had been subject to a viability review. There was no affordable housing proposed in the current application and the Council was not able to require affordable housing provision in applications of less than 10 units under current the current policy.
- It was not felt that the application could be turned down based on only including 1 and 2 bed properties.
- Policy 3.3 of the London Plan applied in this case as the application sought to intensify development on the current site.

The Committee made a number of comments and raised concerns, including:

- The height, bulk, massing and design of the proposal.
- The number of conditions recommended by TfL raised questions over safety.
- The poor workmanship of the cladding on the current building and concerns over building safety.
- The impact of the construction on the access to the lift and stairways and concerns over fire safety.
- Forthcoming statutory guidance due to be published on 1 June 2020 would require buildings over 11 metres to have sprinklers installed and the proposed building would be 27 metres. There was no reference to sprinklers in the report and it was felt that the application should not be approved without addressing this point.
- The application would have a negative impact on the surrounding area.

A motion to refuse the application was proposed and seconded and carried unanimously.

RESOLVED that

1. Planning Permission for Application 19/P3365 is REFUSED for the following reasons:
    - Planning Policy DM D2 – The height, bulk and design are out of keeping with the area.
    - Planning Policy DM D3 – The proposal would not make a positive contribution to the area.
  2. Authority be delegated to the Director of Environment & Regeneration to make any appropriate amendments in the context of the above to the wording of the grounds of refusal including references to appropriate policies
- 6 THE ALL ENGLAND LAWN TENNIS AND CROQUET CLUB, CHURCH ROAD, WIMBLEDON, LONDON, SW19 5AE (Agenda Item 6)

Proposal: Erection of a two storey media pavilion, replacement of temporary cabins with a dedicated technical services room (TSR), and reconfiguration of gate 20 including the relocation and widening of existing access/egress, relocation of existing gatehouse building, new accreditation hut and gatehouse building, landscaping and associated works.

The Chair advised that due to an administrative error, a written submission had been made but not read out when the Committee considered the application on 14 May 2020. Therefore, in the interests of fairness, the statement would be read out and the Committee would be invited to make any comments in addition to those made at the previous meeting.

At the invitation of the Chair, a written statement was read out which raised issues including vehicle noise and pollution from the increased levels of nitric oxide caused by vehicles queuing to enter the site.

In response to the points raised, the Development Control Team Leader (North) advised that the new access road would be closer to Burley House flats and the use of the road would predominantly be used by broadcast vehicles which would enter the site before the tournament and leave at the end. The vehicles would run on the club's electricity supply rather than generators. The use of the access road would be intermittent and the new parking facility would ease pressure further. Therefore the proposal was not considered to have an adverse impact on residential amenities.

One Member asked whether it would be possible to place a condition on the permission to prevent vehicle idling. In response the Development Control Team Leader (North) advised that such condition would be difficult to enforce, however it would be possible to add an informative to the decision notice if the Committee was so minded.

RESOLVED that the decision to GRANT Planning Permission for Application 20 P/0420 subject to conditions be reaffirmed with the addition of an informative.

The Vice-Chair did not speak or vote on this item.

## 7 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - SUMMARY OF CURRENT CASES (Agenda Item 7)

The Committee noted the report on recent planning enforcement.