

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 JUNE 2021

(7.16 pm - 11.37 pm)

PRESENT	Councillor Dave Ward (in the Chair), Councillor Ben Butler, Councillor Stephen Crowe, Councillor Billy Christie, Councillor David Dean, Councillor Joan Henry, Councillor Simon McGrath, Councillor Peter Southgate, Councillor Laxmi Attawar and Councillor John Dehaney
IN ATTENDANCE	Sarath Attanayake (Transport Planning Project Officer), Tim Bryson (Development Control Team Leader (North)), Tim Lipscomb (Case Officer), Amy Dumitrescu (Democratic Services Officer), Jonathan Lewis (Development Control Team Leader (South)), and Farzana Mughal (Democratic Services Officer)

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

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors Stephen Alambritis, Nick Draper and Carl Quilliam. Councillors Laxmi Attawar, Ben Butler and John Dehaney were attending as their respective substitutes.

### 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 29<sup>th</sup> April 2021 were agreed as an accurate record.

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

The Committee noted the amendments and modifications to the officers' report (see item no. 20). This applied to items no. 5, 6, 9, 10, 11 and 17.

Furthermore, the Chair advised that the order of the agenda was changed and would be considered in the order as follows: 5, 6, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 13, 8, 7, 9 and 13. For the purpose of the minutes, items were minuted in the order they appeared in the published agenda.

5 2A AMITY GROVE, RAYNES PARK, SW20 0LJ (Agenda Item 5)

Proposal: Demolition of existing building and erection of 5 storey (plus basement level) residential building comprising 14 self-contained flats and a two storey residential building at rear comprising 3 self-contained flats, with associated landscaping, refuse and cycle stores, on-street blue badge parking and a rooftop plant.

The Committee noted the report and the plans presented by the Case Officer. The Committee also noted the modifications sheet contained in the supplementary agenda.

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

- the prominent front of the building would be clearly visible;
- the proposed scheme was very close to the street and there would be little privacy;
- loss of privacy due to overlooking and the proposed scheme would cause loss of sunlight;
- concerns regarding the smell from wheelie bins and the restaurant kitchen;
- the occupants would suffer loss of lighting, design, noise and visual intrusion;
- the scheme did not contribute to affordable housing.

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

- the proposed scheme was for 17 flats. The development would not be complementary to the locally listed buildings adjacent and would not contribute financially to the borrower through any section monistic contribution;
- the design had been developed to minimise impacts neighbours, through appropriately positioned opaque screening, the massing had also been set back on the top floor, and proposed in a different material to reduce visual impact on the street;
- the design of the scheme was entirely supported by the offices;
- with regards to viability it was unfortunate that both the Summit Report and the Council Independently Assess Report showed no contribution towards affordable housing. The viability position would be subject to both in early and late stages to ensure there were no missed opportunities, deliver affordable housing, either on the site, or through offset contributions;
- the proposed development had achieved the balance between optimising the site, whilst ensuring the impact neighbours were minimised.

In response to Members questions and comments, the Case Officer stated:

- In terms of the planning history, there was a prior approval permission, which would allow for 11 residential units.

- The site also had permission for an additional three units to the roof comprising an additional floor;
- There was no requirement in the prior approval type of applications for any provision of Affordable Housing;
- There was an on-site disabled parking space provided and those residents that required disabled parking space would be able to apply for a parking permit;
- The Waste Services Department had requested to be space on the site for the turning of a large refuse vehicle, which would not been feasible for the development. However, now that the proposal does not involve reducing the space on the highway, it would be possible to service the development from the roadside;
- If members were minded, a condition could be imposed for access control doors to be sought, subject to a secure by design certificate;
- Members raised concerns in relation to impact on the property, in terms of, loss of sunlight;
- The height of the proposed development was 16.1 metres.

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

**RESOLVED** that the application number 20/P3866 be **GRANTED** Planning Permission subject to conditions and s.106 legal agreement.

6 CHASE COURT BAKERS END, 8A BAKERS END, WIMBLEDON CHASE, SW20 9ER (Agenda Item 6)

Proposal: Erection of a bungalow with amenity space and associated parking.

The Committee noted the report and the plans presented by the Case Officer. The Committee also noted the modifications sheet contained in the supplementary agenda.

An objector had registered to speak in relation to the proposed scheme, and at the request of the Chair, had raised a number of points, including:

- Concerns in terms of the flood area which had been designated poorly and had caused sewage coming into the garden;
- The lawn had not been maintained and the fence along from number 9 to 73 was dilapidated and had not been maintained;
- Loss of clean air by pollution and noise of the building.

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

- In terms of the issues of the drainage, a Strategy Plan had been submitted which would hopefully resolve the issues;
- The development would tidy the whole site which would resolve the issue around the lawn and fencing.

In response to the objectors concerns, the Case Officer stated that the status of the site was not a designated flood zone and had not been identified as a critical drainage area, by the local authority, however, this the issues was due to the existing sewerage pipes and would be dealt with at the building control stage.

In response to members questions, the Case Officer stated;

- There was a very low biodiversity value at the site currently, a biodiversity survey was not requested from the applicant, however, a condition for biodiversity improvement could be imposed should members feel that was necessary;
- Clarity was sought that the Council's Drainage Officer had reviewed the drainage strategy.

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

**RESOLVED** that the application number 20/P3874 be **GRANTED** Planning Permission subject to conditions.

7 11 BLOSSOM SQUARE, WEST WIMBLEDON, SW20 8TG (Agenda Item 7)

The consideration of this application was deferred.

8 7 CHRISTCHURCH CLOSE, COLLIERS WOOD, SW19 2NZ (Agenda Item 8)

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and erection of 1 x 2 2 bed two storey detached dwelling house.

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

In the ensuing debate, Members' raised a number of concerns, including height of the building, the development was out of character with the street scene. Members also raised concerns with regards to the scheme being tight on the site and did not have adequate garden space

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

Having considered all the information before it, the Committee was minded to refuse the application, on the grounds of the design, layout and siting and its impact on the streetscene, being contrary to the relevant planning policies.

**RESOLVED** that the application no 21/P0943 be **REFUSED**, on the grounds of the design and layout of the proposal.

9 AELTC CHURCH ROAD, WIMBLEDON, SW19 5AE (Agenda Item 9)

The consideration of this application was deferred.

10 13 DEEPDALE, WIMBLEDON, SW19 5EZ (Agenda Item 10)

Proposal: Erection of replacement dwelling with accommodation in roof and basement following demolition of existing dwelling.

The Committee noted the report and the plans presented by Development Control Team Leader (North). The Committee also noted the modifications sheet contained in the supplementary agenda.

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

- concerns that there was no final basement proposals from a structural engineer. If the Committee was minded to grant planning permission, it was recommended to impose a condition in order to address the concerns;
- the remit of motion in house structural engineer was limited to implications for the highway;
- there were new segments identified that and an additional condition requiring the applicant to submit an updated Basement Impact Assessment was recommended,
- loss of outlook to architectural side windows facing the proposed and sensitive closure enclosure from the basement of the kitchen;
- concerns of the size of the space between the houses;
- potential loss of privacy.

The Committee was informed that the applicant or agent were not present at the meeting.

With regards to the basement accommodation, the Development Control Team Leader (North) informed the Committee that a revised Drainage Strategy and Basement Impact Assessment had been submitted by the applicant and subsequently approved by the Council's Flood Risk Officer.

In response to a member's question, the Development Control Team Leader (North) stated that installation of air conditioning required separate planning permission should it be installed at first floor on the dwelling house. It was further clarified that a condition for first floor windows and above in the side elevations had been included in order to restrict overlooking.

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

**RESOLVED** that the application number 20/P2368 be **GRANTED** Planning Permission subject to conditions.

11 THE PAVILLIONS, GREENVIEW DRIVE, RAYNES PARK, SW20 9DS  
(Agenda Item 11)

Proposal: Application to determine whether prior approval is required in respect of the proposed erection of a two storey roof extension to provide 10 x self-contained flats, with associated car and cycle parking and refuse provision (amended).

The Committee noted the report and the plans presented by the Development Control Team Leader (South). The Committee also noted the modifications sheet contained in the supplementary agenda.

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

- Concerns in relation to visual aspect of the proposed scheme;
- Concerns in relation to the height as this was deemed to be out of scale of the surrounding buildings; The proposal would increase the buildings height by at least 50% and would be overbearing;
- The scale of the development was too excessive for the site;
- This proposal would create a large overbearing structure that would not blend with existing builds;
- The impact on visual amenity was out of character within the areas;
- the impact on residential amenity, due to the increased height, loss and overdevelopment of the site;
- concerns in relation to visual intrusion, overlooking and adverse impact on the ability of neighbours.

The applicant's agent had registered to speak, and at the request of the Chair, informed the Committee that a Construction Management Plan had been submitted to the Council for approval, this required measures of performance that minimises the impact on residents. The scheme provided a new cycle parking and refuse facilities that meet the latest standards. Furthermore, officers had carried out an assessment for the proposal, against the prior approval regulations and that the assessment confirmed that the scheme fully complied with all of the necessary criteria.

Councillor Hina Bokhari had registered to speak on behalf of her constituents, and at the request of the Chair. Reference was made in relation to the concerns regarding height and overlooking of the development, bulk orientation and the design. Furthermore, she addressed the Committee the loss of immunity green space used by the residents due to the construction of more parking spaces, but also being detrimental to the enjoyment of their homes. In addition, the metal cladding would also be keeping out of character of the area.

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

**RESOLVED** that the application number 21/P0380 be **GRANTED** prior approval subject to conditions.

*(The meeting was adjourned at 21.32 and resumed at 21.42 for a short break)*

12 131-135 LOVE LANE, MITCHAM, CR4 3YA (Agenda Item 12)

Proposal: Redevelopment of the site involving the demolition of the existing commercial building and erection of a part 3, part 2 storey building, comprising 9 x residential flats, associated refuse and cycle storage and landscaping.

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

Members' welcomed the proposal, however, it was noted that the scheme was for a nine units dwellings, therefore did not meet the threshold of affordable housing.

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

**RESOLVED** that the application number 21/P1138 be **GRANTED** Planning Permission subject to conditions.

13 FORMER FIRE STATION, LOWER GREEN WEST CR4 3GA (Agenda Item 13)

The consideration of this application was deferred.

14 63 MONKLEIGH ROAD MORDEN, SM4 4EN (Agenda Item 14)

Proposal: Demolition of existing side extension, erection of extensions and the erection of two single storey dwellings at the rear.

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

An objector had registered to speak in relation to the proposed scheme, and at the request of the Chair addressed the Committee with regards to the tentative schedule of restrictive covenants.

The Committee noted the applicant or agent were not present at the meeting.

The Committee was informed that the applicant or agent were not present at the meeting.

In response to a Member question, the Development Control Team Leader (South) confirmed a condition had been required in relation to the use of material for use of green roof to be provided.

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

**RESOLVED** that the application number 20/P0824 be **GRANTED** Planning Permission subject to conditions.

15 52 PARKWAY, RAYNES PARK, SW20 9HF (Agenda Item 15)

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

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

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

- surrounding areas were built in a manner that the carriages and the stairs would always be on the opposite side of neighbours;
- there would be a detrimental effect of nearby residential properties in respect of noise and overlooking;
- harmful impact on neighbours lives;
- the staircase to the fence was standing two metres and 30 centimetres.

The Committee was informed that the applicant or agent were not present at the meeting.

In the ensuing debate, Members raised concerns regarding the location of the stairs to the deck was close to the site boundary and the neighbours' property. Furthermore, there were concerns raised in relation to impact of neighbouring properties and privacy.

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

Having considered all the information before it, the Committee was minded to refuse the application, on the grounds of the location of the stairs connected to the deck, and their harmful impact on neighbour amenity by reason of noise and disturbance being contrary to the relevant planning policies.

**RESOLVED** that the application no 20/P3898 be **REFUSED**, on the grounds of the location of the stairs connected to the deck, loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers by reason of noise and disturbance and was contrary to Merton Sites and Policies Plan policy DM.D3.

16 42 RAYMOND ROAD, WIMBLEDON SW19 4AP (Agenda Item 16)

Proposal: Demolition of existing dwelling house and erection of a new dwelling house incorporating construction of a basement and raising height of garden levels.

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

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

- The development had been misleading,
- objected to the double high windows at the rear through the front of the window;
- the development was overlooking and loss of privacy.

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

- all objectors concerns had been addressed;
- the proposed building was now in size to the area;
- the materials used was in character of the street;
- the streets already consists of a good mix of single dwelling houses, flats, and large multiple flat buildings, and therefore densification at the site would not affect the character of the street in any way;
- the proposed building front façade matched the style of the street;
- the development would not cause overlooking or loss of privacy, as all windows on the side of the building would be frosted and non opening up to 1.7 metres;
- the development does not impact neighbouring properties in terms of overshadowing.

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

**RESOLVED** that the application number 21/P0084 be **GRANTED** Planning Permission subject to conditions.

17 BENNETTS COURTYARD, WATERMILL WAY, COLLIERS WOOD, SW19 2RW (Agenda Item 17)

Proposal: Erection of roof extensions to the three residential blocks which comprise Bennets Courtyard to provide 15 x self-contained flats (comprising 5 x 1 bed and 10 x 2 bed flats)

The Committee noted the report and the plans presented by the Case Officer. The Committee also noted the modifications contained in the supplementary agenda.

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

- There was no additional external amenity space being provided;
- no additional parking spaces were provided;

- impact on heritage assets and that the site was within the conservation area;

The applicant's agent had registered to speak, and at the request of the Chair, informed the Committee that the proposed development was sustainable and had been designed to meet the latest building regulations. Furthermore, the applicant would ensure that construction, particularly on existing residents were kept to a minimum.

The Development Control Team Leader clarified that the recommendation for approval was subject to conditions and restricting parking permits.

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

**RESOLVED** that the application number 20/P3364 be **GRANTED** Planning Permission subject to conditions and S106 legal agreement.

#### 18 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS (Agenda Item 18)

The Committee noted the Planning Appeal Decisions.

#### 19 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - SUMMARY OF CURRENT CASES (Agenda Item 19)

The Committee noted the planning enforcement report.

#### 20 MODIFICATIONS SHEET (Agenda Item 20)

Members noted the modifications sheet.