

Merton Council

Development and Planning Applications Committee Agenda

Membership

Councillors:

Aidan Mundy (Chair)
Matthew Willis (Vice-Chair)
Simon McGrath
Sheri-Ann Bhim
Michael Butcher
Edward Foley
Billy Hayes
Dan Johnston
Thomas Barlow
Martin Whelton

Substitute Members:

Susie Hicks
Caroline Charles
Kirsten Galea
Nick McLean
Stephen Mercer
Stuart Neaverson

Date: Thursday 11 January 2024

Time: 7.15 pm

Venue: Council chamber - Merton Civic Centre, London Road, Morden SM4 5DX

This is a public meeting and attendance by the public is encouraged and welcomed.

Public meeting can be viewed by following this link
<https://www.youtube.com/user/MertonCouncil>

Electronic Agendas, Reports and Minutes

Copies of agendas, reports and minutes for council meetings can also be found on our website. To access this, click <https://www.merton.gov.uk/council-and-local-democracy> and search for the relevant committee and meeting date.

Agendas can also be viewed on the Mod.gov paperless app for iPads, Android and Windows devices.

For more information about the agenda please contact

democratic.services@merton.gov.uk or telephone 020 8545 3356.

All Press contacts: communications@merton.gov.uk or 020 8545 3181

Development and Planning Applications Committee Agenda

11 January 2024

- | | | |
|---|---|---------|
| 1 | Apologies for absence | |
| 2 | Declarations of Pecuniary Interest | |
| 3 | Minutes of the previous meeting | 1 - 16 |
| 4 | Updated Chair Procedure (Private Session) | 17 - 32 |
| 5 | PAS Review (Private Session) | 33 - 56 |
| 6 | Conditions (Private Session) | 57 - 58 |
| 7 | Borough Plan Sites Training (Private Session) | |

Note on declarations of interest

Members are advised to declare any Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter to be considered at the meeting. If a pecuniary interest is declared they should withdraw from the meeting room during the whole of the consideration of that matter and must not participate in any vote on that matter. For further advice please speak with the Managing Director, South London Legal Partnership.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

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.

DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

23 NOVEMBER 2023
(8.00 pm - 10.00 pm)

PRESENT Councillor Aidan Mundy (in the Chair), Councillor Matthew Willis, Councillor Stuart Neaverson, Councillor Michael Butcher, Councillor Edward Foley, Councillor Caroline Charles, Councillor Simon McGrath, Councillor Martin Whelton, Councillor Thomas Barlow, Councillor Billy Hayes

ALSO PRESENT Jonathan Berry (Head of Development Management and Building Control), Stuart Adams (Area Manager, Development Management), Tim Lipscomb (Planning Officer), Jayde Watts (Democratic Services Officer)

ALSO PRESENT ONLINE Sarath Attanayake (Transport Planning Project Officer)

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Bhim with Cllr Neaverson in attendance as substitute and Cllr Dan Johnston with Cllr Caroline Charles in attendance as substitute.

2 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST (Agenda Item 2)

There were no declarations of interest.

3 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Agenda Item 3)

Minutes from the previous meeting to be reviewed at December's meeting.

4 TOWN PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Agenda Item 4)

The Committee noted the amendments and modifications to the officer's report. The Chair advised that the agenda would be taken in the published agenda order.

Please note that members of the public, including the applicant or anyone speaking on their behalf, are expressing their own opinions and the Council does not take any responsibility for the accuracy of statements made by them.

5 BURLINGTON GATE, 42 ROTHESAY AVENUE, WIMBLEDON CHASE, SW20 8JU (Agenda Item 5)

The Planning Officer presented the report.

The committee received presentations from two objectors who stated:

- Since preapplication in 2019, the developer only engaged with the Merton Planning Department and not with the families at the development.
- The Planning committee previously refused the application due to reduced communal space which would result in substantial adverse impact on the standard of accommodation to existing residents.
- Residents deserved to keep the communal space, the proposal demolished the conservatory space and reduced rooftop space.
- As the existing home was built before London standards were introduced, they do not have any private outdoor space.
- The proposed landscaping on the east side of the building was not a replacement for lost communal space as it already existed and was in use.
- Section 7.6.5 of the report stated the area was shaded throughout much of the day and therefore not considered to have high amenity value.
- The proposal to the east of the development was more like a bus shelter and not a replacement for the roof conservatory and sunnier space of the roof terrace.
- The north side of the site already existed, and no amount of comprehensive landscaping would make this better than it already was.
- The privacy of families on the ground floor of both blocks would be negatively impacted by the increase of use.
- The proposed development traded the home they had for a couple of benches and potted plants.
- The Resident Management Company had taken care of Burlington Gate since the mid 90's. The original freeholders took no active role during those years and their relationship with residents were of disregard and disinterest. Out of frustration, owners contacted the resident management company for help.
- Ground rent was collected randomly, sometimes every 5-6 years in lumpsums causing financial stress.
- The freeholder was a stakeholder in major maintenance projects whose permission was required for certain changes, but due to a lack of engagement, the estate management treated the freeholder as a absent freeholder who needed to be worked around.
- In 2018, the resident management company decided to accumulate a reserve fund. They were aware their options would be limited by the need to obtain planning permission with an uncooperative freeholder, but they did not expect it to become this complicated.
- This was the latest of several applications with significant errors, omissions, and misleading statements. The developer claimed cost savings for residents based on insulation improvements above the communal areas of the building. This would amount to several pounds per year and no measurable change for residents.
- There was no notification or coordination with residents since the development of this plan in relation to estate management.
- The freeholder failed to respond to recommendations made by Merton Council to communicate with residents regarding building plans and to be transparent and respectful of opinions. The freeholder has never engaged or offered to invite feedback from residents.

- None of the residents would benefit from the building works or want it to go ahead.

The committee received representation from the applicant John English who raised points including:

- The previous application was only refused due to a loss of amenity space. This application proposes a new 120 square metres roof terrace, almost double from the previous application.
- 91 square metres of amenity space would be provided on the ground floor, 40 metres more than the previous application. On the 21 March, the daylight and sunlight consultant concluded more the 84% of the space would receive at least two hours of direct sunlight which was more than the 50% required.
- This application would give new flats more private amenity space.
- The unused area of 137 square metres on the north of the site would be refurbished and landscaped to provide more amenity space for residents.
- Roof was not accessible for all residents such as the elderly, those with young children and those with mobility issues.
- Current site had no usable ground floor amenities. The application proposed to refurbish and landscape 228 square metres of ground floor space, accessible to everyone.
- As set out in the rooftop condition survey, the existing roof was in state of disrepair. Well used places were loved and looked after, the rooftop terrace did not appear to be either and was not a safe or friendly environment for children and residents.
- The rooftop terrace had no shade, the proposal covered areas on the ground floor and roof which offered an alternative option. There was the opportunity to close such areas if the residents wished.
- The conservatory was 30 years old, 10 years older than its intended lifespan. Roof panels, window gaskets and double glazing were all broken and with the removal of the staircase and lightwell there would legally only be enough space for four chairs.
- Thermal efficiency of the existing building was 30 years old and would not meet today's standards. The proposed development would install two new layers of insulation above the building which would improve thermal efficiency for the flats below.
- The top floor currently sat under the roof terrace whilst the new structure would float above which would create a thermal, fire and sound barrier.
- Benefits for residents would be a new landscaped roof terrace, 228 square metres of ground floor amenity space, new covered ground, and rooftop seating area, two fully insulated roofs and new landscaping throughout the entire site.
- The Council could not provide a 5 year housing supply.

In response to questions raised by the committee, Planning Officers advised:

- In relation to side amenity space, there could be some additional noise disturbance. The height of the windows was just above head height but although there could be some disturbance, officers felt that this was not to the extent of material harm to residents.
- The side amenity space would not require step access.
- The area of land to the side of the property already existed so the area given as part of the application was not more than what was provided with the previous application, the use was what had changed. The key change for considerations was the rooftop area.
- The roof was not currently accessible, nor would it be in the proposed plans as there were no lifts.
- The area to the north of the development would be solely accessed by the block closest, the landscaping was to assist with improving the application. There was no additional space created. The application was for three units so there was no requirement for play space to be provided, this would only be the case for ten units plus. There was an area that could be reorganised to include play space, but the rooftop was not a designated play space, although it could be used in such a way.
- As a minor application there was no requirement for a statement of community involvement although it could be useful to gain feedback from residents on landscaping. As a committee, they had to assess the application presented, based on planning policies regarding the amenity space. If the application were a new development, the amenity space provided would exceed the requirement.
- Prior approval changes allowed for an additional floor to be built on top of flats. A reason the first prior approval was refused was due to when the property was built, but there remained doubt on whether it was an extension or rebuild.
- The reuse of the space at the side of the development did not hold much weight as part of the assessment process. The area was not new but would be relandscaped, via a condition, to include plotted plants, benching and a summer house. In policy terms, the resultant level of communal amenity space was acceptable. Landscaping the area would not make an unacceptable development acceptable and was an additional benefit to the development. Less mobile residents would be able to access this area and the addition of some play equipment could be conditioned. The report highlighted that 84% of the area would receive 2 hours of sunlight per day.
- Officers could not give a decisive answer on how safe the roof was or how often it was used. However, what must be considered was the reduction of 146 square meters to 120 square meters and how that measured against the London Plan Policy.
- In terms of consultation on the condition, it was difficult to envisage how that would work although officers were not opposed to the idea and could look at a liaison arrangement throughout the course of the discharge of conditions, which could also include ward members.
- The rooftop plans were indicative of what it should look like. Officers would expect something similar and could enforce this through the condition discharge. In terms of change, they would expect the same facilities as offered

- but the layout could change with suggestions from the resident liaison group. The lighting may be more than wanted and could be looked at again.
- For landscaping on the ground floor, officers would expect to see a plan which, once agreed, could be enforced. Essentially, they could condition that the principles of the images were followed, and that the layout was strongly adhered to. An informative could also be added to the decision notice to say reasonable endeavours for any recommended improvements coming out of the liaison group would be applied.
 - To address member concerns around the safety of the roof, Jon Berry (Head of Development Management & Building Control Environment and Regeneration) agreed to raise this with Building Control and may be something that needed to be referred to the Health and Safety Executive.
 - If the decision was made to refuse the application, members were encouraged to be as consistent as possible with their reasons given for the last application. Although the balance had shifted slightly, members were encouraged to stick to those reasons for refusal.
 - The condition which related to the rooftop would state that before occupation, they required detailed scaled drawings showing all the features to be approved and implanted before residents moved into the building. If this did not happen it would be a breach of condition.
 - If members and the applicant agreed, there was the option to enclose an area on the rooftop to provide a like for like weatherproof and sheltered area.
 - The applicant responded to queries raised on internal waste storage and the flats exceeded the minimum GIA standards. For the communal bin store, there was currently 5 bins for 34 units but there would be 6 bins for 37 units if the applications were approved, which all flats would benefit from.
 - The rooftop was only accessible via stairs and would be one storey higher if the application were approved. The London Plan required buildings of four storeys plus to have a lift, but as this was not a new build and an addition of three units, building control did not require a lift until there was seven floors. As such, a lift was not a requirement that officers could impose.
 - A condition related to the landscaping to the north of the site could be included.
 - There would be no change to visibility at the north of the site as the pathway already existed.
 - Officers planned to implement as S106 agreement to ensure that no parking permits on the street could be obtained. Parking on the site was up to the freeholder, however the applicant already indicated that new residents could not park on site.
 - If the application were refused and subsequently reviewed by a planning inspector via an appeal, the planning inspector would ask the council to provide a schedule of recommended conditions in the case that the appeal was allowed.

The Chair invited the applicant to respond to clarify details raised within questions from the committee.

The applicant informed the committee of the following:

- There was access to the amenity space via the right of the northernmost building on site. They proposed to relandscape 228 square metres of ground floor space which could be used for a children's play area.
- All areas were accessible by residents but not used due to being in a state of disrepair.
- They wrote to all residents, held discussions with one of the directors of the management company and took onboard all comments received during the consultation process. They were aware of resident concerns of losing amenity, loss of cupboard space, sustainability and parking which was why they spent a year revising the application to address the concerns. Out of the objections received for this application, only seven were from residents.
- They usually signed up to a resident engagement plan and would be happy to apply reasonable endeavours for this site, with the inclusion of ward councillors.
- Installation of a lift was not possible due to the make up of the existing building. They had not considered a stair lift but would be happy to look into this option. Part of the reason behind the changes on the ground floor amenity space was to give residents an alternative option.
- The applicant agreed to enclose the space highlighted by officers and match the existing volume of seats.
- Confirmed that there was no parking on site for new residents.

The Chair invited the public speakers to respond to clarify details raised within questions from the committee.

The public speakers informed the committee of the following:

- There was room on the current roof terrace for four separate spaces but would be reduced to one small area. There were seventy residents and friends who could currently access the roof space and if limited, it would impact residents.
- The gardeners tried to grow on the roof, and they died which was likely to be the case with the landscaping proposed.

The Chair moved to the vote on the Officers' recommendation with the following additional conditions and informatives: Votes For – 8, Against – 2, Abstentions – 0.

CONDITIONS:

- The implementation of a Resident Liaisons Group, including Ward Councillors. The applicant would be responsible for organising and hosting quarterly meetings. the Terms of Reference for that group needed to be approved in writing by the Council.
- Landscape to be reviewed for both ground amenity spaces by the resident liaison group, with reasonable endeavours to meet resident requirements.
- Reasonable endeavours for the applicant to look into installing a stair lift to allow accessible access to the roof.

- That the CGI rooftop space was implemented with the addition of the discussed glass unit that could hold the same number of table and chairs that currently existed, unless otherwise stated by residents.
- If requested by the resident liaison group, a play area would be implemented at the back of the site.
- A new condition to ensure that the garden land to the north of the smaller block is accessible to all residents on the site.
- Condition 7 to be amended to include:
 - A time period of 5 years of planting. Anything that died or deteriorated within that time would be replaced.
 - Physical landscaping and play equipment in perpetuity.
 - Amend wording to say, 'proposed roof terrace, land to the north of the main building and to the north of the small building on site.'
 - Include wording which stated it must include a resident engagement or liaison plan.
- For the applicant to clarify access to the second space for residents.

INFORMATIVES:

- That the resident's liaison group has input into the items placed in the play area

RESOLVED: That the Committee GRANTED Planning Permission Subject to Conditions and Informatives and the conclusion of a s106 Agreement.

6 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS (Agenda Item 6)

The report was noted.

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

The report was noted.

The chair of the committee advised that he would write to the inspector to highlight the 17 cases and report back to committee if needed.

8 GLOSSARY OF TERMS (Agenda Item 8)

9 CHAIRS PROCEDURE GUIDE (Agenda Item 9)

10 MODIFICATION DOCUMENTS (Agenda Item 10)

This page is intentionally left blank

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.

DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

7 DECEMBER 2023
(7.20 pm - 9.02 pm)

PRESENT Councillor Aidan Mundy (in the Chair), Councillor Matthew Willis, Councillor Michael Butcher, Councillor Edward Foley, Councillor Susie Hicks, Councillor Dan Johnston, Councillor Martin Whelton, Councillor Michael Paterson, Councillor Billy Hayes

ALSO PRESENT Jonathan Berry (Head of Development Management and Building Control), Tim Bryson (Development Management Area Manager), Stuart Adams (Development Management Area Manager), Sarath Attanayake (Transport Planning Project Officer) Jayde Watts (Democratic Services Officer)

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr McGrath with Cllr Hicks in attendance as substitute and Cllr Barlow with Cllr Paterson in attendance as substitute. Apologies for absence were also received from Cllr Bhim.

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 26 October 2023 were agreed as an accurate record with the following amendments:

- Bullet point 3 of Cllr MacArther's statement amended to include 'implausible'.
- Inclusion of the YouTube links of the meeting.

4 TOWN PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Agenda Item 4)

The Committee noted the amendments and modifications to the officer's report. The Chair advised that the agenda would be taken with Agenda Item 6 first, followed by Agenda Item 5.

Please note that members of the public, including the applicant or anyone speaking on their behalf, are expressing their own opinions and the Council does not take any responsibility for the accuracy of statements made by them.

5 PENTHOUSE FLAT 11, 3 LANSDOWNE ROAD, WEST WIMBLEDON, SW20 8AP (Agenda Item 5)

The Planning Officer presented the report.

The committee received representation from the applicant Stephen Sexton who raised points including:

- The recommendation for refusal was due to the upper extension resulting in material harm to the character and appearance of the existing building, conservation area and the wider street scene.
- Design features were included to reduce the height and minimise the visual impact.
- Kitchens and bathrooms had the minimum permitted ceiling height and were located underneath the upper extension. This allowed the upper extension to be sunk into the floor below which reduced height and visual impact.
- The top floor flat was built in 1974 and in need of modernisation.
- Surrounding properties were not in the conservation area. The north of 3 Lansdowne Road was in the conservation area, but views were blocked by 2 Lansdowne Road. To the east, the conservation area was blocked by another building. To the south of Lansdowne Road, they were not in the conservation area. The first property to be in the conservation area was 17 Lansdowne Road. There were no direct frontal views to the development from any property which was in the conservation area.
- The upper extension was set so far back from the edge of the building that it would not be visible from Lansdowne Road.
- The upper extension was too far to be seen from the ridgeway, with limited views from the Downes which were not in the conservation area.
- The refused appeal scheme was in relation to two buildings with 2 additional full height floors of 7000 square feet which comprised of 8 two bedroom apartments. The current application was for an ensuite bedroom of 400 square feet, a fraction of the scale which was previously proposed.

In response to questions raised by the committee, Planning Officers advised:

- Visual impact of the scheme was a matter of judgement.
- Downes Road and Lansdowne Road were not within the conservation area although most of the areas outside of those roads were. It was acknowledged that some of the views from immediately in front of the building would be partially visible to the structure but officers also looked at wider views as well as the design of the scheme, and whether it was appropriate for the host building and surroundings.
- This was a subjective assessment. The scheme would improve accommodation for a single unit however, there was already consent to remove the conservatory and extend the flat sideways. The proposal would be a benefit for the resident only and not for the wider public. The proposal would make the building taller than any other in the local area. There were many purpose built blocks of flats in the area so they needed to be sure that the visual impact was acceptable.
- Most of the master bedroom would be glazed with an outlook but there would be some back panelling where there would be no light coming through.

- Many elements of Planning were technical. The term subjective was used as the appearance of the proposal was open to the opinion of members and officers. Officers felt that the proposal would look out of character although other Councils have allowed similar developments. This application needed planning permission as it was not a new flat and was an extension, but where upward extensions were allowed as permitted development elsewhere, other councils decided that the way to accommodate that was to allow similar developments as this one. Some Councils require materials to match the existing building and to be the same shape, this application was not and why officers have recommended refusal. It was up to members to decide if this type of development was acceptable in this part of the borough.
- Received 14 objections summarised within report.
- There would be access to the flat roof. When the inspector dismissed the application for two storeys there were no issues raised around neighbouring amenity, so officers felt that access to the flat roof was ok.
- Officers could not say whether the application would have been approved had it been in a conservation area. There were many purpose build flats in that area and was why those roads were excluded from the conservation area.
- Due to the glazing, the development would be visible at night, despite it being set back. It was worth noting that the windows on the floor below would also be visible when the lights were on.
- The previously refused scheme was rectangle shaped and looked similar to the existing building. However, officers felt that on balance this was visually unacceptable. The applicant was now looking at something different but officers felt that the new application did not overcome the previous reason for refusal.
- If the application was approved and the neighbour wanted to build something similar, the orientation of the clear glass of the bedroom would be facing away and there would not be any overlooking.

The Chair invited the applicant to respond to clarify details raised within questions from the committee.

The applicant informed the committee of the following:

- Happy to have condition to use whichever glass officers deemed necessary to deal with any concerns around light. The development was set back a huge distance from all directions.

The Chair moved to the vote on the Officers' recommendation: Votes For – 0, Against – 9, Abstentions – 0.

The motion to refuse the officer recommendation was proposed and seconded on the basis that members did not agree that the proposed development would have a negative impact on the appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

The Chair moved to a vote for approval with the following additional conditions: Votes For – 9, Against – 0, Abstentions – 0.

CONDITIONS

- A standard time limit condition to be implemented to commence in 3 years.
- A samples and materials condition to address concerns of the glass in the developments prominence.
- A drawing numbers condition.
- Implementation of a construction management plan.
- A standard construction times and days restriction condition as the application is on an existing block of flats.

RESOLVED: That the Committee GRANTED Planning Permission Subject to Conditions.

6 310-356 GRAND DRIVE, RAYNES PARK, LONDON, SW20 9NQ (Agenda Item 6)

The Planning Officer presented the report.

The committee received representation from Ward Cllr Sally Kenny who raised points including:

- Repairs and maintenance were inadequate and would be made worse if two additional floors were added.
- Residents received a letter today which stated that the planning meeting would be on 24 February 2000. Residents accepted the year 2000 was an error but as it stated 24 February, they thought today's meeting would be cancelled. Once residents were made aware that the item would be heard today it was too late for them to attend.
- The leak in the block was ongoing for 2 years which was poor. Scaffolding was currently in place to address this but not many workers have been seen.
- It took two years to address resident concerns of stair nosing. Although now complete it was worth noting how long it took.
- The communal door lock had to be replaced at least three times in one year which suggested materials used were inadequate.
- Residents felt that the communal cleaning areas were done inadequately and to a poor standard.
- How would the developer cope with the addition of 12 new flats.
- Residents wanted to know what steps would be taken to keep them informed at every stage of the process, how would they access their homes, how will they be protected during the works.
- It took four to five months to deal with waste management issues.

The committee received representation from the applicant Thomas Rumble who raised points including:

- Proposal was for an addition of 12 flats, a mix of one and two bedroom apartments.
- The site filled Brownfield land and benefited from the permitted development rights, granted under part 20 of the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) which allowed the addition of floors above the existing building. These rights were further supported by the London Plan and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

- Prior approval considerations were reviewed in the officer's report.
- Two parking surveys completed in 2021 and 2023 demonstrated that the proposal would not cause undue parking stress, further supported by the London Plan which encouraged car free developments. The Councils Highway team also had no objections.
- The scheme would provide a two tier cycle rack provision which offered 12 spaces, available to existing and proposed tenants on site.
- A £10,000 contribution would be provided for the provision of cycle hangers in local area.
- A £3,600 contribution would be made for the Councils local e-bike cycle hire scheme.
- The lower of the two additional floors would match the existing three levels and was previously approved by the Council via prior approval earlier in the year.
- The upper additional floor formed a mansard roof to be pitched on its sides. The setting of this floor broke up massing and ensured the external appearance was appropriate and more consistent with the local area.
- The proposed extension was further supported by the site's neighbourhood parade location.
- The scheme allowed for a proportionate and well designed roofscape in addition to the already approved single storey addition below.
- All flats met space standards and were dual aspect.
- Improvements to refuse would be secured via the suggested refuse and recycling condition, the Councils Waste Services Officer was content with the proposals.
- The building was sited away from residential properties and therefore, in relation to neighbouring residential amenities, they met and exceeded the conventional management criteria.
- The freeholder would do all they could to minimise disturbance during construction. A construction logistics plan and working method statement were required as part of the suggested conditions.

In response to questions raised by the committee, Planning Officers advised:

- Maintenance of the existing building was not considered as part of the application however there was scope to improve waste via a planning condition which would secure a requirement for the Councils waste officer to be consulted and if there were any breaches on the approved plan, enforcement action could be taken. Hopefully this would give reassurance that there would be an improvement for existing and new residents.
- Officers agreed, as an action, to refer concerns around the state of the building to the Building Control Team.
- Officer's considered potential improvements which but had not considered painting the building. This could be an option subject to the applicant's agreement.
- The cycle hanger locations were not yet fixed but ideally, they would be kept on the highway, providing it did not result in the loss of car parking space. The indicative proposals were to place the cycle hangers on St Mary's Avenue or near the Co-op which was where they also proposed placing the e-bikes.

- Structural integrity of the building was covered by building control which would require separate approval.
- Outside communal space was not a planning consideration under the prior approval process.
- Cycle credit was newly introduced, they would need to look into what would happen if the money was not used.
- The proposal created new units which would be a consideration for members although it was not necessarily a criteria for prior approval.
- Prior approval did not include affordable housing provision, if this was a full planning application, they would be able to secure affordable housing. The governments drive for prior approval was to create new housing.
- The transport officer informed the committee that the provider of the cycle credit would inform the Council on how they would manage the credits.
- In relation to cycle credits, the consent was time limited and conditions and or agreements needed to meet certain tests. One of the tests was whether the requirements were necessary to make the development acceptable. If full use of credits were not used it could be argued that the full requirements were not necessary to make the development acceptable. Conditions would have to be tightly controlled and relevant to this particular development. The hope was that all of the credits would be used but if they were not, it was unknown whether they could be used in a broader area. The Chair confirmed that they would need to explore the policy further to gain full benefits.
- Removing the time limit for cycle credits would need to be looked into further. Prior approval time periods were set nationally however, if strictly limited to this development, it was possible for the condition to stay in place in perpetuity.
- Cycle hanger placement was outside of this application, but officers would note the comments and include ward councillors at the correct stage of the process.

The Chair invited Cllr Kenny to respond to clarify details raised within questions from the committee.

Cllr Kenny informed the committee of the following:

- It was required as part of the London plan to provide all residents with adequate waste with no overflowing.
- Queen Mary Avenue Road was a narrow road which was always congested. If the Cycle racks were placed there it would cause traffic.

The Chair invited the applicant to respond to clarify details raised within questions from the committee.

The applicant informed the committee of the following:

- The internal height within the flats would be 2.4 metres and was consistent with the height of the flats on the lower levels in the existing building.
- There may be an aspiration to undertake some work to improve the appearance of the existing building, but this was not part of the proposal. At present the building was a mix of brick and render so would be consistent with the existing image. They would agree to an informative to encourage the idea.

- Agreed to a condition that as part of the submission of a waste plan, to include internal waste storage as part of the kitchen units as standard.
- Prior approval regulation stated that there needed to be floor to ceiling heights that were the same as the rest of the building.
- There was a construction logistics plan condition which could be expanded to include a requirement for engagement from the developer with residents during the construction process. They agreed for there to be fortnightly engagement.
- A condition already existed which stated no work on Sundays and Bank Holidays. On Saturdays, the only time allowed would be from 8.00am to 1.00pm.

The Chair agreed to look further into providing best practice for developers regarding resident engagement.

The Chair moved to the vote on the Officers' recommendation with the following additional conditions and informatives: Votes For – 9, Against – 0, Abstentions – 0.

CONDITIONS:

- Waste plan to include internal waste storage in the kitchen area of the new builds.
- Councillors to be consulted on where the cycles racks would go as part of the consultation process.
- Cycle credits to be in perpetuity.
- Construction and engagement would include a clear plan which included, at minimum, written communication with existing resident's fortnightly.

INFORMATIVES:

- To tidy and clean the front of the development.

RESOLVED: That the Committee GRANTED Prior Approval subject to conditions and S106 Agreement.

7 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS (Agenda Item 7)

The report was noted.

A security and health and safety concern was raised in relation to 7 Watery Lane. It was also noted that works were completed without planning permission. Jon Berry agreed to refer this matter to the Enforcement Team.

8 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - SUMMARY OF CURRENT CASES (Agenda Item 8)

The report was noted.

9 GLOSSARY OF TERMS (Agenda Item 9)

- 10 CHAIRS PROCEDURE GUIDE (Agenda Item 10)
- 11 MODIFICATION DOCUMENT (Agenda Item 11)

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank