

# 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](http://www.merton.gov.uk/committee).

## PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

23 MAY 2016

(7.15 pm - 9.15 pm)

PRESENT Councillor Linda Kirby (Chair), Councillor John Bowcott, Councillor David Dean, Councillor Abigail Jones, Councillor Philip Jones, Councillor Peter Southgate, Councillor Geraldine Stanford, Councillor Najeeb Latif, Councillor Imran Uddin and Councillor Andrew Judge

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

No apologies for absence were received.

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

No declarations of pecuniary interest were received

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

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 April 2016 were agreed as a true record.

### 4 TOWN PLANNING APPLICATIONS - COVERING REPORT (Agenda Item 4)

The published Agenda and Supplementary Agenda tabled at the meeting form part of the Minutes:

- a) Supplementary Agenda: A list of modifications for agenda items 5 and 7 was published as a supplementary agenda.
- b) Verbal Representations: The Committee received verbal representations detailed in the minutes for the relevant item.
- c) Order of the Agenda – The Chair amended to order of items to the following:  
6, 5, 7, 8,

### 5 BROWN AND ROOT HOUSE, 125 HIGH STREET, COLLIERS WOOD, SW19 2JG (Agenda Item 5)

The Committee noted the Officers presentation and the additional information provided in the Supplementary Agenda. Officers explained that the application was a minor material amendment to the current scheme, however Officers were considering how to proceed on the issue of the infilling of the void area to provide additional flats.

Members also noted that the amendments proposed would result in 90.4% of the flats in phase 1 being under London Plan Space Standards, whereas in the original scheme 65.30% of the flats were under these standards, although the consented scheme was not assessed against these standards. Members asked how far under the space standards the amended sizes fell. Officers replied that this information could be provided but that the space standards gave a minimum requirement, which units either exceeded or fell below.

Members also discussed issues of viability and affordable housing and noted that officers were recommending that the financial viability of the phased development be appropriately reviewed to secure off site contributions towards affordable housing. Members commented on the effects if phase two was not to be built.

Members noted the regenerative power of the development and the 3 and 4 bedroomed flats proposed in phase 2 as positives of the development, but felt that the high number of phase 1 flats falling under the London Space Standards was an overriding concern and that they needed more information on this issue before they could make a decision.

A motion to defer was proposed and accepted by a majority of members.

#### RESOLVED

The Item was **deferred** to a future meeting so that Officers could provide additional detailed information on the size of the apartments in relation to the London Plan space standards..

Officers would also provide a Legal view on whether all the variations could be considered under the terms of a section 73 application.

#### 6 THE CRICKETERS PUBLIC HOUSE, 340 LONDON ROAD, MITCHAM, CR4 3ND (Agenda Item 6)

The Committee noted verbal representations from an Objector to the application representing Mitcham Cricket Green Community and Heritage, and the Agent to the Applicant.

Officers asked the Committee to note that the application was required to satisfy the requirements of SPP policy DM D4 that proposals for new development in the conservation area are required to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Members discussed the application and noted that the Design and Review Panel had given the proposed building a 'Red' rating indicating that they concluded that the proposal did not achieve the design criteria for this important site and that the 'bar should be set higher' for the design of any application at this site.

Officers suggested that the Committee consider London Plan policy 7.6 (Architecture) which requires that buildings and structures should be of the highest architectural quality and whether this had been met by this application.

Councillor Andrew Judge summed up the views expressed by Committee Members and proposed a motion for refusal which was seconded and then carried unanimously

RESOLVED

The Committee agreed to:

1. REFUSE the application for the following reasons:
  - The two main elevations of the proposal did not sit well with each other and the corner of the proposed building does not have sufficient quality or distinction
  - The design is muted, bland and of insufficient quality
  - The Committee is looking for a more distinguished building for the prominent site
  - The proposal does not enhance setting of Vestry Hall or The Old Fire Station
  - The Proposal does not make a sufficient contribution to views from the public spaces of Cricket Green and Lower Green West
  - The proposal does not comply with CS14 on Design and does not enhance or reinforce the character of the area sufficiently. Nor does it contribute to Mitcham's sense of place and identity.
  - It does not enhance the setting of the Heritage Assets of Vestry Hall and The Old Fire Station as required by SPP policy DM D4 - nor does it enhance the open areas of Cricket Green and Lower Green West.
  - The proposal does not meet English Heritage Guidance which requires such a new development to maximize the setting of heritage assets
  - London Plan policy 7.6 (Architecture) which requires that buildings and structures should be of the highest architectural quality has not been met by this proposal
  
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.

7 68-70 MEOPHAM ROAD, MITCHAM, CR4 1BJ (Agenda Item 7)

The Committee noted the Officer's presentation and the amended information and recommendations in the Supplementary Agenda. The Committee noted the proposal to request funding from Cabinet to provide affordable housing on site, and the alternate recommendation in the case of no Cabinet approval.

RESOLVED:

The Committee approved the Officer recommendations:

Recommendation A: Grant planning permission subject to planning conditions and a S106 legal agreement including on site affordable housing in order to deliver a policy compliant scheme (not less than 5 units comprising shared ownership and/or affordable rented units), subject to Cabinet approval for any support funding.

Recommendation B: In the event that Cabinet approval for support funding is not confirmed by 1st of September 2016, grant planning permission subject to planning conditions and a S106 agreement including an off-site financial contribution of £261,500.

8 1 SIBTHORP ROAD, MITCHAM CR4 3NN (Agenda Item 8)

The Committee noted the officers presentation and a verbal representation by the representative of the Applicant. The Committee noted that the second reason for refusal proposed in the officers report was no longer relevant, but that the first reason stood and represented Officers views on the application. Councillor Stanford said that she agreed with the Officers report and recommendations.

Members voted unanimously to refuse the application for the first reason given in the Officers report.

RESOLVED

Refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

The proposed additional third and fourth floor by virtue of its bulk, form, scale, height and design would constitute an obtrusive and incongruous form of development that would detract from the appearance of the original building and be out of keeping with, and detrimental to, the visual amenity and character of the London Road streetscene, and would be harmful to the amenity of neighbours in terms of loss of daylight and sunlight and visual intrusion. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan policies 7.4 and 7.6, Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy policy CS14 and Merton SPP policies DMD2 and DMD3.

The proposed development would fail to contribute to meeting affordable housing targets and in the absence of a legal undertaking securing a financial contribution towards the delivery of affordable housing off-site would be contrary to policy CS8 of the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011).

- 9 46 - 76 SUMMERTOWN (VOLANTE), WIMBLEDON, SW17 0BH (Agenda Item 9)

The Committee noted that this Item had been Withdrawn from this Agenda

- 10 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS (Agenda Item 10)

The Committee noted the report showing recent decisions made by Planning Inspectors.

RESOLVED

The Planning Committee noted the contents of the Planning Appeal Decisions Report.

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

The Committee noted the contents of the Planning Enforcement – Summary of Current Cases report, and noted that the site visit to the Burnt Bullock had taken place on 29 April 2016, and that required works had taken place.

RESOLVED

The Committee noted the contents of the Planning Enforcement – Summary of Current Cases report

This page is intentionally left blank