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 <u>www.merton.gov.uk/committee</u>.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 20 APRIL 2017 (7.15 pm - 11.00 pm)

- PRESENT Councillor Linda Kirby (Chair), Councillor John Bowcott, Councillor Philip Jones, Councillor Andrew Judge, Councillor Peter Southgate, Councillor Geraldine Stanford, Councillor Imran Uddin, Councillor Laxmi Attawar, Councillor Daniel Holden and Councillor Stephen Crowe
- 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Abigail Jones and Councillor Najeeb Latif. Councillor Laxmi Attawar and Councillor Daniel Holden attended as their respective substitutes.

Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Imran Uddin (arrived at 19:20).

2 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST (Agenda Item 2)

There were no declarations of interest.

Councillor John Bowcott made a statement to inform the Committee that he chaired the Design Review Panel that considered Item 7, however he did not take part in the debate or vote on the proposal on that panel.

Councillor Andrew Judge informed the Committee that he had been involved in the development of the proposals associated with Item 7, and therefore would not be participating for that item.

3 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Agenda Item 3)

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 16 March 2017 are agreed as an accurate 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:

Supplementary Agenda: A list of modifications for agenda items 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13 and 16 were published as a supplementary agenda.

Items 11 and 14 were withdrawn from the Agenda prior to the meeting.

Verbal Representations: The Committee received verbal representations detailed in the minutes for the relevant item.

Order of the Agenda: The Chair amended the order of items to the following: 5, 7, 6, 9, 10, 13, 15, 8, 12, 16.

5 260 CHURCH ROAD, MITCHAM, CR4 3BW (Agenda Item 5)

Proposal: Demolition of existing building and the erection of a part 3 storey, part 4 storey (with setback) residential block comprising 14 x residential units, provision of 8 on-street car parking spaces (subject to Traffic Management Order) and 20 cycle parking spaces.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation, additional information in the Supplementary agenda, verbal presentations from three objectors, the agent for the application and ward Councillor Ross Garrod.

The objectors raised residents' concerns including:

- The height of the building in relation to the Tall Buildings Paper
- The overpowering effect on the streets
- Erosion of the character due to its scale and height
- The perceived height of the building above the others nearby
- That it was out of character with the surrounding area
- The high number of objections
- The building being built in an area of local character
- The marketing of the site by Developers
- The loss of sunlight
- Loss of privacy and visual intrusion

The Agent to the application asked the committee to note points including:

- The application has been subject to 18 months of discussions.
- This would be a redevelopment of a derelict site
- Affordable Housing was included within the proposal
- The proposal included a £180,000 CIL payment
- The parking would be increased in the area with the proposal
- Sunlight assessments had been undertaken and the levels would be above the suggested levels all compliance would be achieved

Councillor Ross Garrod made pointsincluding:

- The large number of representations received including a petition, noting this was one of the largest number of representations received for an application of this size
- Inadequate parking provision
- The building was out of scale with the surroundings
- Concerns about the safety of the changes to the yellow lines
- Lack of privacy
- The proposed building is too large

The Planning Officer advised that Church Road was subject to a diverse range of building types and did not reflect the character that objectors referred to, and that the surrounding areas contained flats and other buildings which were higher than the one proposed. The Planning Officer advised that quantitative assessments had been carried out in relation to loss of light.

In response to questions, the Planning Officer responded:

- The Planning Officers had fully engaged with Highways Officers and the applicant to look at extra options in the street locally to accommodate vehicles.
- The report was comprehensive and properly reflected the analysis done by the applicant.
- Vacant property levels in the borough were high and it would be unreasonable with the known need for affordable housing to frustrate the application based on the marketing of the site.

Members expressed concerns that a more pleasing design could be achieved and Councillor Peter Southgate suggested a deferral to the Design and Review Panel who would meet on 24 May 2017.

Following further comments, the Chair asked the Committee to vote on the motion to defer.

Members voted on the motion to defer, pending comments from the Design and Review Panel and the motion was carried.

RESOLVED: That the application is deferred pending comments from the Design and Review Panel.

6 CROWNALL WORKS, ELM GROVE, WIMBLEDON, SW19 (Agenda Item 6)

Proposal: Demolition of existing office and warehouse buildings and

erection of a building comprising 924.8 sqm of office floorspace (Use Class B1) and 6 x 3 bed houses (Use Class C3).

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation, additional information in the Supplementary agenda, verbal presentations from one objector and the agent for the application.

The objector raised residents' concerns including:

- Previous projects by the same applicant were too dense
- Devoid of amenity space
- Insufficient parking
- Height
- The front was not in keeping with the area and would diminish the look of the street
- Poor outlook
- The entrances would compromise privacy

The Agent to the application asked the committee to note points including:

- The proposal was lower than others nearby
- The offices would be car free and the area was well served by public transport
- The traffic would reduce with the change of usage of the site
- There would be more jobs than the current usage

In response to questions, the Planning Officer responded:

- Worker numbers would increase from 48 to 109
- There was no overlooking and no resident would be prejudiced by the development.

RESOLVED: That the application is granted subject to s.106 agreement and conditions.

7 MERTON HALL, 78 KINGSTON ROAD, WIMBLEDON, SW19 (Agenda Item 7)

Proposal: Alterations and extensions to Merton Hall including demolition of part of Merton Hall, and alterations and refurbishment of the retained two storey building and erection of a new worship hall, café, foyer and meeting/group rooms.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation, additional information in the Supplementary agenda, verbal presentations from three objectors, the applicant for the application and Councillor Michael Bull.

The objectors raised residents' concerns including:

- The energy report was non viable
- The site was unsuitable
- The proposal was not appropriate or neighbourly
- Loss of parking
- Excessive noise
- The loss of the currently community centre
- Loss of greenspace
- Overbearing impact
- The new proposal would be closer to the neighbouring boundary than the previous building
- Loss of privacy
- Noise from the mechanical ventilation
- Loss of historic fabric and character

The Applicant asked the committee to note points including:

- The tree lined area would be retained
- The proposed building would be well insulated and the applicant had worked hard to ensure that sound would not leak.
- Surveys had been completed in respect of noise, transport and parking.

The Chair, Councillor Linda Kirby read out an email submitted by Councillors Katy Neep and Abigail Jones which outlined their concerns, including:

- Could the useage of the Café be reviewed to consider the number of cafes already in the area
- The retention of greenspace
- Overlooking and noise from the changes at the rear of the property

Councillor Michael Bull made points including:

- Incongruity of application
- Noise and disturbance
- Loss of privacy, parking spaces and greenspace

In response to questions, the Planning Officer responded:

- There had been quantitative conditions applied restricting noise to safeguard neighbour amenity
- A condition had been added to restrict hours of use, and another to restrict the noise breaking out of the building
- The applicant had submitted a parking survey and there was ample on street parking
- It was not for the Local Planning Authority to regulate competition between cafes.

Following further comments, members continued to express concern over the design and the loss of greenspace.

Councillor Peter Southgate moved a motion to refuse on the grounds of the design, and this was seconded by Councillor Stephen Crowe.

A vote was taken on the motion, with 6 members voting for the motion and 3 against.

RESOLVED: That the application is refused as the front design is out of keeping with the building and neighbouring area.

RESOLVED: That officers are delegated the authority to draft the full reasons for refusal citing the relevant planning policies.

8 641 KINGSTON ROAD, RAYNES PARK, SW20 8SA (Agenda Item 8)

Proposal: Application for change of use from a Public House (Use Class A4)

to a 21-room hotel (Use Class C1) including 1 x 1 bed (managers flat) dwelling and demolition of existing taxi business within curtilage.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation, additional plans tabled at the meeting and a verbal presentation from Councillor Michael Bull.

Councillor Bull raised concerns about the lack of parking for the premises, and members acknowledged this issue.

The vote to grant permission was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: To grant permission subject to conditions.

9 27 LANDGROVE ROAD, WIMBLEDON SW19 7LL (Agenda Item 9)

Proposal: Application for variation of condition 10 (use of garage) attached to LBM planning application 07/p1131 relating to the erection of a three storey building on the site of 27 Landgrove Road containing 3 x 2 bedroom apartments involving conversion of second level roof space of 25 Landgrove road to form additional accommodation for new second floor apartment at no.27. Enlargement of existing detached garage at rear of properties incorporating a storage area within the roofspace. Variation to remove restriction of use of ground floor of garage to parking only To allow use of both ground and first floor as a home office.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation, additional information in the Supplementary agenda, verbal presentations from two objectors and the agent for the application.

The objectors raised residents' concerns including:

- The use of the building was unclear
- Size
- Transparency of the plans
- Parking issues caused by using the garage as an office
- Overlooking

The Agent to the application asked the committee to note points including:

- It would be low key ancillary use
- It would cause a loss of one parking space only
- A recent parking survey stated there was spare capacity for parking
- There was no intention to put as separate use

In response to questions, the Planning Officer responded:

- The location was in a CPZ, but there was sufficient space
- The application was permitted on the basis that it was not for commercial use and would not for example, have staff in the building
- The reworded condition allows for home office use, domestic storage and parking to retain flexibility for future use

RESOLVED: That the application is granted subject to conditions.

10 OBERON PAVILION, 19 LINDISFARNE ROAD, WEST WIMBLEDON, SW20 0NW (Agenda Item 10)

Proposal: Formation of 2 single storey side extensions to existing bungalow; formation or roof extension to bungalow and infill between bungalow and pavilion; formation of roof extension over pavilion including 2 new dormers; improvements to hard and soft landscaping and provision of new netball court, erection of new fencing and gates to site boundary including formation of drop off area at Lindisfarne Road.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation, additional information in the Supplementary agenda, verbal presentations from two objectors and the agent for the application.

The objectors raised residents' concerns including:

- The maximum height of the hedge to preserve visual enjoyment and the heritage asset
- The maximum height for the mesh fence
- Overlooking from the veranda
- Safety of children who would be above residents gardens
- Privacy
- Parking
- Construction traffic and the risks associated with this in a small site with no pavements on the road, which is a popular walking route

The Agent to the application asked the committee to note points including:

• The agent raised the positive value of the high level of resident engagement in this road

- Late amendments had been made as the agent was respectful of the concerns raised by residents and had responded to them
- The agent advised he was willing to accept reasonable conditions

In response to questions, the Transport Officer responded that there was a construction management plan.

The vote to grant was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application is granted subject to conditions.

11 17 MERTON HALL ROAD, SW19 3PP (Agenda Item 11)

WITHDRAWN FROM THIS AGENDA

12 THE PERSEID UPPER SCHOOL, MIDDLETON ROAD, MORDEN, SM4 6RU (Agenda Item 12)

Proposal: Erection of a single storey north-west extension, a two storey rear central extension and 2 x single storey south east extensions.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation.

The vote to grant was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: To grant planning permission subject to conditions.

13 29 ST GEORGES ROAD, MITCHAM, CR4 1ED (Agenda Item 13)

Proposal: Erection of a front porch

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation, additional information in the Supplementary agenda, verbal presentations from one objector and the applicant for the application.

The objector raised concerns including:

- Loss of character of the road and erosion of the character of the property
- The proposal is not in keeping and would lead to a loss of uniformity in the road
- Changes to the visual outlook
- Loss of natural surveillance and security

The applicant on the application asked the committee to note points including:

- There had been a large number of houses developed in the road in various ways so houses were not uniform
- The proposal was the same size as other garages and extensions in the road
- The road includes a large block of flats
- The properties need updating and this would improve the look of the area

The vote to grant was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application is granted subject to planning conditions.

14 12 WATERSIDE WAY, TOOTING, SW17 0HB (Agenda Item 14)

WITHDRAWN FROM THIS AGENDA

15 21-23 WIMBLEDON HILL ROAD, WIMBLEDON, SW19 7NE (Agenda Item 15)

Proposal: Erection of first and second storey rear extension and rear roof extensions in connection with the conversion of the first, second and third floors of the building from beauty salon (Class Sui Generis) to Class A1 use (part first floor) and five 3x1 bed and 2x 2 bed self-contained flats (part first, second and third floor).

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation.

The vote to grant was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application is granted subject to s.106 agreement and conditions.

16 120 WINDERMERE ROAD, STREATHAM, SW16 5HE (Agenda Item 16)

Proposal: Erection of an outbuilding in the rear garden to be used as a garage

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

Following questions from members the Planning Officer advised that the permission would have suitable conditions so as to prevent use of the garage for commercial purposes and that if members remained concerned about the condition of the site and its impact on the character of the surrounding area consideration could be given to enforcement action under S215 of the Planning Act.

The Chair raised concerns about the effect on neighbours and their personal amenity.

RESOLVED: To grant permission subject to conditions.

17 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS (Agenda Item 17)

The Committee noted the report on recent Planning Appeal Decisions.

18 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - SUMMARY OF CURRENT CASES (Agenda Item 18)

The Committee noted the report on recent Planning Enforcement. Following questions from members, the Planning Officer clarified the current staffing levels.

This page is intentionally left blank