

# 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

19 OCTOBER 2017

(7.15 pm - 10.15 pm)

PRESENT Councillor Linda Kirby (in the Chair), Councillor Najeeb Latif, Councillor Philip Jones, Councillor Laxmi Attawar, Councillor Peter Southgate, Councillor Stephen Crowe, Councillor David Dean, Councillor Andrew Judge, Councillor Joan Henry and Councillor Judy Saunders

ALSO PRESENT Neil Milligan, David Gardiner, Jonathan Lewis, Chris Chowns, Lisa Jewell

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Geraldine Stanford and Jerome Neil.

They were substituted by Councillors Joan Henry and Judy Saunders

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

There were no declarations of pecuniary interest.

In the interests of openness and transparency Councillor David Dean declared that he had recently been involved, in his role as a local councillor, with discussions with Metro Bank regarding their new branch in Wimbledon.

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

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 September 2017 are agreed as an accurate record.

### 4 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Agenda Item 4)

Supplementary Agenda: Amendments and modifications to the Officers' report were published in a Supplementary Agenda. This applied to items: 5,7,8,10, 12, 13, and 14

Order of the meeting – The Chair announced that the order of items taken at the meeting would be: 7,14,10,8,5,13,16,11,6,9 and 12.

### 5 7 CALONNE ROAD SW19 5HH (Agenda Item 5)

Proposal: Addition of additional storey to existing bungalow

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

The Objector raised residents' concerns including:

- The plans are inaccurate, figures are wrong and no amendments have been made
- There has been no proper consideration of the neighbour's loss of amenity
- The development is out of keeping with the conservation area
- The charred timber cladding is not in keeping with the area

The Agent to the application made points including:

- The original submitted plans are accurate
- The existing bungalow detracts from the conservation area
- This proposal has been sensitively designed

Members asked officers about the impact of the proposal on sunlight to the neighbouring properties, and noted that it was officers view that there would be very little impact on sunlight levels.

#### RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

#### 6 REAR OF 145 CLAREMONT AVENUE, KT3 6QP (Agenda Item 6)

Proposal: Erection of 3 bedroom single storey dwelling house

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation

Members commented that this application was a good use of land to provide housing

#### RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

#### 7 THE WOLFSON CENTRE, COPSE HILL, SW20 (Agenda Item 7)

Proposal: Erection of 7 x flatted blocks with a maximum height of 5 storeys (including roof space and lower ground floor accommodation) to provide 75 residential units with associated arrangements including basement car parking and the provision of public and private landscaped spaces.

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

The Objectors raised concerns including (full details of objections received are summarised in the Officers report):

- Application is invalid
- Housing Density is too high, and much higher than previous application
- Housing Density is too high for a PTAL (Passenger Transport Accessibility Level) rating of 1
- Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) should not be included in application site
- Disturbance to wildlife
- Trees are deciduous and so will not provide screening in the winter
- Inadequate provision of parking for visitors and service vehicles
- Air Pollution survey by residents suggests that levels of pm10s and Nitrogen Oxide are double those in the report

The Agent made points including:

- The site is defined by the hospital buildings
- The application has been reduced in scale
- Community sessions have been held
- The DRP have made positive comments
- The Scheme will substantially enhance the Conservation Area and MOL with the provision of a community pavilion, playing fields, and measures to ensure biodiversity
- The development will provide much needed homes

Councillor John Bowcott made points including:

- Application is unacceptable and will dominate the Conservation area
- Buildings are too tall and monolithic in this sensitive area.
- The Council has policies to protect views
- This is a semi-rural area and the MOL is protected
- The development is a threat to air quality

Councillor Jill West made points including:

- This application does not protect the Copse Hill Conservation Area
- It is too dense, lacks affordable homes and is subject to flooding
- No evidence that the Applicant has listened to residents
- There are no other tall blocks in this area

- It is a semi-rural area, and this development would set a precedent

In reply to Members' Question, Officers made points including:

- The affordable housing provision was 18 units for shared ownership. This was a 24% provision and had been set by the independent viability assessment. A 'clawback' review mechanism could be required by condition to review this provision at a later date.
- The site density of 298 habitable homes per square hectare is higher than the figure of 150-200 suggested in the London Plan. However, the London Plan is clear that its figures are indicative not absolute, and the density of this site is considered acceptable.
- Members must remember that there was a large ugly hospital on this site and that would have generated many car journeys
- London Plan allows for inclusion of grass land into site boundary
- The height of the buildings is considered to be acceptable in the setting.

Members commented that it was a well designed scheme with significant gaps between the buildings to maintain the view, and was a considerable improvement on the previous hospital buildings.

Other Members considered the proposal to be too high and bulky in its setting within the conservation area and next to MOL. They did not consider that the application met the criteria of protecting and enhancing the Conservation Area. They also felt that residents of the site would be reliant on their cars. They were also disappointed about the amount of affordable housing.

A resolution to refuse on the grounds that the development neither protected nor enhanced the Conservation Area was proposed but was not carried by the vote. The Chair used her casting vote to support Officers Recommendation to grant Planning Permission. An additional condition requiring a review of the viability arrangements in the future (a 'clawback' mechanism) was agreed.

## RESOLVED

- A. The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to completion of s106 agreement and conditions set out in the Officers Report and an additional condition requiring the viability arrangements to be reviewed in the future.
- B. The Director of Environment and Regeneration be given delegated authority to agree the detailed wording of the above additional condition

8 BELVEDERE COURT, 1A COURTHOPE RD SW19 7RH (Agenda Item 8)

Proposal: Demolition of the existing building and erection of a three storey building (with accommodation at basement level and within the roof space) comprising 9 x 2 bedroom flats together with associated car parking and landscaping.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation and additional information in the supplementary agenda. The Development Control Manager asked the Committee to note that this scheme had been previously allowed but that it was back at Committee as the applicant had created two further parking spaces on site and wished to remove the permit free status of the previously allowed scheme.

The Objectors made points including:

- Wimbledon Village suffers from parking congestion
- further permits would make this congestion worse
- further parking would make air quality, worse
- other recent developments are permit free
- the area has excellent transport links with many bus routes and walking distance to Wimbledon station

The Agent to the application explained how further parking had been created on site and how this development was policy compliant

In reply to Members questions, The Development Control Manager and Transport Planning Officer made points:

- Officers would normally welcome permit-free, but in this case it cannot be ignored that the existing units on the site have permit parking
- Cannot split the decision and allow the extra spaces but not the removal of 'permit free'
- A Planning Inspector would take account of the fact that existing units on the site have access to parking permits.

In reply to Members questions the Transport Planning Officer made points:

- The PTAL (public transport accessibility level) of this development is 4 to 5
- There is no mechanism to limit the number of permits to one per dwelling unit
- The average number of permits, across the Borough is one per dwelling

Members commented that owing to the severe congestion in Wimbledon Village and that the previous application had been granted permit free they did not wish to allow this application

## RESOLVED

The Committee agreed to:

1. REFUSE the application for the following reasons: That the Highway in Wimbledon Village is very congested with parked cars, and allowing further permit parking would make this situation worse
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

### 9 7 ELLERTON RD, SW20 0ER (Agenda Item 9)

Proposal: Demolition of existing dwellinghouse and erection of 2 detached dwelling houses plus alterations to existing vehicular crossover.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation.

Members commented that they much preferred the design of this application over the previously refused application.

## RESOLVED

The Committee voted unanimously to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

### 10 21 GOODENOUGH RD, SW19 3QY (Agenda Item 10)

Proposal: Retention of a part single/part two storey rear extension and an L-shaped rear roof extension.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation and additional information in the supplementary agenda. The Development Control Manager asked Members to note the circumstances of this application, as detailed in the Officers report. The part single storey part first floor extension had already been given planning permission. If this dormer window extension had been carried out after the substantial completion of the allowed part single storey, part first floor extension then it would not have required further planning permission, but as the work was carried out simultaneously it fell foul of the permitted development regulations and a certificate of lawful development could not be issued. If this upper part of the extension had been carried out as a separate building operation it would have been lawful. Also, if the upper part

of the extension was to be removed it could be reinstated as a single building operation and not require planning permission. Officers considered this to be a material consideration. Officers also considered that it was the impact of this roof extension that they were to consider at this meeting.

The Objectors raised points including:

- At no stage has this application been assessed in its entirety, and all surrounding neighbours want the entire scheme to be assessed.
- The scheme is contrary to Merton Policy DMD2
- The certificate of lawfulness was refused
- The scheme is overbearing and out of scale with the neighbouring properties.
- The proposal will cause overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbours.
- The windows installed are larger than those on the plan
- The rear garden of the application site will disappear

The Applicant made points including:

- If the two parts of the extension had been carried out separately, both would have been allowed
- The whole extension is similar in size to others in the area
- This is a family home
- Have added extra soundproofing to mitigate the effect of noise to next door neighbours
- Some neighbours have written in support
- Accept that windows at rear need to be changed to protect privacy

The Development Control Officer replied that they had noted that the rear windows were larger than approved and had added a condition to reduce these windows size. He also commented that this type of extension, with a roof extension over the first floor extension, was common on the Borough, and could be built under permitted development.

Members commented that this application did seem very large, but that as it would have been allowable under permitted development rights in different circumstances, there were no grounds to refuse.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

## 11 UNIT 7, PRIORY RETAIL PARK, 131 HIGH ST, SW19 2PP (Agenda Item 11)

Proposal: Demolition of existing retail unit (Class A1) and the erection of a bank (Class A2) with 2 x ATMs, associated car parking and landscaping.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation. The Committee noted that Officers were recommending the application for refusal on the grounds that it was underdevelopment on a site that was suitable for intensification and could provide a much larger mixed use development.

As the officer recommendation was for refusal the applicant was allowed to address the committee. He made points including:

- Metro Bank had plans to invest and create jobs, they had already created 25 new jobs in Wimbledon, and this application would create 25 more
- They planned to redevelop the site to provide a new bank and also to alter the road layout to remove a 'rat run'
- He believed that the freeholder of the land had no plans to develop housing on the site, and the site may never come forward as a housing site.
- If allowed, the new bank would be operating by Christmas 2018

In answer to members' questions, officers replied:

- They have not received an application for housing on the site
- The London Plan flags up areas for intensification and Colliers Wood is such an area.
- Officers did discuss aspirations for mixed use/higher rise on the site at pre-app stage.

Members commented that:

- This application does not fit with the aspirations for development in Colliers Wood and is underdevelopment of the site
- A member did like the design and would like to see a bank on the retail park
- A member doubted whether this landowner would ever make an application for housing/mixed use and it would be better to accept this application now rather than wait.

RESOLVED



The Committee voted to Refuse planning permission for the following reason:

The proposed development by reason of design, size, scale, character and location represents a poor standard of design that fails to impact positively on the character and quality of the public realm, failing to relate positively and appropriately to the siting, rhythm, scale, density, height and massing of surrounding buildings and urban layout and undermines the policy goals for the intensification of use of this site to the detriment of the future development of the wider area. The proposals fail to accord with the objectives of policies; DM D1 and DMD2 of the adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan 2014, Strategic Objectives 2b, 2c, 3a, 3b, 4a, 5f, 8b & 8c & policies CS1, CS7, CS9 & CS14 of the Merton Core Strategy 2011, policies 2.13, 2.15, 3.4, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6 & 7.7 of the London Plan 2016 and supported by the contextual framework of Merton's Tall Building Background Paper (2010).

## 12 577 KINGSTON RD SW20 8SA (Agenda Item 12)

Proposal: Demolition of existing church building (no.577 Kingston road – use class d1) and erection of a part 5 storey building (to Kingston road) and part 3 storey building (to Abbott avenue) to provide replacement church building (use class d1) at ground, first and part second floor and 15 residential units (use class c3) at second, third and fourth floor; retention of car parking; provision of cycle parking and landscaping to Kingston road; together with provision of waste storage at ground floor level

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

Following discussion between the committee and officers, the committee made the following requests:

- Members were unhappy that the viability study had said that the cash in lieu payment for carbon shortfall was unaffordable, and requested a condition requiring a review in the future of this payment
- Members asked Officers to work with the developers on improving and increasing the landscaping at the front of the building
- Members also asked it be noted that residents wished for the current bus stop to stay in its current position and that many residents would like to see a road crossing put in.

## RESOLVED

The Committee voted unanimously to GRANT Planning Permission subject to; completion of a s106 agreement, conditions in the officer's report and also an additional condition requiring a review of the cash in lieu payment for carbon shortfall

13 119 MERTON HALL RD, SW19 3PY (Agenda Item 13)

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear and side extension following demolition of existing side extension

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

The Objector raised concerns including:

- The proposed extension, at 3.7m high, would be overbearing on no.117
- It would cause a loss of daylight and overshadowing to no. 117 and shade 60% of their patio
- The proposed extension would present 10.5 m<sup>2</sup> of wall to no.117 and would adversely affect their enjoyment of their garden.

The Applicant raised points including:

- The proposal is in keeping with others in the area and has been designed to be similar to the extension recently built next door at no.121

Members commented that they could see no reason to refuse this single storey extension

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

14 12A RAVENSBURY TERRACE, SW18 4RL (Agenda Item 14)

Proposal: Demolition and redevelopment of the site to provide office accommodation (318m<sup>2</sup>) on the ground floor with 24 residential units on the first, second, third, fourth and fifth floors, together with eight car parking spaces including two disabled spaces and associated landscaping, cycle and refuse storage.

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

Councillor Linda Taylor spoke in support of the application, she was pleased that the developers had listened to residents views. The proposal to build a bridge would improve the walking route to Earlsfield station for many residents, and would be mainly funded by a contribution from the developers.

The Councillor continued that issues of height and flooding had been adequately addressed by the developers and the proposal will benefit the Wandle Trail.

In answer to members questions, officers made points including:

- There is a mistake in the Officer's report regarding the size of Flat 5
- Officers will work with developers regarding the shared ownership affordable units
- Adjustments were made to improve connectivity along the river, if necessary CIL monies could be used to complete the proposed bridge, if the developers contribution is not enough.

Members asked that the footpath be completed as soon as possible.

RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

15 12 WATERSIDE WAY, SW17 0HB (Agenda Item 15)

This Item was removed from the Agenda prior to the meeting

16 TPO AT 15 KINGSWOOD RD, SW19 3ND (Agenda Item 16)

Objectors to the TPO made comments including:

- The tree is too large and overbearing in its setting
- It cannot be seen from the local highway so does not provide public amenity or make a significant contribution to the public – so does not meet the requirements in Merton's Guidelines for applying a TPO
- It is the wrong tree in the wrong setting
- There are other trees in the garden

Members requested that in allowing this TPO they were asking the Tree Officer to be sympathetic to residents and allow for reasonable cutting back of the tree

RESOLVED

That the Merton (No.712) Tree Preservation Order 2017 be confirmed, without modification.

17 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS (Agenda Item 17)

RESOLVED

The Committee noted the report on Planning Appeal Decisions

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

RESOLVED

The Committee noted the report on Planning Enforcement