## 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 <a href="https://www.merton.gov.uk/committee">www.merton.gov.uk/committee</a>.

# PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 20 SEPTEMBER 2018

(7.30 pm - 8.44 pm)

PRESENT Councillors Councillor Linda Kirby (in the Chair),

Councillor Najeeb Latif, Councillor Laxmi Attawar, Councillor David Chung, Councillor Simon McGrath,

Councillor Peter Southgate, Councillor Marsie Skeete and

Councillor Dave Ward, Councillor Stephen Crowe and Councillor

**Dennis Pearce** 

ALSO PRESENT Councillor Nigel Benbow

Jonathan Lewis Tim Bryson Sarath Attanayke Amy Dumitrescu

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors David Dean and Russell Makin. Councillors Stephen Crowe and Dennis Pearce attended as substitutes.

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

Declarations of interest were made by Councillor Najeeb Latif in relation to Item 5 – 141 The Broadway. Councillor Latif advised that he had been involved with arranging meetings between Planning Officers and the Developer on s106 agreements and therefore would not be voting on this item.

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

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 23 August 2018 are agreed as an accurate record.

Councillor Stephen Crowe asked what the outcome had been in relation to Item 10 on the minutes of the previous meeting. Officers responded that a visit had confirmed that the tree was on site and that TPOs had been placed on both trees.

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

Supplementary Agenda – Amendments and modifications to the Officer's report were published in a Supplementary Agenda. This applied to item 5.

#### 5 141 THE BROADWAY, WIMBLEDON, SW19 1QJ (Agenda Item 5)

Proposal: Redevelopment of site with demolition of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floor levels, remodelling of retained ground floor restaurant (Class A3) and erection of 6 storey building consisting of 6 residential units (7x1 and 9x2 bedroom flats).

The Committee noted the officer's report, the Planning Inspectors appeal decision from the previous application, the officer's presentation and additional information in the Supplementary Agenda.

The Committee received verbal representations from one objector to the proposal, the agent and planning consultant for the application and Ward Councillor Nigel Benbow.

The Objector made points including:

- The building is not in line with the character of the local area
- The application is from 2016 and therefore the information and policy used is outdated
- There are no listed elevations in metres
- The LDF Tall Buildings Background Paper (2010), which is quoted by officers
  as being pertinent to the application, states that tall building may be accepted
  if they are of exceptional design, which this proposal is not.

The Ward Councillor Nigel Benbow made points including:

- The building was too high and out of character from the surrounding area
- Strict conditions should be placed on the building materials to be used
- The balcony would be overlooking nearby properties
- The proposal would cause issues with Parking

The Agent for the application made points including:

- The premises is located in a high PTAL area and has no car parking in line with policy
- Whilst there is some overlooking, the use of obscured glass has been used to help to mitigate this and the distance from the windows is more than 20 metres
- The proposal is the result of extensive negotiations and is acceptable in planning terms

Members expressed concern that the level of affordable housing suggested a registered provider might be difficult to find and questioned whether there was any incentive on the developer to find a provider. Officers responded that there was a reasonably lengthy timeframe of 6 months for the developer to find a provider and

that the developer would need to demonstrate that they had made attempts to find a provider.

Members expressed their concern that the affordable housing target would not be reached and therefore commented that there should be a clawback mechanism in place to enable a review of viability. This was proposed and seconded.

In response to further questions from members, officers advised that render would be used on the top floor only and the rest of the building would be glass. It was noted that it could not be conditioned that bikes were not stored on glass balconies.

#### RESOLVED

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to a S106 agreement to provide for the scheme to be made permit free and for there to be a review mechanism to examine viability and the delivery of affordable housing and conditions.

#### 6 35 COOMBE LANE, RAYNES PARK, SW20 0LA (Agenda Item 6)

Proposal: Construction of an additional floor containing two x 2 bedroomed flats on an existing residential building.

The Committee noted the officer's report and presentation.

The Committee received verbal representations from one objector and the agent for the application.

The objector raised concerns including:

- The proposal would cause issues with Privacy/Overlooking
- The proposal would lead to light Restriction
- The proposal would undermine security and allow intruder access
- The proposed height has increased since 2014
- The proposal would exacerbate parking issues
- An antennae has been added which is not in line with the current amenity

#### The agent raised points including:

- The proposal had included an increase in height in accordance with minor amendment approval
- The properties being overlooked were already overlooked and the two additional windows would be replacing a roof terrace and therefore would be an improvement in terms of overlooking.

- The additional floor could only be accessed within the flats
- There were a number of key benefits from the proposal including helping to meet demand for housing, reasonable sized properties, improving the street scene and the proposal was designed to compliment the location

Members questioned whether the developer could apply again to add another floor in the future, officers responded that a further application could be submitted and if so, it would likely need to go through the Planning Applications Committee if officers were minded to approve.

Members commented that the proposal was not perfect but that the Borough was in need of more housing.

#### **RESOLVED**

The Committee voted to GRANT Planning Permission subject to a S106 Agreement for permit free development and conditions.

7 LAND ON SOUTH SIDE OF WYKE ROAD, RAYNES PARK (Agenda Item 7)

This item was withdrawn from the agenda prior to the meeting.

8 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS (Agenda Item 8)

RESOLVED: That the Committee noted the report on recent Planning Appeal Decisions.

9 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - SUMMARY OF CURRENT CASES (Agenda Item 9)

RESOLVED: The Committee noted the report on current Enforcement cases.