

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.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

20 JANUARY 2022
(7.15 pm - 9.20 pm)

PRESENT Councillors Councillor Dave Ward (in the Chair),
Councillor Stephen Crowe, Councillor Stephen Alambritis,
Councillor Billy Christie, Councillor David Dean,
Councillor Nick Draper, Councillor Joan Henry,
Councillor Simon McGrath, Councillor Carl Quilliam and
Councillor Peter Southgate

ALSO PRESENT Jonathan Lewis (Development Control Team Leader (South)
Leigh Harrington Planning Officer (Environment and
Regeneration), Bola Roberts (Democratic Services Officer)
Richard Seedhouse (Democratic Services Officer)

ATTENDING Amy Dumitrescu (Democracy Services Manager), Tim Bryson
(Development Control Team Leader North), Jourdan Alexander
(Planning Officer) and Lesley Barakchizadeh (Building and
Development Control Manager)

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 1)

There were no apologies for absence. Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Draper.

2 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST (Agenda Item 2)

A declaration of interest was made by Councillor David Dean in relation to Raynes Park Ward application 20/P1438 and 21/P2432 application number 7 and 8 in that the charity he supported received funding from the Applicant. Therefore Councillor Dean withdrew from the Chambers whilst both applications were considered.

3 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Agenda Item 3)

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 9th December 2021 are agreed as an accurate record.

4 TOWN PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Agenda Item 4)

The Committee noted the amendments and modifications to the officer's report. The Chair advised that items would be taken in the following order: Items 5, 8, 7 and 6. For the purposes of the minutes the items are minuted in the published agenda order.

5 RICARDS LODGE HIGH SCHOOL, LAKE ROAD, SW19 7HB (Agenda Item 5)

Proposal: ERECTION OF FLOODLIGHTS ADJACENT TO EXISTING HOCKEY PITCH. THE FLOODLIGHTS WOULD BE PERMITTED TO OPERATE BETWEEN 8AM AND 10PM MONDAY TO FRIDAY, AND BETWEEN 8AM AND 9PM ON SATURDAYS, SUNDAYS AND BANK HOLIDAYS

The Development Control Leader (North) presented the report.

The Committee received a verbal representation from two objectors who made points including:

- Back fence is around 12 to 13 meters from the side of the pitch
- Family life will be significantly adversely affected by the proposed development
- The proposed hours all year round represent an increased in out of hours use from 240 hours to over 1700 hours
- The applicant's calculation of glare is more than 10 times over the correct limit
- Concerns about pollution from noise, light or toxic engine emissions that the volume of traffic would bring
- The Objector raised concerns on the glare of car headlights into residents' bedrooms.

The Applicant spoke in response and made points including:

- The Applicant spoke on the benefits, opportunities of exercise on both physical and mental health since covid to provide safe environment
- The Applicant mentioned that Merton council themselves in 2019 in their pitch strategy highlighted the need for more pitch space in order to meet current demand and specifically highlighted the opportunity and need to develop the Ricards lodge pitch including adding flood lighting. The Applicant made further points including:
 - Ricards lodge girls would benefit as would the local primary school would also benefit by extended after schools clubs on site when the school is not using the site
 - The previous 20 years the pitch was used by the school it was used by external hires and that will continue to be the case
 - Under this planning application from a noise perspective as highlighted by the Officer noise will actually be reduced so it's a lower level than ever in the history of the 20-year pitch.
- The Planning Officer responded that it is important to note that this is an existing hockey pitch and so whilst the use isn't changing what the proposal would allow would be evening use
- The Planning Officer said environmental health colleagues are assisting with not only the issue of the floodlights, but also noise the conclusions of that are that whilst there would be some impact in addition to the existing pitch in terms of into the evenings with viewing the lights from the distance from the neighbouring properties, the pitch would otherwise be dark

- The Planning Officer said, there are a number of mitigation measures proposed which would assist in reducing noise and that had been included in the Officers report.
- It was noted that the environmental health officer had not objected to the 10 pm curfew for this application
- The Planning Officer concluded that would be acceptable with the mitigation measures proposed in terms of traffic the car park existing car parking on the site as 80 spaces the Wimbledon hockey club would only be using the facility outside of school operating hours and then the applicant's submission There are only 13 cars expected with approximately 25 players at a time would allow for the facility for training purposes for women hockey club

Members commented on the application and the times, the level of noise from users and the affect it would have on residents' amenities. Members also welcomed the progression and regeneration the application presented.

The Chair moved to the vote and it was

RESOLVED:

That the Committee granted planning permission subject to conditions.

6 192-202 MARTIN WAY, MORDEN SM4 4AJ (Agenda Item 6)

Proposal: ERECTION OF AN ADDITIONAL STOREY TO PROVIDE 5 x SELF-CONTAINED FLATS, ALONG WITH REFUSE AND CYCLE STORAGE PROVISION.

The Planning Officer presented the report and then responded to members' questions advising:

- Based on the previous planning history of the property whereby the property had been previously extended, the application could therefore not be further extended under prior approval and full planning approval was required in this case.
- No section 106 contributions were being requested by the Council, noting there were wider impacts that were expected to be created by the scheme.
- Amenity space had been considered and was considered acceptable on balance in relation to the number of units provided.
- The parking survey had been undertaken during the evening as this is when the majority of cars would be parked at and outside properties. Given the data provided from this survey it was considered that there was sufficient available car parking space for the additional cars that could be generated by the proposed scheme.

Members commented on the proposal noting:

- The proposal was located close to a number of amenities and travel routes.

- A member expressed concern that the proposal did not meet external space requirements

The Chair moved to the vote on the officers' recommendation and it was RESOLVED that:

The Committee agreed to grant planning permission subject to conditions.

7 29 RICHMOND ROAD WEST WIMBLEDON SW20 0PG (Agenda Item 7)

Proposal: ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR WRAP AROUND EXTENSION, PARTIAL TWO-STOREY REAR EXTENSION, ERECTION OF FRONT PORCH AND HIP TO GABLE AND REAR ROOF EXTENSION WITH INSTALLATION OF THREE ROOFLIGHTS TO THE FRONT SLOPE.

The Planning Officer presented the report.

In response to member questions, the Planning Officer advised that if the scheme were to be granted, there would be two planning permissions for that site (as the application for Item 8 had been granted prior to hearing this item).

The Chair moved to the vote on the officer's recommendation and it was

RESOLVED:

The Committee agreed to grant permission subject to relevant conditions.

8 29 RICHMOND ROAD WEST WIMBLEDON SW20 0PG (Agenda Item 8)

Proposal: APPLICATION FOR THE RETENTION OF THE AS BUILT SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR WRAP AROUND EXTENSION, PARTIAL TWO-STOREY REAR EXTENSION, ERECTION OF FRONT PORCH AND HIP TO GABLE AND REAR ROOF EXTENSION WITH INSTALLATION OF THREE ROOFLIGHTS TO THE FRONT SLOPE INCORPORATING A RISE IN THE ROOF RIDGE HEIGHT.

The Planning Officer presented the report.

The Committee received a verbal representation from two objectors who made points including:

- The development was quite intrusive on the house next door and the objector was surprised it was given planning permission
- The Objector would like to register disappointment and that of other neighbours in the area for the fact that this is being done through retrospective planning application

- The proposal to convert the roof space was registered long after the ground floor and first floor adjustments were approved
- The extension of the side is now actually fixed to the neighbour's side wall despite the plans showing a 10 centimetre gap
- The objector raised concerns that other people were building structures without getting planning permission and that the Local Authority had failed residents in their Planning regulations, which does not provide protection against retrospective building application.

The Agent to the Applicant spoke in response and made points including:

- Keeping the ridge line would have created a floor to ceiling height measuring slightly below 2 meters. There are a number of examples of other houses in close proximity to the size which have raised ridge lines.
- The agent outlined the circumstances of the construction, acknowledging this had been completed without planning permission.

The Team Leader (South Team) responded to some of the points noting that government guidance makes it quite clear that in terms of enforcing planning controls it is important that planning controls are enforced to protect the public interest and that where it is deemed appropriate it is quite in order for a local planning authority to invite an application to be submitted retrospectively.

The Planning Officer noted both applications should be considered separately and on their merits.

The Planning Officer responded to councillors questions:

- The Planning Officer advised it would be acceptable to grant permission for an extension to be attached to a neighbour's property. Planning permission does not override the need to ensure other legal processes are followed and attaching an extension to a neighbour's house would need a party wall agreement or agreement between the neighbouring property owners. Planners would undertake an assessment as to whether a development has an impact on the amenities of a neighbour. This does not include assessing property ownership matters or disputes.
- In planning town planning terms the development is considered acceptable notwithstanding neighbour concern.

The Chair moved to the vote on the officer's recommendation and it was endorsed.

RESOLVED:

The Committee agreed to grant planning permission subject to relevant conditions

9 201A SOUTH PARK ROAD, WIMBLEDON, SW19 8RY (Agenda Item 9)

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

10 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS (Agenda Item 10)

The Committee noted the report.

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

The Committee noted the report.