# Merton Council Planning Applications Committee 25 April 2019 Supplementary agenda

12 Supplementary Agenda - Modifications

1 - 8



## Planning Applications Committee 25th April 2019 Supplementary Agenda (Modifications Sheet)

## <u>Item 5. 141 The Broadway, Wimbledon, SW19 1NE</u> Application Number: 17/P0296 Ward: Abbey

- 1. Insert new section into committee report. Section 5.5 (MET police comments)
  - 5.5 MET police
  - 5.5.1 Amendments: Bike storage has been added to the rear at ground floor, changes to fenestration and details of font balconies, obscure glazing has been added to the side south facing elevation, 1.7m high obscure glazed screens to rear balconies (East Elevation), kitchen extractor vent has been added to the elevations and materials added on the elevations to consist of: Brickwork match existing surrounds, render on North Elevation and East Elevation (only on riser at sixth floor)
  - 5.5.2 Thank you for inviting me to comment on the changes to the development. I have had no contact with the architects or developers prior to the application.
  - 5.5.3 In the year ending September 2018, the crime rate in Merton (66.07) was lower than the average for the Metropolitan Police Force area (92.87) for Police recorded crimes per 1,000 population. The top five crime types in Abbey ward where the proposed site is located, between March 2018 and February 2019 are shown in the table below.

Crime type	Total	Percentage
Anti-social behaviour	272	25.07%
Violence and sexual offences	241	22.21%
Burglary	105	9.68%
Other theft	105	9.68%
Vehicle crime	90	8.29%

- 5.5.4 Having given due consideration to the details of the security and safety features from the drawings provided, I have a few comments and recommendations.
- 5.5.5 Bike storage has been added to the rear at ground floor. As bicycles and their parts are extremely attractive to thieves the cycle store should have appropriate CCTV coverage to provide identity images of those who enter and activity images within the space.
- 5.5.6 The bicycle store door design is double leaf therefore twice the amount of security is needed, the door should be single. The door should have access control and a locking system operable from the inner face by use of a thumb turn to ensure that residents are not accidentally locked in by another person.

- 5.5.7 The cycle storage should incorporate stands or racks secured into concrete foundations, which should enable cyclists to use at least two locking points so that the wheels and crossbar are locked to the stand rather than just the crossbar.
- 5.5.8 The rear area should have lighting that avoids the various forms of light pollution (vertical and horizontal glare). It should be as sustainable as possible with good uniformity. Bollard lights, under bench and architectural up lighting are not considered as good lighting sources. White light aids good CCTV colour rendition and gives a feeling of security to residents and visitors. Any public space lighting should also meet the current council requirements.

#### Officer response

Add planning condition relating to MET police comments. Requiring the submission and approval of details that respond to the MET's comments, (condition - Secure by design).

2. Update section 5.1.1 of committee report, 12 objections received, not 11 as stated in committee report.

The missed objection letter from an address in SW19 (based on original plans) raises the following points:

- The applicant has submitted elevations, drawings and/or scales which do not accurately reflect the existing streetscape.
- The drawings suggest that 141 The Broadway will be much taller than the CIPD.
- The applicant has failed to recognise the architectural merits of CIPD which should be a standalone building.
- Request that the inaccurate and misleading documents are withdrawn and accurate drawing provided.
- The CGI's will also be inaccurate. Request for further CGI's in relation to Palmerston Road and the residential block across the road – Chorus Building – on corner of the Broadway and Stanley Road.
- Further drawings with scale/CGI's are needed from the direction of the Grade II Wimbledon Theatre.
- How will this proposed residential building with its bland office-like boxed glass front be viewed from the Conservation Area or the Grade II theatre?
- The design is wholly uncharacteristic with what we aspire for Wimbledon.
- 3. Update section 5.1.5 of committee report as follows:

In response to re-consultation, 6 letters of objection and 1 letter of comment received.

The letter of comment raises the following point:

The balconies on the west elevation should also be obscured glazed to
protect the street scene when viewed from properties on the other side of
the road. Balconies in blocks of flats like this often become cluttered with
bicycles, BBQ's and other equipment.

The letters of objection raise the following points:

#### <u>Design</u>

- The design remains un-Wimbledon and Not "high quality" as required by the revised NPPF which this planning department consistently ignores, or the draft Wimbledon plan, or Merton's own Tall Building paper or CS14 of Merton's Core Strategy planning policy.
- The CIPD which is a high quality building is going to be harmed as a result of these plans as will the vista from the Conservation Area.
- The building line on this application has been moved forward, causing harm to the streetscape and visuals from the conservation area and from the listed Grade II Wimbledon theatre. The balconies – although shorter – will become excessively visible, eating into the curved frontage of the CIPD and its seamless vista, and bizarrely causing overlooking (into the office from residential flats or vice versa as they sit snug with the CIPD building line).
- The balconies will become storage and clutter facilities rather than inviting views of a "brand" town. (This must be secured by condition not to use balconies as storage)
- The CIPD curved frontage is the first thing that greets you as you turn the bend in the road when travelling from the town centre towards the listed theatre. With the current plans, the balconies will jut out into the curved frontage, breaking up the flow and causing harm to the streetscape.
- Why is the frontage render not Portland stone as was required of Premier Inn? This surely would improve the quality. And why the vast number of aluminium balconies which are cheap and industrial and highly visible from the Conservation Area, making it unfitting?
- The height of the proposed development risks turning this particular section of The Broadway into an urban corridor of featureless tall buildings, which deprive the area of sunlight, plunge it into shade for many hours and contribute nothing to the character of the area.
- The overall height has been reduced slightly so that is does not exceed the adjoining CIPD building but still believe that it is unnecessary to match the height of the tallest buildings in The Broadway.

#### Officer response

See section 7.5 of committee report

#### Plans

- I raised concerns in 2017 that the proposals elevations and drawings were not correct. These concerns remain in the amended plans.
- The Council has a legal obligation to submit accurate plans to a planning committee.
- Plans incorrectly labelled (North elevation are the front of the building not west as stated. All other elevations area therefore mis-labelled. This

causes confusion when reading the officers report accompanying this application for PAC.

Previously no public consultation on the amended plans.

#### Officer response

The applicant has updated their elevations to include levels of the site and its neighbour (CIPD). The inclusion of levels on the drawings ensures that the building is correctly shown in context with CIPD building. A planning condition relating to levels is also secured within the application.

The incorrectly labelled plans have been noted. For the sake of clarification, the elevations should read as follows (West – corrected to North) – (East corrected to South) – (South corrected to West) – (North corrected to East)

The amended plans have now been subject of public consultation. The reconsultation response has been included as part of the modification sheet.

#### Housing

- No affordable housing. PAC decided an affordable housing claw back mechanism when approving 16/P2585 in September. 16/P2585 was for 16 units (six agreed to be affordable housing). This current application is for 20 units, an increase from the previous application, and yet offers no affordable housing or clawback mechanism. Why is this allowed when the GLA is pushing for more affordable housing?
- Doesn't meet housing mix. Out of 20 units, not one family 3-bedroom unit despite Merton Policy and the London Plan.

#### Officer response

The application has been subject of an independent viability review. Each application must be treated on its own merits. The results of extensive viability reviews are that the scheme cannot support any affordable housing. The application does however include affordable housing review mechanisms at early and late stages. This would secure that the Council can clawback any additional surplus in profit if applicable.

Whilst there is no 3 bedroom units within the proposal, the scheme does provide a mix of dwelling types (including family accommodation). It should also be noted that the Councils housing mix is only an indicative target.

#### Sustainability

- It's a shame that such a visible site should receive such poor treatment and contribute little to sustainability - meeting the minimum 35% on carbon emissions - at a time of great environmental need and revised policy (NPPF).
- BREEAM Very Good should be a target. Where is the BREEAM report?
- No provision for solar panels, efficient energy usage or greenery at the front.

#### Officer response

See section 11 of committee report

#### Air Quality

Air quality issues will be exacerbated during construction and adversely
affect local people, after construction, the proposed building offers no
measures to promote air quality and promote the heath of residents in
and around the new development.

#### Officer response

The proposed development is modest scale, matters relating to air quality can be suitably controlled within the construction management plan condition. The provision of soft landscaping (trees) secured by the landscaping planning condition could help alleviate some concerns relating to air quality.

#### Landscaping

- Where are the trees, greening on the street? A small internal courtyard for 20 flats, can't be an improvement in the quality of life.
- Greening create and maintain significant areas of plant life.
- Landscaping does not attempt to enhance the street or provide a
  sustainable landscape scheme. Of great importance is that the
  opportunity has not been taken to allow space for trees to be included
  front and back of the development. Trees would help improve air quality
  on the traffic polluted Broadway and achieve a much welcomed
  greenness to the barren streetscape and make a visual link between the
  grounds of Holy Trinity Church and the London plane trees outside the
  old town hall.

#### Officer response

A planning condition requiring details relating to soft landscaping is secured via planning condition 13 (which includes the requirement of tree planting to the front boundary).

#### Neighbour Amenity

- Loss of privacy suffered by residents in the building opposite
- The building would be of an excessive depth at a high level, projecting many metres past our rear wall and therefore would restrict outlook from our living room windows.

#### Officer response

See section 7.6 of committee report

#### Other

- This very late representation is due to not having been notified of any amendments until checking the PAC agenda for April.
- Where in the application are provisions for the retained ground floor restaurant? Where are the waste and servicing facilities? The ground floor plans show only storage for waste from flats. It also shows access from the restaurant/commercial rear door into the residential lift/bikes area which must flag some security issues.
- Danger of creating a wind tunnel effect on The Broadway
- The proposal does not meet the ten things Wimbledon wants. Where is the brilliant proposal for a permeable and navigable network, how does the proposal address the terrible air quality, where is the Police report on designing out crime, where is the greening of the site, at the very least street trees should be included in the front and back, why is the front al fresco dining area set art such a harsh angle to the CIPD and remaining footpath, have you considered the needs of staff at CIPD, why does the applicant persist in proposing a dozen or so opaque glass balconies adorning the front and back elevations, the building is right next to the award winning CIPD building (detract) and where is the BREEM excellent or very good?
- There is insufficient evidence in the proposal of consideration of the MET advice on designing building so as to minimise opportunities for criminal activity.

#### Officer response

All original consultees were notified of the committee meeting with the exception of one neighbour, in SW19. Due to an administrative error, the original objection letter from this address was not attached to the application (and hence why the letter was not sent to this address relating to amended plans and committee meeting). This administrative error has now been rectified. The original objection letter from this address has been summarised above in the modification sheet for committee reference.

Due to the administrative error, this address, was not sent a letter notifying them of the amended plans, however an objection letter relating to the amended plan has been received from this address. This has been summarised in the modification sheet, along with the other 5 objections relating to the amended plans.

In light of the objection from this address, officers are content that the neighbour has been able to view and make appropriate comments on the amended plans.

A planning condition has been added to modification sheet requiring details of all refuse. This can ensure that there is adequate refuse for both the residential and commercial elements of the building.

There is no evidence that the proposed would lead to or create a wind tunnel.

Ten things Wimbledon wants - As set out in the planning committee report, the proposed development is considered to meet planning policy and is therefore considered to be acceptable from a planning perspective.

#### Conditions

• If permission is granted, urge committee to impose conditions relating preventing unsightly storage of balconies, no roof top plant or machinery, no parking permits and restriction of ground floor use to A1.

#### Officer Response

Unsightly storage of balconies – This condition is considered to be unreasonable given that the balconies would serve as the private amenity space for each flat.

New roof top plant – Any addition to the building form would require permission, therefore the condition is not required.

Parking permits – The scheme is subject to a permit free agreement secured via legal agreement

Restriction of ground floor use - There is no planning justification to restrict the use of the ground floor to A1. The existing use is A3/A4 and any change of use would require the normal change of use procedure as necessary.

- 4. Add additional planning conditions:
  - 22. <u>Secure by design</u>
  - 23. Refuse Storage (details)

<u>Item 6. Former Atkinson Morley Hospital Site, Copse Hill, SW20</u>
Application Number:19/P0693 Ward: Village

This item has been WITHDRAWN from the agenda.

Item 7 36 Durham Road, SW20 0TW

Application Number: 18/P4132 Ward: Raynes Park

No modifications.

<u>Item 8. Wellington Works, Wellington Road, Wimbledon Park, SW19 8EQ</u>
<u>Application Number: 18/P4361 Ward: Wimbledon park</u>

#### Page 67

Substitute 21st March 2019 for 25th April 2019.

Proposal: Substitute current wording for the following: Erection of a single storey extension to existing building to provide additional workshop space and resurfacing of hardstanding with permeable paving.

#### Page 78

Amend paragraph 7.5.5 to read as follows:

Servicing including private refuse collection (using an 8m vehicle) currently takes place on site. Service vehicles travel along Wellington Road through the industrial estate and turn in front of the building. However, the site is capable of being accessed from either Wellington Road or Dawlish Avenue. Due to the minimal extent of the extension proposed the existing situation is acceptable in regards to servicing and refuse collection. The proposal would allow for a refuse vehicle to enter the site from Wellington Road and leave via the Dawlish Avenue access route, or vice versa. Given the likely frequency of the refuse collection, it is not considered it would have a harmful effect on the surrounding highway network.

#### Consultation

One late representation was received in objection to the application from the owners of the adjoining property (Units 1-6 Wellington Works). This outlined the following concerns:

- Level of traffic in both directions on single track access and resultant congestion exacerbated by the limited amount of onsite parking and near impossibility for large vehicles to turn around;
- The units on the 1/3 Wellington Works site have not been occupied for the last year or so, therefore there will be an increase in traffic when there are reoccupied, exacerbating this issue;
- The proposed building removes turning and parking space;
- The access to Dawlish Avenue hasn't been used for the last 30/40 years and is narrow and unlikely to be able to accommodate a large vehicle;
- Accident risk to pedestrians in Dawlish Avenue area.

## Item 9. West Lodge, 4 West Side Common, Wimbledon, SW19 4TN Application Number: 19/P0219 and 19/P0220 Ward: Village

#### Consultation

Seven late representations were received in objection to the application, two of which were second representations from the same people. These outlined the following concerns:

- Photos showing parking in the street on the weekend exemplifying the demand in the street and the need to retain the spaces lost by the proposal;
- Loss of parking in a CPZ where there is parking pressure/demand;
- Loss of part of the boundary wall;
- Already good access available to the property.