

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

10 DECEMBER 2020  
(7.15 pm - 0.21 am)

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

Sarath Attanayake (Transport Planning Project Officer), David Gardener (Planning Technician), Jonathan Lewis (Development Control Team Leader (South)) and Neil Milligan (Development Control Manager, ENVR)

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

There was no apologies for absence.

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

Councillor Henry declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of item 11 – Pollards Hill Estate, as she's a Ward Member in Pollards Hill. She took part in the debate and voted on the proposal.

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

The Committee noted the amendments and modification to the officers' report which was published in the modification sheet (see item no. 16). This applied to items no. 7, 8, 9, 11 and 12.

Furthermore, the Chair advised that the order of the agenda was changed and would be considered in the order as follows: items, 6, 9, 10, 12, 8, 11, 5, 7 and 10. For the purpose of the minutes, items were minuted in the order they appeared in the published agenda.

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

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> November, 2020 were agreed as an accurate record.

5 GARAGES RO 30-40 BARNES END, KT3 6PB (Agenda Item 5)

Proposal: Demolition of 24 garages and construction of 2 dwellings with associated parking and landscaping.

Further to Minute No. 6 on 22<sup>nd</sup> March, 2018, the Committee noted the reports and the revised plans presented by the Development Control Team Leader (South).

The Committee noted the applicant was not present at the meeting.

Councillor Hina Bokhari (Ward Member) had registered to speak on behalf of the residents. She expressed her concerns in relation to the height of the extension, notwithstanding, the disruption this would cause for the residents and felt that the developers had no real concern for the local area. She further advised the Committee that the residents felt that their views were not considered at the previous Planning Applications Committee and requested that Members' to refuse the revised proposal.

In response to Members' questions and comments, the Development Control Team Leader (South) clarified, in terms of, material change to the proposal, under Section 73 of the Planning Act, applicants were requested to formally submit an application for any amendments to the scheme, including any minor material amendment.

Members' reinsured the Committee that all participants, including residents had the opportunity to speak at Committee to put forward any points they wish to make to the Committee and that their views were noted. However, the Committee had a duty to reach a clear decision for an application on planning grounds.

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

**RESOLVED** that the application number 20/P0781 be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to conditions.

6 YMCA, 196-200 THE BROADWAY, SW19 1RY (Agenda Item 6)

Proposal: Demolition of buildings and a 2 phased redevelopment comprising a mixed use development with the erection of part basement, part single, part five, part 6, part 7, part 8 and part 9 storey buildings.

The Committee noted the reports and plans presented by the Planning Officer.

Two residents had registered to speak in objection, and at the invitation of the Chair, raised a number of points including the following:

- There had no objections to the development of the YMCA, and fully support the YMCA aims;
- Concerns were raised with regards to the current plans, related to an extensive breach through a number of properties on South Park Road and Trinity Road. The proposed development was located in a suburban setting;
- The scale of the development was too excessive;

- Concerns in relation to high noise levels, lack of privacy, parking issues and overshadowing, both for the existing properties and for residents of new development;
- the proposal did not meet the Merton Strategy DMD, both with the quality of living conditions and privacy;
- Local residents had experienced anti-social behaviour and trespassing from people staying at the YMCA hostel.

The applicant and the applicant's agents had registered to speak, and advised the Committee that the YMCA had been serving the people of Wimbledon since 1870s. YMCA had a desire to continue supporting young people in the community with a wide range of services for them to access. The new development would provide modernised accommodation, which would offer modern facilities, an upgraded affordable gym in large a studio space, new children's area and a new community cafe. Furthermore, the development would benefit the local community providing quality accommodation for local residents and community groups.

Councillor Hayley Ormrod (Ward Member for Trinity) had registered to speak on behalf of the residents in Trinity Ward. She advised the Committee the concerns raised by residents relating to overpopulation of the area scale and density being excessive, loss of light and overshadowing and lack of parking.

Councillor Eleanor Stringer (Cabinet member for Children's Services and Education) had registered to speak, and at the invitation of the Chair informed the Committee that she welcomed the proposal as the current building was outdated and in need of renovation. The proposal would benefit both the hospital and neighbouring residents, as well as providing new homes to residents. She further recognised the need to work closely with the police to tackle anti-social behaviour.

Councillor Nigel Benbow (Ward Member for Abbey) had submitted a written speech which was read out by the Senior Democratic Services Officer. The Committee noted that Councillor Benbow welcomed the new redevelopment of the YMCA. Nonetheless, he did not feel the proposed development was complete and stated that this could be improved to become acceptable in the residential area of Wimbledon. He further stated that there was a lack of pavement space on Trinity Road. The development was overlooking to the South Park Road properties, and was two meters away from the end of their gardens and the boundary of the YMCA redevelopment. Furthermore, issues had been raised around anti-social behaviour and residents needed reassurance in term of their security and protection for both neighbouring residents and occupants of the hostel. There were also concerns that the proposed building was too excessive in height and would block daylight and sunlight to the surrounding properties.

Councillor Paul Kohler (Ward Member for Trinity) had registered to speak on behalf of his constituents. He explained to the Committee that he was in support of the proposal, however recognised some residents had raised concerns and requested YMCA to continue to work with the community to address their concerns. Furthermore, he was pleased that the development had agreed not to concede any work during the weekends.

During the ensuing debate, Members expressed both their support and concerns relating to the proposal. Members' extended their gratitude to the applicant of YMCA,

the objectors and everyone for their contributions, in particular, the planning officers for their hard work.

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

**RESOLVED** that the application number 20/P1738 be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to s106 agreement and conditions.

7 95 DEVONSHIRE ROAD, COLLIERS WOOD, SW19 2EQ (Agenda Item 7)

Proposal: Addition of basement and erection of second storey and part single, part double rear extension to create two new self-contained flats.

The Committee noted the report and plans presented by the Development Control Team Leader (South). The Committee also noted the modifications contained in the supplementary agenda. The Development Control Team Leader (South) provided updates on various matters relating to the amendments.

The Committee noted that there were no objectors registered to speak. The Committee noted that the applicant had also not registered to speak.

In response to Member's questions, the Development Control Team Leader (South) clarified that the existing first floor had two, three bedroom units, and the three bedroom units were below the national current national standards, irrespective of whether or not there was a first floor extension. The development had proposed to add a meter and a half to the rear part of the units to provide more space and improve the standard of the units.

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

**RESOLVED** that the application number 20/P1399 be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to s106 obligation or any other enabling agreement and conditions.

8 30 LANCASTER GARDENS, WIMBLEDON. SW19 5DG (Agenda Item 8)

Proposal: Demolition of existing house and erection of a new six bedroom detached dwelling with accommodation in basement and roof levels.

The Committee noted the report and plans presented by the Planning Technician. The Committee also noted the modifications contained in the supplementary agenda.

An objector had registered to speak, and at the invitation of the Chair, addressed the Committee with the following points;

- The proposed development was out of scale to other nearby properties;
- The construction would potentially damage the trees to the boundary, which were important to the street scene, therefore it was requested that a condition to be imposed to protect the trees.

The applicant agent's had registered to speak, and at the invitation of the Chair addressed the Committee with the following points:

- There were no TPO trees in the garden of the application property;
- The demolishing of the existing house would potentially provide adequate access through to the rear of the site in order to access the site for any construction works;
- It was standard procedure to include roof protection area;
- The applicant would ensure that the trees to the neighbouring property would be protected; however, would welcome the Council to impose condition to the tree protection area;
- The proposed application followed established precedent on the site.

Members' welcomed the proposal and the traditional design of the development. Nonetheless, Members' were reinsured that the applicant would ensure that the trees to the neighbouring property would be protected and that a condition to protect the trees was not required.

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

**RESOLVED** that the application number 20/P2276 be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to conditions.

9 WIMBLEDON COLLEGE OF ART, 40 MERTON HALL ROAD, SW19 3QA  
(Agenda Item 9)

Proposal: New forecourt landscaping, façade and roof alterations of the theatre annex building, installation of the new windows and cycle parking facilities of the main college building, alteration to campus services equipment.

The Committee noted the report and plans presented by the Planning Officer. The Committee also noted the modifications contained in the supplementary agenda. The Planning Officer provided updates on various matters relating to the amendments.

Two residents had registered to speak in objection, and at the invitation of the Chair, raised a number of points including the following:

- Whilst supporting the Art College and their reputation for design excellence and creativity, the character should be preserved to enhance the listed buildings;
- The proposed application would potentially damage the character of the conservation area;
- The dark grey/black paint to the terracotta brick of the main building was intrusive and was out of character with the natural red bricks in London. It was requested that conditions to be imposed to ensure that the red bricks were retained to keep up with the character;
- All local houses had white frame windows and the proposed black frames would be out of character for the area; therefore, any new windows should retain the existing style and white frames;

- The replacement of the roofing tiles with a steel roof was not in keeping with the conservation. It was requested to use PV solar panels or traditional tiling.
- The objectors did not oppose to the development it was offering to students, however, there were concerns around the damaging impact to the areas, including road safety and congestion and there was no provision parking for the general public.

The applicant's agents had registered to speak, and at the invitation of the Chair, responded to the points raised by the objectors and addressed the Committee with the following points:

- The proposed planning application formed part of UBS multimillion pound investment to create a unique integrated performance centre;
- The existing theatre and actress building was outdated and needed modernisation.
- The current building was not fit for purpose;
- The new forecourt would be open to the community, enhance the streetscape and improve the ecology and biodiversity of the site;
- The proposed forecourt improvements would complement the character and appearance of the area;
- The developers continued to consult with neighbours to address any concerns;
- Security would be managed to the forecourt area to alleviate the concerns raised with regards to the removal of the fencing and necessary actions would be taken to secure the development against anti-social behaviour;
- The proposed campus would only be used for studying and teaching and no student accommodations would be located on the site;
- The proposal was a free car development, therefore, this would not increase traffic level; and would be improving the cycle facilities;
- The proposed would improve immunity for everyone.

Councillor Anthony Fairclough (Ward Member for Dundonald) had registered to speak on behalf of his ward. He advised the Committee the concerns raised by residents in relation to parking and delivery vehicles parked on the streets, including on weekends. He further raised concerns that the proposed development was out of character to the conservation area, in particular, the paintwork and the replacement of the windows.

In response to Members' questions, the Planning Officer informed the Committee that, in terms of the colour to the paintwork of the bricks to the properties, the applicant did not require planning permission.

In response to Members' questions, the Transport Planning Project Officer clarified that delivery vehicles were permitted to park on single and double yellow lines for loading and unloading provided it was not causing an obstruction. All deliveries would take place near the entrance to the college, therefore, the car parking bays would not be used by the delivery vehicles.

The Planning Officer informed the Committee, in terms of, the replacement of the windows, it was proposed that the windows would be replaced with double glazed which would improve the thermal performance to the studio and allow more light. Furthermore, he advised the Committee that the proposed colour and materials would not cause any harm to the conservation area.

Members' concluded by thanking Professor David Crow and the Vice Chancellor of the Wimbledon College of Arts for this investment and believe that the students in London would fully benefit from this project.

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

**RESOLVED** that the application number 20/P1952 be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to s106 agreement and conditions.

*(Councillor Dean declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to this application as he had been in communication with residents. He took part in the debate but abstained from voting)*

10 5 PARKSIDE AVENUE, WIMBLEDON, SW19 5ES (Agenda Item 10)

Proposal: Demolition of 2 storey dwelling house and erection of replacement dwelling house with accommodation within the roof space.

The Committee noted the report and plans presented by the Planning Officer.

Two residents had registered to speak in objection, and at the invitation of the Chair, raised a number of points including the following:

- Concerns with regards to loss of protected trees;
- There would be a detrimental effect on the visual amenities of the area;
- The development was out of scale and excessive, this would potentially cause harm the conservation area;
- The felling of trees and the development would overlook the streetscape;
- The development had disregarded the council's conservation assessment proposal and this would cause harm to the character and appearance of the constellation air;
- The proposed development should be set further back from the road and be reduced in both height and width;
- The modifications made to the scheme were insignificant and had not addressed the concerns raised;
- There was no objection to the site being developed, however, the major concerns were regards to the property was too excessive. The existing frontage of the property was approximately 19 meters, and the proposed frontage to the new development was 47 meters.
- Concerns to road safety, in particular, to the eastern driveway there was no turning space and this was deemed to be dangerous.

The applicant's agent had also registered to speak, however, during the meeting he had lost connection and experienced technical issues re-joining the meeting. Subsequently, the Chair informed that Committee that the agent had advised that the officers' report covered the main points and he did not have anything further to add in respect of this application.

In response to Members' questions and comments, the Planning Officer clarified the following points:

- the width of overall development of the two wide side wings were two meters wider;
- Officers' carried out the tree assessment, the quality of the trees was also assessed and officers' considered that the replacement of the trees mitigated the loss of the existing trees, including the TPO trees, nonetheless, the planning permission outweighed the Tree Protection Order.
- The vehicle access point to the eastern end of the site would be used on a regular basis;
- In terms of the footprint ratio, the size of open space to the plot was less; therefore, provided more open space compared to the other plots in the surrounding areas.

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

**RESOLVED** that the application number 20/P2610 be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to conditions.

#### 11 POLLARDS HILL ESTATE, MITCHAM (Agenda Item 11)

Proposal: Installation of 180 bin stores and 28 food stores with reconfiguration of parking spaces (increase of 40 spaces) across the Pollards Hill estate.

The Committee noted the reports and plans presented by the Case Officer. The Committee also noted the modifications contained in the supplementary agenda.

An objector had registered to speak, and at the invitation of the Chair, raised a number of points including the following:

- The Equality Act 2010 sets out that a authority must give due regard to the public sector equality duty, including, removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by people with a protected characteristics such as age or disability;
- The proposal would have a significant impact on the elderly and people with disabilities, who would struggle to use the communal bins ];
- The report noted that additional assistance would be provided for those who had mobility issues, however, no details was included on what support would be provided;
- The report referred to communal bins being partly curved roof and bollards which could compromise accessibility and present further barriers to people with visual impairment. The commuter bins would increase noise disturbance and had an impact on people's mental wellbeing.

It was noted that the applicant was not present at the meeting.

In response to Members' question, the Case Officer clarified that any residents who were unable to put out their bins (ie; elderly or residents with disabilities) would be provided with assistant with regards to their bin collections and would not be expected to use the communal bins. Furthermore, Members' were informed that Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal had not been carried out.

A Member expressed their concerns with regards to the bin stores located in the middle of the forecourt and reiterated the concerns the objectors raised. Furthermore, their stated that this was not fit for purpose.



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

**RESOLVED** that the application number 19/P4032 be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to conditions.

12 LAND ON SOUTH SIDE, WYKE ROAD, RAYNES PARK (Agenda Item 12)

Proposal: Erection of 2 x part-3, part-4 storey buildings comprising 9 x self-contained dwellings with 8 off-street car parking spaces, highway works and associated landscaping. Proposals include a land transfer to re-provide 18 CPZ parking spaces.

The Committee noted the report and plans presented by the Development Control Team Leader (South). The Committee also noted the modifications contained in the supplementary agenda. The Development Control Team Leader (South) provided updates on various matters relating to the amendments.

Two residents had registered to speak in objection, and at the invitation of the Chair, raised a number of points including the following:

- The scheme did not comply with the Council's Green Spaces policy;
- The proposed development was on land designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Green Corridor and would result in the loss of 25 trees;
- The proposed development would create poor quality living and would cause harm to the amenities of the area;
- the proposal would cause a significant loss of tree canopy cover, which helped alleviate regular flooding problems and improved air quality;
- Concerns relating to loss of trees; loss of a SINC and Green Corridor;
- Concerns relating to noise pollution for nearby residents;

The applicant's agent had registered to speak, and at the invitation of the Chair, addressed the Committee with the following points:

- Since the beginning of this project in November, 2019, there had been extensive pre application discussions and negotiations with the council offices and public consultation;
- The proposed scheme would provide much needed homes in a highly sustainable location;
- The design was revised in September 2020 on the advice of offices in order to provide three apartments rather than a single family home on the eastern part of the site. The two proposed blocks would be lower and subservient to land on court, comprising exceptional contemporary architecture with detailing that would significantly lift the character of the distance relying on court, therefore, scheme would not adversely affect the immunity of any local neighbouring residents,
- The Council Environmental Health Officer had assessed the scheme and confirmed that there would be no adverse impacts of noise and vibrations from the adjoining railway line.
- The proposal provided much needed homes in a sustainable location that had no detrimental impact on adjoining properties, it would enhance the appearance of the site through high quality inefficient architecture and improve the appearance and

accessibility of white road by replacing existing on street parking with dedicated off street spaces.

Councillor Adam Bush (Ward Member for Raynes Park) had registered to speak on behalf of his ward. He expressed his concerns regarding the overdevelopment of this proposal and advised the Committee to refuse the application. He explained to the Committee that the proposed application was situated in a very narrow conservation area, which was adjacent to a railway line, the new building would be on land that was designated as both were a site of importance for nature conservation and a green corridor. The development would cause a huge loss of green space and provided poor quality amenity space. The new homes would also suffer from excessive noise, due to the close proximity of the railway line. Furthermore, White Road was a narrow road which resulted residents to park on pavements.

During the debate, Members' sought clarification on a number of various matters outlined in the report provided by the Development Control Team Leader (South).

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

**RESOLVED** that the application number 20/P0945 be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to s106 agreement and conditions.

#### 13 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS (Agenda Item 13)

The Committee noted the Planning Appeal decisions.

#### 14 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - SUMMARY OF CURRENT CASES (Agenda Item 14)

The Committee noted that there were no planning enforcement cases reported.

#### 15 URGENT ITEM - REF 19/P2387 - TESCO SITE - LAND AT BURLINGTON ROAD NEW MALDEN KT3 (WEST BARNES WARD) (Agenda Item 15)

**RESOLVED** that the report and its conclusion be noted by the Committee.

#### 16 MODIFICATION SHEET (Agenda Item 16)

The Committee noted the modification sheet.

*(The meeting was adjourned at 21:09 and resumed at 21:15)*