

Planning Applications Committee 29th April 2021

Supplementary Agenda

Modifications Sheet.

Item 5. 94 The Broadway, Wimbledon SW19 – 20/P3088 – Trinity Ward.

Item 6. 57 Coombe Lane, Raynes Park SW20 – 20/P1046 – Raynes Park Ward.

Item 7. Dundonald Recreation ground, Dundonald Road, Wimbledon SW19 – 19/P4183 – Dundonald Ward.

Consultation – Page 61

Submissions in support by the Applicant, comprising documents titled:

- Additional Evidence 19P4183
- Applicants Supplementary Submission
- Executive Summary Application

The following provides a summary of the additional supporting points made:

- The current facilities attached to the school building are not available for hire;
- The 'community hall' is not available to the public;
- The toilets are not open to the general public and therefore there is an urgent need for public toilets;
- Community groups using the old pavilion no longer have a local community space to them. There is an urgent need for community space;
- Emails from ID Verde showing that toilets are only open for sport bookings, the pavilion is not available as it is used by the school full time Mon-Fri and cricket utilizes during the Summer and football in winter on weekends.
- The need for a sports and community room ancillary to activities in the Recreation ground therefore remains unmet.
- The proposal received overwhelming support during the formal consultation.
- The proposal is in line with local and national Planning Policies which support ancillary development on open space which enhance the use and sustainability of an area, improve public health, and promote engagement in the local community.
- The Rose Graden area received no investment during the Council's work on the Rec from 2013, and remains in poor condition.
- Dundonald's local community groups have demonstrated the need on Dundonald Rec for an accessible community pavilion and public toilets, available throughout the week and weekends. This Application meets those needs and would be of benefit to the sports and leisure use of the Rec.

- Applicant has sought to address tree issues raised.
- Differing views between planning officers. Delays in determining the application.
- Policies in support of the proposal:
- Paragraph 91 a, c of the NPPF Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places.
- Paragraph 92 of the NPPF advises that planning policies should plan positively, including for the provision and use of shared spaces and community facilities to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments.
- CS11 e. Supporting multi use of social, educational, cultural and recreational facilities. CS13 e. Supporting proposals for new and improved cultural, leisure, recreational and sporting facilities.
- Strategic Policy O8.1 Enhancing existing open spaces and the natural environment, providing habitats for biodiversity to flourish and expand
- Policy GG1 Building strong and inclusive communities;
- Policy GG2 Making the best use of land
- Policy GG3 Creating a healthy city
- PPG17 Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation
- DM C1 (Community Facilities) of the Adopted Merton Sites Policies Plan (2014).
- Considered there is a need for it, contrary to the Greenspaces Manager comments.
- Wider community benefits to the building.
- The Planning Officer's recommendation to refuse relies on an out-of-date and contradictory statement from GreenSpaces regarding access and usage of existing facilities. The Report incorrectly states that there is adequate provision for community leisure purposes in Dundonald Rec. The evidence proves that the 'community' hall in the new building is not available for community use, contradicting the Officer's assertion. The Planning Officer's report also fails to address the important issue of the lack of availability of public toilets.

Council's Greenspaces Manager (Additional comments):

The toilets are only opened for sports bookings and events. This is common practice throughout our sites, primarily due to drug use and vandalism. We no longer have manned sites and so these sorts of facilities are vulnerable to abuse.

Item 8. 9A The Grange, Wimbledon SW19 – 20/P2882 – Village Ward.

Item 9. 3 Hamilton Road, Wimbledon SW19 – 20/P2774 – Abbey Ward.

Informatives – Page 162

13. INFORMATIVE

You are advised to contact the Council's Street Trees Team as you will require their consent should you wish to carry out any works to the street tree to the front of the property. They can be contacted at streettrees@merton.gov.uk

Item 10. Garages R/O 38 Inglemere Road, Mitcham CR4 – 20/P1722 – Graveney Ward.

Item 11. 52 Parkway, Raynes Park SW20 – 20/P3898 – West Barnes Ward.

Item 12. 19A to 19F Princes Road, Wimbledon SW19 – 21/P0197 – Trinity Ward.

Amend proposal due to typo error - Page 229

APPLICATION TO DETERMINE WHETHER PRIOR APPROVAL IS REQUIRED IN RESPECT OF ERECTION OF SECOND FLOOR EXTENSION IN CONNECTION WITH CREATION OF TWO SELF-CONTAINED FLATS (2 X 1 BEDROOM)

Item 13. 18D Ridgway, Wimbledon SW19 – 21/P0008 – Village Ward.

Planning History – Page 263

20/P2836: ERECTION OF A FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION AND CONVERSION OF EXISTING D1 OFFICE INTO A SINGLE DWELLINGHOUSE C3. REFUSE PERMISSION:

1. The proposal by reason of its design, height, scale and massing would have a detrimental impact on the character of the site and surrounding Conservation Area. As such the proposal fails to comply with Policies DM D2, DM D3 and DM D4 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan (2014), CS14 of Merton's Core Strategy (2011) and Policy 7.8 of The London Plan (2016).
2. The proposal by reason of its design, height, scale and massing would result in a development that would have an overbearing impact, be visually intrusive and cause overshadowing to neighbouring amenity, in conflict with Policies DM D2 and DM D3 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan (2014) and Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy (2011).

Consultation – Page 263

Additional comment received in support from the Agent outlining that the window in the proposed side elevation is already partially obscure glazed, and provides the following in response to objections received:

1.	Work underway at 18A,C and D.	This is wrong. Only 18C is currently being worked upon. The Tenant at 18A is in occupation.
----	-------------------------------	---

2.	Light and Noise Pollution. No light assessment.	There are no external alterations to 18D to affect light or noise pollution and it is located some 25m from the property at 25C Lingfield Road.
3.	Loss of office space. Loss of health amenity.	The tenant who occupies 18A did not renew the lease at the end of the term in February and has vacated but remains at 18A. The objector is completely misinformed on whether office space is required.
4.	No merit in single bedroom housing.	One-bedroom units are very desirable, We have 4N° in the upper floors of N ^{os} 18-20 Ridgway with continuous occupancy.
5.	Proposed accommodation small / substandard.	The proposed accommodation meets the Council's spatial requirements as set in the London Plan 2021. Furthermore there is no external alteration to the building.
6.	Trees will be affected.	There are no trees in the vicinity of 18D,
7.	No Cycle storage facilities.	Cycle facilities are provided along with a car park space and amenity space.
8.	No internal storage facilities.	Internal Storage is shown on the submitted drawings.
9.	No Community Infrastructure Levy submitted.	CIL liability form is included with application.
10.	Loss of office space.	Offices were on site, unfortunately both tenants gave up their space as after 20 years it is no longer required.
11.	Noise pollution / vehicle movements.	There will be far less vehicle movements. Car parking provision is down approximately 50% in favour of the provision of amenity space.
12.	Site is dangerous/poor outlook/.lack privacy.	The occupiers will in fact have a good courtyard vista and total privacy.
13.	Access by Fire Brigade.	The Fire Brigade approved the access when the building was originally constructed.
14.	Window opening to side on parking space.	The window in question will have obscured glazing.

Additional representation received outlining the following: Though the application has not been dealt with as of yet I would hope that the same arguments and outcome that

was provided for the refusal of 18A (21/P0451) would apply to 18D. The reason behind my email is that section 36 of the redacted form for 21/P0008 stipulates that you advised that Merton do not object to the principle of change of use, which I find surprising since it is prior planning received all representations.

Item 14. 51 Streatham Road, Mitham CR4 – 19/P1798 – Figges Marsh Ward.

5.5 Additional Officer comment:

Whilst an HMO Licence has been granted by the Council's Housing Enforcement team for 13 occupants and 11 rooms, there are a number of reasons as to why Officers consider that the amendments sought to reduce the proposal to 7 rooms and 8 occupants are necessary:

- *The layout currently includes unauthorised extensions which do not form part of the consideration for granting a Licence. There is no assessment of the impact on neighbouring amenity as a result of the bulk and massing of the extension or the impact on the character of the area.*
- *The conditions for the licensing do not require the submission of details required by the Secured by Design Officer, such as the provision of details of CCTV, provision of individual mailboxes, external lighting, which will further assist in managing any potential anti-social behaviour.*
- *The Licence, issued by the Housing Enforcement team, deals with issues such as gas and electrical safety, the provision of facilities in each room, fire safety, reporting of anti-social behaviour, changes in tenure and, therefore, does not consider the range of issues which are considered under the assessment of a planning application.*
- *The planning application would secure the provision of cycle parking and adequate bin storage (whilst the Licence requires the property to be adequately managed, it does not include the details of bin storage and collection which are controlled through the conditions imposed on a planning permission).*
- *In addition, the amended scheme proposed under this planning application would result in a higher quality of accommodation with the provision of a shared living room and would also not require the use of the unauthorised conservatory as a kitchen, which given the thermal qualities of a conservatory is unlikely to make for a suitable residential environment.*

Item 15. Planning Appeal Decisions.

Item 16. Planning Enforcement Summary.

This page is intentionally left blank