

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

10 FEBRUARY 2022
(7.15 pm - 10.20 pm)

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

ALSO PRESENT

Tim Bryson (Development Control Team Leader North)
David Gardener Planning Officer
Stuart Adams Planning Officer
Bola Roberts (Democratic Services Officer)

ATTENDING REMOTELY Amy Dumitrescu (Democratic Services Manager)
Lesley Barakchizadeh (Building and Development Control)
Manager Environment and Regeneration)
Sarath Attanayake (Transport Planning Project Officer)

(7:15pm – 22:20pm)

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Billy Christie and Councillor Ben Butler attended as substitute. (Agenda Item 1)

2 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST (Agenda Item 2)

There were no declarations of interest. (Agenda Item 2)

3 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Agenda Item 3)

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 20th January 2022 are agreed as an accurate record. (Agenda Item 3)

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 8, 9, 7, 5 and 6. For the purposes of the minutes the items are minuted in the published agenda order. (Agenda Item 4)

5 LAND TO THE REAR OF 1-5 ARCHWAY CLOSE, WIMBLEDON PARK,
LONDON SW19 (Agenda Item 5)

The Development Control Leader (North) presented the report.

The Committee received a verbal representation from one objector who made points including:

- Concerns on the poor structure which was not in keeping with the neighbouring surround
- The Objector felt the family's privacy would be the structure and staff who work there smoking and talking outside
- Trees that would have provided screening are not adequate
- The bright light from the security lights remain on all night
- The Objector listed conditions that they requested be put in place such as opaque glass, controlled lighting, fully positioned screening and corrected positioning on the security flood lighting

- The Agent to the Applicant responded that:
- The site needs regeneration which meets demand for small local companies
- The design was agreed to be within permitted development
- The height was restricted to 5 metres height and side parameters
- The garden is set far back, and the tree screening is adequate
- The Agent to the Applicant felt the benefits of the scheme, outweighed any minor infringement, in that it improved local environment
- The site was an improvement and the quality of the building material was not offensive

The Planning Officer responded to points raised and advised Members that:

- Planning Officers were satisfied with the angle of the Applicants building
- That the modification sheet contained a recommendation on an additional condition

The Team Leader (North) responded to Councillors questions and advised that

- The distance provided is 32 metres from the site to the Objectors property based on the plan
- The Applicant had provided a new toilet facility for the units which is installed nearest to the road arches
- Committee Members noted some of the concerns raised by the Objector had been addressed in the modification sheets
- Members requested for a condition to be imposed that the windows were required to have opaque glass

The Chair moved to the vote and it was

RESOLVED:

The Committee agreed to grant planning permission subject to conditions in Officers report and an additional condition for obscure glazing for first floor side windows.

6 94 COTTENHAM PARK ROAD WEST WIMBLEDON LONDON SW20 0DP
(Agenda Item 6)

The Development Control Leader (North) presented the report.

The Chair moved to the vote and it was

RESOLVED

The Committee agreed to grant planning permission subject to conditions

7 RUFUS BUSINESS BUILDING CENTRE, RAVENSBUURY TERRACE,
WIMBLEDON PARK, LONDON, SW18 4RL (Agenda Item 7)

The Planning Officer (North Team) presented the report.

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

- The development would increase the population
- The Objector felt the cumulative developments would amount to a thousand-person occupancy.
- The Objector had been in contact with the council over a period of six years over any application to Rufus building site, to ensure that traffic would go down Wellington works
- The Objector spoke of the large volume of construction vehicles that would pass by residents' windows as there were no provisions for vehicle access via Wellington Works through the proposed Rufus business centre site
- The Objector asked the Committee to delay the application until a ruling had been made on the adjacent site

- The Objector asked that the application be refused under urban greening, bulk, height and social housing
- The current Rufus proposal would have an impact on residents whose gardens are 3 metres from the site
- The proposed building is five storeys higher than neighbouring buildings
- Other developments in the area, had height restrictions and this should be maintained and in keeping with the area
- The Objector believed that the development would be harmful to the local landscape and impact the River Wandle trail, which is an urban feature
- The level of urban greening in the application did not meet minimum GLA standards
- Affordable housing is low and only eight out of the 96 units are being considered for affordable housing

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

- The Objector described the development as a mixed-use office development centre and felt the proposal provides for attractive residential homes
- The development has been identified as needed and is welcomed in the borough
- Each home would be fulfilled in terms of amenities; light, balconies and shared space; eight of which are affordable housing
- The scheme has no parking facilities other than disabled and a car club bay
- The developers have worked closely with Planning Officers and made amendments to the report members have at present
- The GLA did not object to a previous application which was higher in height, however the Applicant considered the current plans would be more in line with the area in Dawlish Avenue
- The developers have taken into consideration the design and amenities for residents such as light, space and fire safety for the scheme
- The scheme would be developed in an otherwise underutilised brown space
- Developers knew about the objections on Wellington Works and they had looked at best practise and ways forward
- Objectors had been in close contact with the GLA, Merton, future Merton and adhered to policy
- The Officers report addressed the issues of sustainability, greening and flood risk
- The vehicle route suggested by residents for the developers, would go against the London Plan

The Planning Officers addressed concerns by Objectors points including:

- The Planning Officer said responses were contained in the modification sheet
- Planning Officers had no powers or policies to serve on the adjacent site relating to access
- Officers provided guidance to the developers earlier on in the process and asked them to do a feasibility report
- The height of the structure is in keeping with similar structures alongside Wandle River area.
- A viability study had been carried out and the Planning Officer confirmed that there would be eight affordable housing units within the scheme

The Planning Officer responded to councillors questions:

- The Planning Officer confirmed that the affordable houses would be in a block on its' own
- Planning Officers had been in touch with the councils environmental Officers who are aware of contamination on the developers' site and adjacent site
- Flood risks, design and proximity between other properties, were issues that could pose restrictions on three bedroomed homes built
- The council no longer agreed density. Consideration is given to how close the development is to public amenities and other properties

Members made comments on the application. Members commented on access in terms of fire risk and location of the scheme to the road and direct access for the emergency services. Members raised concerns on balance on number of bedrooms and more affordable homes. Issues on contamination and safety. Members asked to defer the application pending further information.

The Team Leader (North) responded to members comments:

- Having separated blocks for affordable and private house makes the scheme more attractive for Housing Associates to manage
- Planning Officers could not place conditions on schemes having separate affordable and private housing

The Chair moved to vote and it was

RESOLVED:

That the Application be deferred to a future Committee Meeting, to allow members seek further information on financial viability, contamination and whether affordable housing could be amalgamated to the other building in the proposal.

.

8 ST GEORGE HOUSE EAST WIMBLEDON SW19 4DR (Agenda Item 8)

The Development Control Leader (North) presented the report.

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

- Concerns were raised on the proposed building height
- The development would restrict sunlight and reduce amenities for residents
- Concerns were raised that the station square would be in shadow most of the day
- The application is for glass reinforced concrete and does not go with the surrounding heritage
- The Objector felt that the office space proposed in the development is in excess of workforce levels, with more staff working from home
- The proposal was not made known to residents until Friday
- There are questions of its' sustainability
- DRP stated that the building would restrict daylight most of the day all year round
- The development creates a dull, dark and cold look to the open spaces
- Wimbledon already had adequate office space without the need for this application, considering current hybrid ways of working.

The Applicant spoke in response and made points including:

- The building as it currently stands does not support grade A office space and cannot be adapted
- The building would provide fabric first and eco-friendly, energy efficiency by the year 2030
- The development would provide landscape features for wildlife to forage nest and roost
- A new pedestrian link would be provided through to St Georges Road
- The development would enable well over one thousand jobs, with the current construction providing ongoing jobs
- Following the feedback from DRP, the Applicant had amended the design including lowering the height and providing sustainability in line with SDP
- The development will boost the local economy
- The scheme allows for safety to travel to work, with 340 cycle spaces that would be provided
- The Applicant informed members that the design team had described that the building was 'well designed and impressive'
- The Planning department and GLA supported the scheme in line with SDP
- 70 letters from local residents and businesses had been received by the Applicant in support for the scheme, including Love Wimbledon
- The application had satisfied daylight testing
- There is an increase in demand for office space
- The scheme would grow the office sector of Wimbledon

Ward Councillor, Councillor Daniel Holden, gave a statement opposing the application on behalf of the residents, residents' associations and civic societies. Councillor Holden raised concerns on height restrictions and stated that the proposal was out of character to the Wimbledon rhythm. The building would be larger than any other building in Wimbledon. There were public amenities problems. The building would cast a shadow in the square giving an overbearing feel. Councillor Holden stated that the window design was out of keeping with the character of Wimbledon. Councillor Holden asked the Committee to consider rejecting the proposal under DMD1 and the issue of height, excessive bulk and rhythm.

The Planning Officer responded to Councillors points:

- The building will be on the northern side of St Georges Road, which is the largest site of office development
- Although the height goes beyond what is considered in the Future Wimbledon SPD, the overall design and height can be supported.
- The development is set back and this will mitigate the overbearing aspect on the road and forecourt
- The public will benefit by the widening of the pavement

In response to Member questions, The Planning Officer advised:

- The SDP had been drafted for a while; consideration was not given for the return to office space by work force.
- The winds microclimate studies showed there would be more slight winds on the southwest side of the building. The frontage would provide comfortable levels of cover for pedestrians and people sitting outside on the pavements
- The Planning Officer advised that the development has a ground floor that will protect public realm
- Cross rail had not raised objections to the application
- The Development was within the London urban green specification
- The building has an indicative height of 54 metres including plants in the parapet
- The Planning Officer said that that the urban greening had been passed by the GLA during stage one and biodegradable. Trees will be planted via the biodiversity on St Georges Road. Two will be removed on Wimbledon Road.
- The application will go back to the GLA for approval
- The Applicant had submitted a sunlight daylight report
- The number of glass windows has been reduced in line with DRP guidelines

Members commented on the application.

Concerns were raised on the bulk and size and the fact that the Design Review Panel had rated the application amber twice. The SDP needs to be respected. Additional concerns were raised on height.

The Chair moved to vote and it was

RESOLVED

That the Committee grant planning permission subject to any direction from the Mayor of London, completion of a S106 Agreement and Conditions

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

The Development Control Leader (North) presented the report.

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

- The application breached policies DMD2 and 3
- The application plans contained discrepancies and inaccuracies
- The plans were not clear The proposed works would have an impact on privacy
-
- The Objector said the scheme would affect the foot path and would contribute to a loss of amenities. A fence would be required to depict boundaries
- The scheme will affect loss of sunlight
- There is poor visual design
- The application would have a detrimental impact on the Objectors property
- The scheme is similar to a previously rejected application submitted in the past
- The height and depth of the scheme had not been altered, which would cause a detrimental impact on the Objectors home
- It was queried how a previously refused scheme could be brought back with a higher boundary wall
- This was the fifth application and should therefore be refused.

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

- The applicants wanted to create a family home and were not developing to make a profit.
- The scheme was to accommodate the Applicants growing family
- The Agent to the Applicant drew members' attention to two relevant previous planning application decisions; Noting that the 2012 appeal for the planning application had been dismissed.
- The second application had been granted in September 2021, as the height was only 6.2m on the boundary line. A reduction of 0.3m was acceptable.

Members were asked to note that the windows that would have affected the neighbouring property were bricked up

- The current scheme would be 3.7m deeper and would not have any detrimental impact on the neighbouring property
- Sunlight daylight assessments had been carried out and neighbouring properties would not be affected
- Similar schemes had been granted on the same side of the Street.

The Chair announced that representations would only be received by Ward Councillors. Therefore, the statement from Councillor Benbow, would not be read out at the meeting but the written statement would be made available.

Councillor Ormrod made representations to the Committee on behalf of residents of South Park Road, and raised points including:

- Similar applications submitted were refused, including an appeal.
- A further application had then been approved, with no cap on flat roof ridge, or conditions put on the application and similar to the refused previous application.
- The scheme would have an impact on neighbours' homes and on surrounding homes on the corner of Wycliffe Road. Councillor Ormrod raised concerns on consideration for neighbours, which this scheme did not and which the DMD2 states should be the case under design.
- The application had failed to meet DMD2 in other areas proposed in the scheme.
- The designs were not in keeping with the surrounding area and the scheme would impact on neighbours lighting and privacy amenities.
- The proposed scheme was large and overbearing and would be similar to a commercial building.
- Councillor Ormrod requested conditions be placed on the application, should it be granted and would provide some suggested conditions

The Team Leader (North) responded to some of the points clarifying the refusal of previous application/The daylight study took into account both houses on either side of the Applicant with neighbours. The roof was flat in design and similar to other flat roof extension in the area

The Planning Officer responded to councillors' questions

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

RESOLVED:

The Committee agreed to grant planning permission subject to conditions.

10 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS (Agenda Item 10)

The Committee noted the report

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

Planning Enforcement – Summary of Current Cases (Agenda Item 11)

The Committee noted the report

At the close of the meeting and at the invitation of the Chair, the Committee agreed for the Chair to write an email on behalf of the Committee to the Planning Team Leader Jonathan Lewis, thanking him for his service to the council and best wishes on his retirement.