

Planning Applications Committee

14th September 2023

Supplementary Agenda

Modifications Sheet.

ITEM 5 (SELBRIDGE COURT, 35 PRINCE'S ROAD, WIMBLEDON, LONDON, SW19 8RH)

Page 11 - PLANNING HISTORY

Reasons for refusal detailed:

22/P1736 -APPLICATION FOR PRIOR APPROVAL OF ADDITIONAL STOREY. REFUSED:

1. The application site is or forms part of land situated within a 3km radius of the perimeter of an aerodrome (St Georges Hospital, Blackshaw Road, London SW17 0QT) which is used by aircraft engaged in the public transport of passengers, and therefore fails to comply with A.1 (o) (vii) of Schedule 2, Part 20, Class A of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (as amended).

2. The proposed development would generate additional pressure on parking in the area, and in the absence of a legal agreement securing a car free agreement, the proposal would be contrary to Policies DM T1 (support for sustainable transport and active travel) and DM T3 (Car parking and servicing standards) of Merton's Adopted Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014), Policy CS20 (Parking, servicing and delivery) of Merton's Adopted Core Planning Strategy (July 2011) and Policies T6 (Car Parking) and T6.1 (Residential Parking) of the London Plan (2021).

22/P3204 - PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF ONE ADDITIONAL STOREY TO PROVIDE 4 NEW RESIDENTIAL UNITS. REFUSED:

1. The proposed development, due to a combination of its height, bulk, massing and design would have a detrimental impact on the Prince's Road streetscene and would fail to preserve or enhance the setting of the adjoining Merton (South Park Gardens) Conservation Area contrary to Policies DM D2, DM D3 and DM D4 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014), Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy (2011) and Policies HC1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021.

2. The proposed development would generate additional pressure on parking in the area, and in the absence of a legal agreement securing a car free agreement, the proposal would be contrary to Policies DM T1 (support for sustainable transport and active travel) and DM T3 (Car parking and servicing standards) of Merton's Adopted Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014), Policy CS20 (Parking, servicing and delivery) of Merton's Adopted Core Planning

Strategy (July 2011) and Policies T6 (Car Parking) and T6.1 (Residential Parking) of the London Plan (2021).

MEMBER QUESTIONS

Officers can provide the following responses received from the **applicant** to member questions raised at the Technical Briefing:

1. Fire regulations. Can the applicant confirm that the layout proposed is compliant with the current fire regulations under Building Regulations? Specifically the kitchen locations?

Yes the flats will be fully compliant with Building Regulations in particular part B, and would include, for example, that all the doors will be FD60 doors. Further, the new flats will be compliant with Policy D12 of The London Plan 2021. This will entail installing a high pressure watermist fire suppression system: PUCK, iCO, Plumis A atomist or similar. The system is comply to 'BS8458' for residential watermist s tandard and fire tested to British Standard 'BS:9252'

2. Who currently uses the existing car parking area and garages at the rear of the site? Are they in separate ownership or are they tied to each existing flat? How many flats have an allocated parking space or garage at the rear?

Save two visitor spaces, all the garages/spaces are demised to leaseholders either as part of their flat lease or on separate leases

3. Who currently owns the application site building? Who's the intended future occupants of the 4 new flats? Would they be on the open market for purchase or rent? Or would they be for affordable housing? Are the existing flat owners/occupiers being compensated for the proposal with a new roof?

Site owned by Abacus Land 4 Limited. The new flats will be for open market sale. No compensation but leaseholders will benefit from set of building improvements on which they have been consulted and surveyed individually, including a new roof.

4. Has the existing building ever been social housing? What's the current status of the existing 12 flats? (re they all market rent or ownership).

The building has been privately owned since construction, early 1970s. All leaseholders are private, no affordable/social.

5. Could the applicant bring along their construction specialist to answer any queries the committee may have on the modular construction process and how this works?

Tim Benson can be available form 7.30 online (he is on a flight beforehand). If for any reason he can't make it then Nick Moody can answer the questions, but hopefully they will both be available online.

Officer's response to member questions at the Technical Briefing:

Q: When discussing the height of a development, what is the local reference point or is this subjective?

A: A subjective view is taken although one storey extensions have been supported by planning. Many homes in the area are traditional although is still a mix of homes due to being just off of the town centre in Wimbledon. For example, there is a part 4/3 storey building further down the road to the west of the site known as Alden Court.

Q: The existing building was an extension on the site of 55 princess road and already reduced light. With the proposed additional storey the light will be further reduced. If the first extension was not already built, would this application be recommended for approval?

A: This would have an impact on the decision but on balance would likely be agreed. This has been acknowledged for the current application.

Q: Wimbledon Society highlighted concerns as to whether enough changes have taken place to address height, bulk and mass concerns raised when it the application was last refused. Have these concerns been addressed?

A: They didn't appeal the last decision. Changes such as setting back a rooftop with better panelling can tip the balance by mitigating impact on the street scene. Height would be similar but the key aspect of setting the extension further back and inwards has made a difference.

Q: Is the additional cycle storage just for regular bikes and could the condition be updated to permit free excluding electric vehicles?

A: As stated in the report, they have agreed to permit free with the exception to zero emission vehicles subject to permit and subject to capacity in surrounding roads.

Q: In reference to parking, point 6a – should we be saying you can get a permit? Concerns have been raised that people are using spaces behind the building to park and then the existing residents apply for permits. We need to take this into account and think about how these spaces can be best used.

A: Will feed this back to the developer and provide the committee with an update.

Q: Does this comply with fire regulations? The approved document for fire regulations noticed the kitchen location being furthest away from an escape route. If you are on the top floor you may have to go on balconies as exits would be blocked.

A: This would be a building control matter. If kitchens were in the wrong place they would have to come back to committee to get this corrected.

Q: Has there been any conversations with the existing residents that have accessibility needs to establish the type of support that could be given as part of a construction management plan.

A: The Standard Hours condition has been added but can be amended if committee decided to. The report indicated modular construction so should be quicker than usual but this can't be enforced by planning.

Q: Is modular construction a trial or familiar within the borough and is it usual to condition this?

A: It has been used often in the borough but has become an increasingly popular route.

Q: We would like clarity on who owns it, is it social housing, who will be living there, is there an issue with them paying for their own flat roof? Is this purely commercial or not?

A: Will find out and let the committee know.

ITEM - 6 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

No mods

ITEM 7 - PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - SUMMARY OF CURRENT CASES

No mods