

Planning Applications Committee

7th December 2023

Supplementary Agenda

Modifications Sheet.

ITEM 5 (Penthouse Flat 11, 3 Lansdowne Road, West Wimbledon, SW20 8AP)

Additional representations

(Page 4) - Two additional representations received. The following provides a summary of points raised:

- Only received committee letters this morning in the post and therefore very short notice of the meeting.
- People should have a chance to attend the meeting.
- Remain in objection to the proposal.
- Application flat still owes Section 20 payments.
- Loud noise and noise insulation should be provided.
- Applicant needs to pay his share of the 2021 Section 21 bill.
- Urgent repairs (roof/stairwell/lift) were only completed because 4 or 5 leaseholders paid on time.

MEMBER QUESTIONS

Q: In planning terms, how do you assess harm? The predominant change appears to be a change from a rectangle shape to an oval shape, how is this balanced?

A: The oval shape design is an unusual shape for the building. The building is a semi-detached building which initially had consent for a 2nd floor which matched the neighbouring property. This scheme would take it further by adding an oval shaped feature which would be distinctly different and provide an imbalance to the existing building.

The 2017 refusal for two floors noted an impact on the conservation area. This application is for one floor, but officers believe it would be a harmful addition to the road.

Q: The previous application was mainly refused due to character as opposed to neighbouring amenity. As the extension would be set back in the new proposal, would this still be grounds for refusal?

A: The new proposal is set back but the previous application was also set back. There would be no harm to neighbouring amenity, but officers believe there would be harm to visual impact.

Q: Are the main grounds for refusal, privacy, shape and height?

A: The development has gone for a more contemporary style from before, but this sits awkwardly on the building. It would also be the tallest part, including the adjoining property so officers have made a judgement call.

Q: The site line from the adjacent pavement shows its cut off by the corner of the first of the 2 levels being extended. Will the oval shaped extension be visible?

A: Officers acknowledge the extension will be set back so if walking on the pavement closest to the property, you may see it. It's important to note it would be a larger space to the buildings opposite. On the first floor you would see the structure in its entirety and from further away you would also see it. Officers have had to consider its impact on the immediate local area as the proposed application would be the tallest part and therefor visually negative.

Q: If the extension was more central, would it be more acceptable?

A: Side on, this may make it more hidden but may look odd if it were more central and be imbalanced with the adjoining property. It would also be possible for the adjoining property to apply for a similar extension.

ITEM 6 (310-356 Grand Drive, Raynes Park, London, SW20 9NQ)

Amended drawings

The applicant has provided below amended plans at the request of the case officer:

The amended elevation and visualisation to show:

- Amendment to elevation treatment through the introduction of brick banding on the top level

Officer comment

- Officers requested the amendments for a smoother visual transition between the upper floor and roof level.

Amendments to conditions

(Page 51) (amended/additional text shown in bold and italics):

Following amended plans being received (details as above), condition 2 is updated as follows:

- 2 . The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: HA22-182-P101, HA22-182-P102B, HA22-182-P106B, HA22-182-P107, HA22182-P108, ***HA22-182-P109C***

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning

MEMBER QUESTIONS

Q: At 6.10, the analysis is referred to as being based on 12 flatted units. Does “flatted units” mean blocks of flats (and if so how many flats in total) or to 12 individual flats (in which case I am sure you will agree the analysis is statistically meaningless)?

A: Clarification has been sought from the applicant and Officers have been advised that the quoted ‘The 12 flatted units’ is a typo. It should say “from a sample of 383 flats”.

Q: Given the reduction in parking availability between 2021 and 2023, is it possible that car ownership has increased since 2011 (the census data used, para 6.10)

A: Apologies for the confusion but the 2023 parking survey reveals more available parking spaces. Officers has cross referenced the 2011 and 2021 census data for the area and car ownership has remained broadly similar.

Q: If the cycle hangars are sited close to the proposed development, how many parking spaces is that likely to eliminate?

A: Highway officers have identified 3 potential locations for the cycle hangars, only one of which would result in loss of an on-street parking space on Queen Mary Avenue.

Q: Re the use of the Lambeth Methodology to assess parking pressures, as this is premised on a residential area with peak pressure occurring overnight, but the area under consideration is a mixed residential/commercial area with shops and daytime footfall (“fronting a busy neighbourhood parade” para 6.27), and yellow lines that operate during the daytime, is there any way of assessing the impact on daytime parking pressures (assuming the 11-12 cars is an accurate estimate) and could this be done?

A: The Lambeth Methodology survey is an industry standard tool that planners use to assess additional on-street parking created by new development. Its purpose is to record a live ‘snapshot’ of parking conditions within a 200m walking distance of the site.

In accordance with the Lambeth Methodology, the survey should be undertaken when the highest number of residents are at home, generally late at night during the week. A snapshot survey between the hours of 0030-0530 should be undertaken on two separate weekday nights (i.e. Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday).

Officers would therefore not deviate from the Lambeth Methodology. Officers consider that an assessment of daytime parking pressure would not be appropriate, as the survey at night gives the best indication of parking pressures. It should also be noted that the uptake of parking spaces for commercial purposes would considerably vary from day to day, time of day and would only generally be in use for a short period of time (stopping at the shops etc).

Q: Does the Co-op have parking round the back, and if so how much ?

A: There is a private car park which is managed by Co-op and there are 18 parking spaces and 3 disabled parking bays.

Appearance/Height

Q: Is the picture at p63 a CGI of the proposed final appearance?

A: An amended proposed elevation and visualisation were received just after the committee report was published. Please find attached an amended visualisation. The only difference is the introduction of a continuous line of brick banding along on the 4th floor.

Q: Are there any additional images of the difference in height between this and surrounding buildings ?

A: No. If Members consider it necessary, this can be requested however given the committee is in 2 days, it may not be available before the meeting.

Swifts

Q: At 6 storeys this would be ideal for the nesting of swifts and other small birds. Could informative number 15 be made a condition and specify the type of swift brick required?

A: No unfortunately as this is a prior approval application and Officers can only assess the application on the following grounds:

- (a) transport and highways impacts of the development;
- (b) air traffic and defence asset impacts of the development;
- (c) contamination risks in relation to the building;
- (d) flooding risks in relation to the building;
- (e) the external appearance of the building.

OFFICER'S response to member questions at the Technical Briefing:

Q: During the previous application, the applicant said there was no space for 12 cycle's but in this proposal there is space. How have they been able to do that?

A: The highways team have been persistent due to competing demand. The applicant initially wasn't supportive but through conversations with officers they explored available areas, but these were all leased for commercial use. Officers also made suggestions and the applicant was then able to find an area to place 12 cycle spaces.

Q: Is this application something that could go ahead with prior approval? Why did it come to committee previously?

A: It came to committee previously as it exceeded 10 objections, this time they have received 6 objections but as it previously came to committee it is required to come back again. To address parking concerns raised at the previous committee, the application had another parking survey completed which showed they could accommodate the parking shortfall and the 12 additional parking spaces on surrounding roads.

Q: We would like to understand how some of the internal challenges such as internal waste storage and narrow walkways have been addressed?

A: In relation to waste management, the refuse manager was happy that the condition issued as the previous committee addressed the concerns raised.

The applicant advised they have a new management company on board to address issues on refuse and fly tipping.

The units and kitchen areas are large enough to accommodate any internal waste facilities each occupant would require.

The development would need to comply with building control regulations which would require adequate width walkways.

ITEM - 7 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

No mods

ITEM 8 - PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - SUMMARY OF CURRENT CASES

No mods

This page is intentionally left blank