

**LONDON BOROUGH OF SUTTON**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**WEDNESDAY, 15TH JULY, 2015**



**7.30 pm at the**

**Civic Offices, St Nicholas Way, Sutton, SM1 1EA**

To all members of the Planning Committee:-

## **AGENDA**

### **ADDENDUM**

Enquiries to: Victoria Lower, Senior Business Support Officer (Democratic Services)  
Tel: 020 8770 4640 | Email: [victoria.lower@sutton.gov.uk](mailto:victoria.lower@sutton.gov.uk)

Copies of reports are available in large print on request

**This page is intentionally left blank**

**Planning Committee: 15 July 2015**

**Addendum Report**

**ITEM 4:- Site F, Kimpton Park Way, Sutton**

**Amendment to committee report:**

Paragraph 2.5 should be amended to read: "One new vehicular access is proposed onto Wealdstone Road. The access would be double width (allowing two vehicles to pass).

**Additional representations:**

1 additional letter of objection (2 in total from 1 address).

**Summary of material representations:**

- Concern that loading bays are being considered as parking spaces.
- Suggestion that it is not normal practice for Travis Perkins to use loading bays for customer parking and may breach Health and Safety rules.
- Insufficient parking – the parking ratio should be one parking space per 40sqm of floorspace.
- The proposed access is not wide enough for two HGVs to pass, as demonstrated by the swept path analysis.
- Early opening hours will mean that staff would use all the available parking spaces, meaning customers would have to park on the surrounding roads.
- The TRICS data used is not representative of the proposed use and are not comparable to a builders' merchants operation.

**Summary of non-material representations:**

- Suggestion that financial penalties be introduced if more than 62% of staff travel to work by car.

Response: The application submitted has been assessed on the basis of the information supplied with the application. There are specific highway requirements in terms of on-site car parking, cycle parking and vehicular access to the site. A revised Transport Statement prepared by iceni projects and dated June 2015 was supplied in support of the application and it was this document that was used in providing the original response. A draft Travel Plan was also provided by the same consultant and some information was also used from that document.

Selco are a nearby supplier of a range of building products and have appointed consultants to provide an objection to the current application. A letter dated 14th July was supplied to me identifying issues that were perceived as relevant and I will address these issues below:

1. Travis Perkins – the letter suggests that Travis Perkins sells more than timber and from their website it says 'You'll find top quality timber, building materials and tool hire' which summarises the likely product offering at the site. The consultant's points are noted.

2. Parking Provision - Council has received confirmation from the applicant that the 15 loading spaces can be used by customers so it would be expected that a customer would visit the store and park in one of these bays while their purchases are being assembled for delivery to their vehicle which is a usual process in a builders merchants. The 29 parking spaces would seem adequate for a store of this size. The consultant suggests that this is not a normal situation at a Travis Perkins store. I would like this arrangement to be conditioned so that loading spaces are part of any approval.

3. Parking Levels – As stated in my previous correspondence there are no parking levels established for Sui Generis uses in DM22 but given the inclusion of loading bays (see above) then a more generous provision than the 1space per 100sq.m has been achieved for the latest scheme.

4. Proposed access – The majority of users of builders merchants use vans and small trucks which would be able to enter and exit simultaneously. It is only when very large HGVs are entering and exiting the site that there would be the situation where it require one vehicle to wait which happens all over the Kimpton Industrial Park including the nearby access to Tesco’s delivery yard. Even in such circumstances I do not believe there would be a road safety issue.

5. Existing parking restrictions – There are existing parking restrictions opposite the proposed site entrance adjacent to the Plumbase/Halfords operation and on the corner of Wealdstone Road and Stayton Road. With the proposed access in place it is likely that the existing access to Plumbase/Halfords would be better off as it would remove parking which is currently located opposite their access.

In the light of the above comments there is always concern about a development of this type being provided within the busy Kimpton Industrial Park but I believe that the consultant’s letter does not provide sufficient evidence to show that the likely impacts in terms of traffic and parking are severe and on that basis there is no objection to the proposals.

It is considered that the associated benefits of this proposal would far outweigh any perceived problems resulting from an increase in congestion problems that may arise. It is not considered that the proposed development is contrary to policy, or that a refusal of this application on Highways grounds could be substantiated.

**ITEM 6:- 5 St Mary Avenue, Wallington, SM6 7JH**

**Amendment to committee report:**

The title should read: PLANNING COMMITTEE - Date: 15 July 2015

Ref: D2015/71537/HHA	WARD: D15 / WALLINGTON NTH	Time Taken: 14 weeks, 1 day
----------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------------

Paragraph 2.5 should be amended to read: “Significant Amendments to application since submitted: The roof form and design of the proposed conservatory has been amended. Also, amended plans have been submitted to consistently show the height of the proposed conservatory at 2.45m to the eaves/top of the flat roof”.

**Additional representations:**

1 additional letter of objection (5 in total from 3 separate addresses).

**Summary of material representations:**

- All previous representations still apply.
- Due to the proximity to the boundary, any pebble dashing, drainage, rendering or roofing will encroach on the property of no.7 St Mary Avenue.
- Although the new plans show obscured glazing the proposal would result in a loss of sunlight.
- The porch is oversized and not in keeping with the character of the area.
- The garden appears to be overdeveloped with a raised shed which has been erected recently.

**Summary of non-material representations:**

- There is no party wall act agreement in place with respect to the rear extension.
- The development does not appear to have been subject to any building regulations.

**ITEM 7:- 101 Cheam Road, Sutton. B2014/70685/FUL**

To report additional letters of representation received following the formulation of the Officer's report.

As such, amend paragraph 3.6 to read –

**3.6 Number of Letters Received in response to additional consultation:**

Four letters were received from 99 and 103 Cheam Road and 1 and 15a Landseer Road.

**Summary of material responses in objection to the proposal:**

- Incongruous development in terms of height, depth and length which would fail to preserve and respect the conservation area
- Inappropriate siting / overdevelopment
- Impact on protected tree
- Loss of light and outlook
- Issues with construction deliveries on a red route

The additional representations raise no additional issues and as such have been addressed in the officer's report.

**ITEM 8:- Westcroft Leisure Centre, Westcroft Road, Carshalton, SM5 2TG****Amendment to committee report:**

The recommendation should read: GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION

**This page is intentionally left blank**