

PLANNING COMMITTEE

3 June 2015 at 7.30 pm

MEMBERS: Councillor Richard Clifton (Chair), Councillor Samantha Bourne (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Kevin Burke, Margaret Court, Vincent Galligan, Patrick McManus, Hamish Pollock, Jason Reynolds, Tony Shields and Graham Whitham

OFFICERS: Kemi Erifevieme, Allison Letts, Peter Loveday, Victoria Lower, Andrew Vaughan and Andy Webber

1. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 13 May 2015 were approved as a correct record, and signed by the Chair.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Samantha Bourne informed the committee that her daughter attended a Treetops Nursery elsewhere in the borough, the applicant for application B2015/71406/3FR. Councillor Bourne stated that she was coming to the meeting with an open mind.

Councillor Tony Shields informed the committee that his son attended Greenshaw High School, the applicant for application B2015/71406/3FR. Councillor Shields stated that he was coming to the meeting with an open mind.

3. WHITEHALL, MALDEN ROAD, CHEAM

(a) APPLICATION NO. A2015/71491/LBC

The Committee considered a report on the above application for listed building consent involving demolition of cellar access enclosure and side addition known as 'Roy Smith's Gallery' and erection of a two storey side/rear extension to provide staircase and lift enclosure, re-building side gallery at an increased height and internal alterations associated with conversion of flat into museum use; Modifications to main building to include widening/removal/re-instatement of internal/external doors, removal/installation of internal access ramps and steps, remedial works, raising floor levels (where necessary), removal of beam to lower kitchen (ground floor), removal of screen glazing and new balustrade (first floor), extension of viewing platform with new guarding (second floor), remedial works to roof timbers and secondary glazing to windows together with external access ramps and associated works.

A poll vote on the officers' recommendation to grant permission was held in accordance with Standing Order 31.4, when there voted:

To grant (10) Councillors Samantha Bourne, Kevin Burke, Richard Clifton, Margaret Court, Vincent Galligan, Patrick McManus, Hamish Pollock, Jason Reynolds, Tony Shields and Graham Whitham

**Planning Committee
3 June 2015**

Resolved: That planning permission be granted for application No. A2015/71491/LBC, subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives set out in the Appendix to these Minutes.

(b) APPLICATION NO. A2015/71490/3FR

The Committee considered a report on the above application for the demolition of cellar access enclosure and side addition known as 'Roy Smith's Gallery' and erection of a two storey side/rear extension to provide staircase and lift enclosure, re-building side gallery at an increased height and change of use of wardens flat (Class C3) into additional floor space for museum use (Class D1) together with access ramps to side and rear and associated hard and soft landscaping.

A poll vote on the officers' recommendation to grant permission was held in accordance with Standing Order 31.4, when there voted:

To grant (10) Councillors Samantha Bourne, Kevin Burke, Richard Clifton, Margaret Court, Vincent Galligan, Patrick McManus, Hamish Pollock, Jason Reynolds, Tony Shields and Graham Whitham

Resolved: That planning permission be granted for application No. A2015/71490/3FR, subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives set out in the Appendix to these Minutes.

4. BOROUGH SPORTS GROUND, SUTTON UNITED FOOTBALL CLUB, GANDER GREEN LANE, SUTTON - APPLICATION NO. B2015/71563/FUL

The Committee considered a report on the above application for the replacement of the natural pitch with an artificial pitch.

A poll vote on the officers' recommendation to grant permission was held in accordance with Standing Order 31.4, when there voted:

To grant (10) Councillors Samantha Bourne, Kevin Burke, Richard Clifton, Margaret Court, Vincent Galligan, Patrick McManus, Hamish Pollock, Jason Reynolds, Tony Shields and Graham Whitham

Resolved: That planning permission be granted for application No. B2015/71563/FUL, subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives set out in the Appendix to these Minutes.

5. GRENSHAW HIGH SCHOOL, GRENNELL ROAD, SUTTON - APPLICATION NO. B2015/71406/3FR

The Committee considered a report on the above application for the partial demolition and erection of a three storey extension at front to provide new classrooms and entrance area with associated facilities. Refurbishment, extension and alterations to existing school incorporating enlargement of hall involving an increase in height, new staircase enclosure, extension of corridors and new windows with additional car parking facilities and landscaping.

The application had been de-delegated by Councillor Penneck.

Officers clarified that the original proposal was a maximum 41 additional staff, however it was unlikely there would be more than 20 on site at any one time and around 46% of staff travelled sustainably.

Alexander McLeish, an objector, and Councillor Marlene Heron, a ward councillor, addressed the meeting under Standing Order 31, and Kieran Holliday, William Smith, and Steve Bradford, the applicants replied.

The principal issues raised by Mr McLeish were:-

- The photos shown to the committee did not accurately reflect the on street parking situation in the local area as it was normally difficult to move in the surrounding roads.
- There was on street parking due to the school from 6.30am into the evening.
- The parking and access issues were causing problems for local residents and had caused an issue for an ambulance to access a property in the past.
- The goodwill of the local community was starting to be strained by the attitude of the school in recent years.
- The proposal did not provide an alternative solution to the need for expansion.
- Consultation with the local community was done at late notice and request genuine consultation is completed with residents.
- Residents felt their concerns were being put to aside and not considered.
- A petition had been submitted due to the level of residents concerns.
- The site was overdeveloped already.

In response to Member questions Mr McLeish stated that the schools meeting with residents regarding the proposal was arranged six days in advance and residents were informed that the development was a 'done deal'. A further meeting was arranged by ward councillors with the school. It was felt by residents that there was an absence of long term planning for school places, and that while it was acknowledged additional school places were needed, Greenshaw was not felt to be the right location. Mr McLeish clarified that it was felt that the proposal was over dominant and would not fit with the rest of the school site.

The principal issues raised by Councillor Marlene Heron were:-

- There was an understanding that there was a need to expand schools in the borough.
- A meeting was arranged with local residents and the school three weeks ago and residents felt that there had been enough expansion on the site in recent years and that there was little room left on the site.
- The school was well served by buses, however parking issues were experienced on the surrounding roads as staff and sixth form students drove to school and parked very close to residents access to their properties.
- It was estimated there were 300 car journeys twice daily and a further 99 was expected with this proposal.
- The school had developed an ambitious School Travel Plan, however there were queries as to how this could be monitored.
- That the street frontage and highways improvements should be made by the proposed development is opened.
- That the school should improve its engagement with local residents.

**Planning Committee
3 June 2015**

- That any council review of CPZs should include this area.
- Construction conditions were necessary to ensure there was no work on site on Sundays and Bank Holidays.
- The landscaping condition needed to be reviewed.

In response to Member questions Councillor Heron stated that the traffic survey was completed by the school and was not independent.

Officers stated that they would consider enforcement if there were breaches to conditions, however the council was dependent on residents reporting the breaches. School Travel Plans do have specific dates by which the school should achieve the targets. Furthermore Transport for London had introduced the STARS scheme which ensures School Travel Plans are robust, however officers worked with the schools rather than imposing punitive sanctions.

Officers suggested that that the Construction Method Statement could include specific hours that building works could take place during, and how delivery vehicles would access the site. An additional condition was further suggested for the creation of a residents liaison group. Officers further suggested an additional condition, that before the development was opened highways improvements would need to be introduced.

The Highways Engineer informed the committee that the highways grant would be used to review improvements to Grennell Road to alleviate congestion and reduce nuisance parking.

The principal issues raised by Mr Holliday, Mr William Smith and Mr Steve Bradford were:-

- That the local authority was experiencing a significant challenge to provide school places for all young people.
- Officers were planning for future school provision.
- A number of schools across the borough were expanding and it was thought an additional one or two schools would be necessary to meet demand.
- Two form entry was considered to be the maximum the Greenshaw School site could take.
- The school acknowledged the traffic issues in the surrounding area and would support a traffic review.
- The school had submitted a School Travel Plan and were committed to educate all on sustainable travel.
- The school would limit the construction hours on site.
- Original application suggested a 20% increase in staff, however this figure has been lowered to 21 as the school would not be able to support an additional 41 members of staff.
- 85% of students of the school lived within Sutton and the majority of Year 7 students lived within 1.3km of the site.
- The school had a policy to promote strong relationships but acknowledged that improvements could be made to improve relations with the local community.

In response to Member questions Mr Bradford stated there were around 100 bike racks on site, though not all were used. Mr Smith stated that the school could not

control parents driving to the school beyond constructive conversations; however there was a strong staff presence on the gate at the beginning and end of the school day. Staff did however discuss with students who drove regarding acceptable parking in the local area.

Mr Bradford informed the committee that the school invited around 180 local residents to two consultation meetings in February 2015, and following feedback did make two changes to the proposal. A further session was arranged by ward councillors and hosted by the school three weeks before the meeting.

The school were happy to comply with setting up a residents liaison group and limiting the construction hours, however did raise concerns whether this would effect the proposed opening in September 2016 so would need to discuss further with the appointed contractors.

The committee acknowledged the need for school expansions and that there had been concerns raised regarding the design of the building. Members noted that residents had raised a number of concerns regarding parking and the ability for traffic to move in the surrounding roads, but recognised that a grant would be provided to make highway improvements to the area which it was hoped would alleviate issues experienced by local residents. The committee requested that consultation on any possible school expansions began earlier in the planning process. Members further requested that the proposed additional conditions were included in any decision to grant.

A poll vote on the officers' recommendation to grant permission was held in accordance with Standing Order 31.4, when there voted:

To grant (9) Councillors Samantha Bourne, Kevin Burke, Richard Clifton, Margaret Court, Vincent Galligan, Hamish Pollock, Jason Reynolds, Tony Shields and Graham Whitham

Abstained (1) Councillor Patrick McManus

Resolved: That planning permission be granted for application No. B2015/71406/3FR, subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives set out in the Appendix to these Minutes.

Councillor Shields informed the committee that he had an interest in a property on Aultone Way.

6. THE OLD STABLES, CHEAM PARK, TUDOR CLOSE, CHEAM - APPLICATION NO. A2015/71612/FUL

The Committee considered a report on the above application for the erection of single storey extensions, alteration and renovations together with replacement of two dormer windows and installation of rooflights all in connection with use of premises as a day nursery with enclosed children's play area.

Officers informed the committee that there would be a maximum of 80 children and 20 staff on site at any one time, in line with OFSTED regulations. The allocated

**Planning Committee
3 June 2015**

parking for nursery staff would be provided in the allotment car park rather than the public car park.

Councillors expressed concern that there could be over 100 car movements per day associated to the proposed nursery in a public car park which was already busy at weekends and school holidays, and that local schools use the park for sports activities. Members raised concern that the park gates were closed at dusk which would not be in line with the opening hours of the nursery in winter.

Susan Desborough and John Baird, objectors, and Councillor Mary Burstow, a ward councillor, addressed the meeting under Standing Order 31, and Colin Shea, the architect replied.

The principal issues raised by Ms Desborough were:-

- The main concerns of residents were the parking and access to the park, particularly at weekends and during school holidays.
- There was already difficulty accessing Tudor Close and the proposal would increase issues.
- There was no sign in the park informing users of the proposal.
- Seven letters rather than the 11 stated in the report were received by residents.

The principal issues raised by Mr Baird were:-

- The park was bequeathed to the council and whether the proposal was in line with the bequeathment.
- Biodiversity was not considered within the officers report, however Cheam Park had bats and stag beetles, which were endangered, in addition to a variety of other wildlife which the proposal would disrupt.
- The site should be a community asset and not to be an opportunity for private profit.
- Parking is an issue in the local area.
- The opening hours of the nursery would cause issues with closing the park.
- Lack of consultation with local residents.
- Moving the disabled toilets 200metres from the car park was not acceptable.

In response to Member questions Mr Baird stated that traffic into the park increased during the day, with the car park being full still at 6pm in the summer. There were concerns that in addition to the staff and parents car movements, issues would be caused by deliveries to the nursery.

Officers stated that site notices were displayed and an advertisement placed in the local newspaper. Over the past few years attempts had been made to let the building however no viable proposals had been received. The proposal of a day nursery would ensure the longevity of the building. The peak car movements were thought to be at the main drop off and pick up times and there would not be an increase in long term parking.

The principal issues raised by Councillor Burstow were:-

- Not against the proposal however there were concerns with regards to parking as during half term there were no available spaces for several hours in the public car park or on Tudor Close

- Cars currently parked on both sides of Tudor Close which caused tail backs to Malden Road.
- Concern regarding access for emergency services to the park and the proposed nursery.
- If parking spaces are allocated to the nursery then the owner would need to pay an annual fee.
- Local schools were encouraging parents to park in the public car park to drop off their children.
- There was a need to manage the parking during drop off and pick up times.
- Did not want parents to use the road along the back of the site as it was dangerous and so a bollard may need to be installed and raised during drop off and pick up times.

The Highways Engineer agreed that a lockable bollard may resolve some issues.

In response to Member questions Councillor Burstow stated that residents could be consulted on the introduction of a single yellow line on Tudor Close to improve access to the park. Directional lighting may need to be introduced which protected local residents and the children. Councillor Burstow suggested that parking spaces could be set aside if they were paid for, however the issue of the increased wear and tear of the car park would need to be addressed. In response to Member questions Councillor Burstow suggested that the application should be deferred to enable further discussion with the developer regarding access to the site and parking.

Some Members stated that the main issue was access to the site and the car park via Tudor Close and not parking as it would predominantly be pick up and drop off usage of the car park. Access by emergency services was raised as a concern by councillors which would need to be addressed.

The principal issues raised by Mr Shea were:-

- The inside of the building was in serious disrepair and would need around £300,000 investment to bring it up to a reasonable standard.
- Substantial annual rent would be paid to the London Borough of Sutton.
- Figures had been provided by the applicant on indicative traffic movement based on a similar nursery.
- The main issue was access to the site which was outside the application, however it was felt that the applicant would be happy to discuss proposals to improve access with officers.

Members of the committee stated that they had concerns regarding access to the site and the park, and the effect that may be felt at the junction of Malden Road if there was increased traffic movements in the area. Councillors suggested that ward councillors should liaise with residents further on future of the site.

Some councillors felt that the proposal was beneficial as it brought a derelict property into use through some substantial investment and the proposal was sympathetic to the original building. However access concerns needed to be addressed.

**Planning Committee
3 June 2015**

Concerns were raised by some councillors that the proposal was not sympathetic to the location and would change the feel of the park. Furthermore it would lead to the loss of a public asset.

A poll vote on a motion to defer consideration pending further discussion on traffic and parking concerns with the applicant, Highways and Parks officers was held in accordance with Standing order 31.4, when there voted:

To defer (6) Councillors Richard Clifton, Margaret Court, Patrick McManus, Jason Reynolds, Tony Shields and Graham Whitham

Against (4) Councillors Samantha Bourne, Kevin Burke, Vincent Galligan and Hamish Pollock

Resolved: To defer consideration of application No. A2015/71612/FUL.

7. STIRLING HOUSE, 18 AVENUE ROAD, BELMONT - APPLICATION NO. B2015/71099/FUL

The Committee considered a report on the above application for the erection of a two storey side extension to provide additional B1 office accommodation.

The application had been de-delegated by Councillor Hicks.

Officers confirmed that a further planning application would be required to convert the building into residential use, despite the prior approval given to convert the current building into residential due to the extension being proposed. The full planning application would enable the Planning Authority to consider all aspects of the proposal unlike under prior approval scheme. The application the committee was being requested to consider was for an extension to office accommodation however.

Peter Matthey, an objector addressed the meeting under Standing Order 31, and Zubair Ahmed the applicant replied.

The principal issues raised by Mr Matthey were:-

- The current application was a technical application which was not accurate and was confusing
- Residents were concerned about parking
- There were concerns that by granting this application would enable an additional flat to be added to the development
- Request for an additional condition that approval does not automatically enable an additional flat to be added to the development

Officers confirmed that clarification could be provided that an additional residential unit would not be automatically accepted with an additional informative to the decision notice.

The principal issues raised by Dr Ahmed were:-

- The application was for a small infill which would sit on the existing footprint of the building
- The application would increase the floor space by less than 10%

- The extension would enable one proposed flat to be two bed rather than one bed.
- Nine parking spaces would be provided.

Councillors were informed that the design of the extension could be considered on the current application. Concerns were raised by some councillors that the proposal did not compliment the host building, however it was noted by councillors that the extension would not be seen from the street.

A poll vote on the officers' recommendation to grant permission was held in accordance with Standing Order 31.4, when there voted:

To grant (7) Councillors Samantha Bourne, Kevin Burke, Richard Clifton, Margaret Court, Vincent Galligan, Jason Reynolds and Tony Shields

Against (2) Councillors Hamish Pollock and Graham Whitham

Abstained (1) Councillor Patrick McManus

Resolved: That planning permission be granted for application No. B2015/71099/FUL, subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives set out in the Appendix to these Minutes.

The meeting ended at 10.35 pm

Chair:

Date:

This page is intentionally left blank

**Appendix to Minutes:
Planning Committee
3 June 2015**

PLANNING CONDITIONS, REASONS AND INFORMATIVES

WHITEHALL, MALDEN ROAD, CHEAM - APPLICATION NO. A2015/71491/LBC

(1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date hereof.

Reason: To comply with Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended.

(2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:

957 PL 100; 105 Rev A; 200 Rev A; 201 Rev A; 202 Rev A; 203; 204; 205 Rev E; 206 Rev E; 207 Rev E; 208 Rev E; 209 Rev A; 400 Rev A; 401 Rev A; 402; 403; 405 Rev C; 406 Rev C; 407; 410; 500 Rev B; 501 Rev B; 502 Rev B; 505 Rev E; 506 Rev E; 506 Rev E; 507 Rev E; 508 Rev D; 700; 701; Landscape Masterplan; Stage D Report February 2015; Archaeological Interpretative Survey ASE Report No. 2012250; Preliminary Ecological Assessment Report No. RT-MME-117808-01 February 2015; Daytime Bat Survey Report No. RT-MME-117808-02; Structural Overview by EAR Sheppard December 2012; Pre-development Arboricultural Survey Report No. RT-MME-117808-02; Structural Survey Report January 2014 (issue 01); M&E Stage 2 Report February 2015.

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

(2) (A) No development shall take place until the applicant (or their heirs and successors in title) has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological investigation in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the local planning authority in writing.

B) No development or demolition shall take place other than in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under Part (A).

C) The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under Part (A), and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of the results and archive deposition has been secured.

Reason: Heritage assets of archaeological interest are expected to survive on the site. The planning authority wishes to secure the provision of appropriate archaeological investigation, including the publication of results.

(3) No demolition shall take place until the applicant (or their heirs and successors in title) has secured the implementation of a programme of building recording and reporting in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the local planning authority in writing.

**Appendix to Minutes:
Planning Committee
3 June 2015**

No development shall take place other than in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation.

Reason: Built heritage assets on this site will be affected by the development. The planning authority wishes to secure building recording in line with NPPF, and publication of results, in accordance with Section 12 of the NPPF.

(4) Detailed drawings at a scale of 1: 10, 1:5 or 1:20 (as appropriate), in respect of the following shall be submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority prior to the relevant part of the works commencing on site.

a) Elevations, Sections, plans and details of the treatment of the internal wall and opening to the north elevation of the building to link the staircase extension. The detailed drawings shall also include (but not be limited to) its treatment.

The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved details and maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the heritage asset and to ensure a high standard of design in accordance with Policies 7 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and Policy 7.8 of the London Plan, 2015.

Informative(s)

1. The written scheme of investigation, in respect of condition 2, will need to be prepared and implemented by a suitably qualified archaeological practice in accordance with English Heritage Greater London Archaeology guidelines. It must be approved by the Local Planning Authority before any on-site development related activity occurs.

2. The written scheme of investigation, in respect of condition 3, will need to be prepared and implemented by a suitably qualified heritage practice in accordance with English Heritage Greater London Archaeology guidelines. It must be approved by the Local Planning Authority before any on-site development related activity occurs.

WHITEHALL, MALDEN ROAD, CHEAM - APPLICATION NO. A2015/71490/3FR

(1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date hereof.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended.

(2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:

**Appendix to Minutes:
Planning Committee
3 June 2015**

957 PL 100; 105 Rev A; 200 Rev A; 201 Rev A; 202 Rev A; 203; 204; 205 Rev E; 206 Rev E; 207 Rev E; 208 Rev E; 209 Rev A; 400 Rev A; 401 Rev A; 402; 403; 405 Rev C; 406 Rev C; 407; 410; 500 Rev B; 501 Rev B; 502 Rev B; 505 Rev E; 506 Rev E; 506 Rev E; 507 Rev E; 508 Rev D; 700; 701; Landscape Masterplan; Stage D Report February 2015; Archaeological Interpretative Survey ASE Report No. 2012250; Preliminary Ecological Assessment Report No. RT-MME-117808-01 February 2015; Daytime Bat Survey Report No. RT-MME-117808-02; Structural Overview by EAR Sheppard December 2012; Pre-development Arboricultural Survey Report No. RT-MME-117808-02; Structural Survey Report January 2014 (issue 01); M&E Stage 2 Report February 2015.

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

(3) Full details and samples of the facing materials and finishes, to include colour, texture, face bond and pointing, to be used on the buildings shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority before the development commences on the site. The scheme shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved detail.

Reason: In order that the Council may be satisfied with the external appearance of the building.

(4) Prior to the commencement of works, an arboricultural method statement and tree protection plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submissions shall include full details of ground protection, the position of tree protection fencing, and an arboricultural method statement detailing no-dig construction methods for the access ramp where it affects any Root Protection Area. The submissions shall be in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 and measures for protection in accordance with that Standard shall be implemented prior to the storage of materials or commencement of work on site and shall be maintained to the Local Planning Authority's reasonable satisfaction until the completion of the development.

Reason: To enable proper consideration be given to the impact of the proposed development on existing trees.

(5) Full details of soft landscaping and replacement tree planting proposals shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. All hard and soft landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and to a reasonable standard in accordance with the relevant recommendations of appropriate British Standards or other recognised Codes of Good Practice. The works shall be carried out prior to the completion of the development or in accordance with the timetable agreed with the Local Planning Authority. Any trees or plants that (within a period of five years after planting) are removed, die, or become in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority seriously damaged or defective shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species/size/number as originally approved, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

**Appendix to Minutes:
Planning Committee
3 June 2015**

Reason: To ensure the provision, establishment, and maintenance of a reasonable standard of landscape in accordance with the approved designs.

(6) Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, full details of all installed energy efficiency measures, including the proposed secondary glazing and roof insulation measures, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved detail.

Reason: To ensure compliance with Policy DM5 of Sutton's Site Development Policies DPD

(7) A demolition/construction method statement shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The method statement shall include details of the following:

- Works of demolition and construction shall be carried out during normal working hours, 08.00 to 18.00 hours Monday to Friday, and 09.00 to 14.00 hours on Saturdays, with no noisy working audible at the site boundary being permitted on Sundays or Bank Holidays
- Details of any noise screening measures
- Proposals for monitoring noise and procedures to be put in place where agreed noise levels are exceeded
- Likely dust levels to be generated and any screening measures to be employed
- Proposals for monitoring dust and controlling unacceptable releases.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of neighbouring properties and the area generally.

(8) The use of the new access to be created on the north side of the building shall only be open to the public between: 14:00 and 17:00 hours Monday to Friday, Sunday and Bank/Public Holidays and, 10:00 and 17:00 hours on Saturdays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of neighbouring properties and the area generally.

BOROUGH SPORTS GROUND, SUTTON UNITED FOOTBALL CLUB, GANDER GREEN LANE, SUTTON - APPLICATION NO. B2015/71563/FUL

(1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date hereof.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended.

(2) The pitch shall not be used before 09:00 hours or after 22:00 hours on weekdays or Saturdays (with the exception of weekday fixtures that may run until 22:30 hours at the latest where extra time is played) or after 20:00 hours on Sundays and Public Holidays.

**Appendix to Minutes:
Planning Committee
3 June 2015**

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the surrounding residential occupiers.

(3) Prior to works starting on site, detailed design specifications and associated micro-drainage calculations must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that the artificial pitch will not lead to an increase in flood risk either within the site or elsewhere and that peak run-off rates and annual volumes of run-off will be equal to or less than previous conditions on the site (i.e. 'greenfield' run-off rates) for all events up to and including the 1 in 100 year storm event (with a 30% allowance for future climate change).

Reason: To protect the local water environment and in order to comply with Policy DM7 of the Site Development Policies DPD.

(4) Prior to first use of the artificial pitch, written confirmation that the approved site drainage arrangements have been implemented must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing. All the measures integrated shall be retained for as long as the development is in existence.

Reason: To protect the local water environment and in order to comply with Policy DM7 of Sutton's Site Development Policies DPD.

(5) The pitch shall only be operated as a community facility as indicated in the supporting documentation to the application, and in particular it shall not be operated as a commercial 5-a-side football centre.

Reason: To ensure that the nature of the use is commensurate with the surrounding residential environment and in order to protect the amenities of the surrounding residential occupiers.

(6) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: D01, L02, S15-031/dwg/C S0001, S15-031/dwg/PV0002, S15-031/dwg/PV0001, 01, Design, Access and Planning Statement March 2015, CSR Report 2014 and e-mails dated 2nd June 2015 and 21st May 2015.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning and to ensure that the development is completed in accordance with the approved plans and statements.

INFORMATIVES.

(1) This approval only grants permission under section 57 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Further approval or consent may be required by other legislation, in particular the Building Regulations and you should contact Building Control on 020 8770 5000 before proceeding with the work.

**Appendix to Minutes:
Planning Committee
3 June 2015**

(2) The submitted application complied with the relevant planning policies and Sutton Council has accordingly granted planning permission.

(3) The developer/applicant is hereby advised to remove all site notices on or near the site that were displayed in pursuant to the application.

GRENSHAW HIGH SCHOOL, GRENNELL ROAD, SUTTON - APPLICATION NO. B2015/71406/3FR

(1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date hereof.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended.

(2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

772-P-0010 Location Plan, 772-P-0101 Site Survey Plan, 772-P-0110 Ground Floor Existing, 772-P-0111 First Floor Existing, 772-P-0112 Roof Existing, 772-P-0301 Elevations Existing Sheet 1, 772-P-0302 Elevations Existing Sheet 2, 772-P-0351 Street Elevation & Site Sections Existing, 772-P-1001A Site Plan Proposed, 772-P-1010A Ground Floor Proposed, 772-P-1011A First Floor Proposed, 772-P-1012A Second Floor Proposed, 772-P-1013A Roof Plan Proposed, 772-P-2101A Elevations Proposed Sheet 1, 772-P-2102A Elevations Proposed Sheet 2, 772-P-3101A Street Elevation & Site Sections Proposed, Energy Report submitted by TP Engineering Services dated February 2015, Preliminary Ecological Assessment Report BREEAM Assessment submitted by PJC Ecology dated February 2015, Planning Statement submitted by AND Planning Ltd, Tree Survey & Arboricultural Impact Assessment submitted by Oakwood Tree Consultants dated February 2015, Transport Statement submitted by TTP Consulting dated March 2015, School Travel Plan submitted by TTP Consulting dated March 2015, BREEAM Pre-Assessment Rev C submitted by Etude dated February 2015 and Design & Access Statement submitted by Fraser Brown MacKenna Architects dated March 2015.

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

(3) The type and treatment of the materials to be used on the exterior of the building(s), shall be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the relevant part of the development being carried out. The approved materials shall be used in the construction of the development hereby approved and completed prior to its occupation/use.

Reason: To safeguard the visual amenities of the area and to ensure buildings are of a high standard of design and where applicable compatible with existing townscape.

**Appendix to Minutes:
Planning Committee
3 June 2015**

(4) The development shall not begin until a Construction Method/Environmental statement, to include details of:

- (a) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors;
- (b) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- (c) storage of plant and materials;
- (d) programme of works (including measures for traffic management);
- (e) provision of boundary hoarding, behind any visibility zones;
- (f) construction traffic routing;
- (g) means to prevent deposition of mud on the highway;

has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction period.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not interfere with the free flow of traffic and conditions of safety on the public highway.

(5) Prior to the development being occupied an amended Travel Plan describing in detail the measures to be implemented, which will reduce travel by car and in the interests of promoting sustainable transport modes, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall be implemented by the school and monitored and enforced by the Local Planning authority in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To promote sustainable transport choices to encourage access by non-car modes and reduce the need to travel especially by car.

(6) Prior to the commencement of any development, a Tree Protection Plan and Method Statement shall be submitted to the Local Planning authority for approval. The submissions shall specify means whereby levels within the root protection areas of retained trees are to remain unaltered and protected during the demolition/construction of all hard standing for vehicular access, car parks, & footpaths, and the methods of excavation and construction within the RPA of retained trees. The plans shall also indicate the position of protective fencing in accordance with British Standard BS 5837:2012.

Reason: To ensure the adequate protection of trees on the site that make a valuable contribution to the character of the area and the setting.

(7) The relevant part of the development shall not commence until full details of both soft landscaping and replacement tree planting proposals have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. All soft landscaping and planting shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and to a reasonable standard in accordance with the relevant recommendations of appropriate British Standards or other recognised Codes of Good Practice. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the timetable agreed with the Local Planning Authority and shall be provided prior to occupation or within the first planting season following occupation. Any trees or plants that (within a period of five years after planting) are removed, die, or become in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority seriously damaged or defective shall be replaced as soon as is

**Appendix to Minutes:
Planning Committee
3 June 2015**

reasonably practicable with others of species/size/number as originally approved, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure the provision, establishment, and maintenance of a reasonable standard of landscape in accordance with the approved designs.

(8) Any window/s above ground floor level on the southern elevation of the development hereby approved shall be fitted with obscured glazing that shall be fixed shut up to a height of 1.7 metres above the finished floor level of the room that those windows serve, the remaining elements above may be clear glazed and openable.

Reason: To safeguard the level of privacy enjoyed by the current occupants of the adjoining properties.

(9) Prior to the development being occupied a highway assessment shall be carried out to assess the existing highways infrastructure, parking levels and parking restrictions. Should any mitigation works be required these shall be completed prior to the occupation of the development.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not interfere with the free flow of traffic and conditions of safety on the public highway.

(10) Prior to the occupation of the development a community liaison scheme shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority to ensure that the school will communicate and inform local residents regularly throughout the construction process.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of the occupiers of adjacent premises and the area generally during the building construction process.

(11) All building operations in connection with the construction of external, roof, and foundations; site excavation or other external site works; works involving the use of plant or machinery; the erection of scaffolding; the delivery of materials; the removal of materials and spoil from the site, and the playing of amplified music or speech shall only take place between the hours of 8:00 am and 6:00 pm Monday to Friday, and between 8.00 am and 1.00 pm on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays, Public and Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of the occupiers of adjacent premises and the area generally during the building construction process.

(12) Prior to the occupation of the development a delivery and servicing plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The delivery and servicing plan should aim to manage freight and deliveries effectively and sustainably. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed and retained thereafter.

**Appendix to Minutes:
Planning Committee
3 June 2015**

Reason: In order to ensure the proposals are in accordance with the London Plan policy 6.14 'Freight'.

INFORMATIVES.

(1) This approval only grants permission under section 57 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Further approval or consent may be required by other legislation, in particular the Building Regulations and you should contact Building Control on 020 8770 6263 or 6325 before proceeding with the work.

(2) This application has been assessed against the relevant policies of the London Plan 2011, Sutton's Core Planning Strategy 2009 and the Site Development Policies DPD 2012. The proposal is generally in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and for this reason planning permission is granted.

(3) The submitted application complied with the relevant planning policies and Sutton Council has accordingly granted planning permission.

**STIRLING HOUSE, 18 AVENUE ROAD, BELMONT - APPLICATION NO.
B2015/71099/FUL**

(1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date hereof.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended.

(2) All external facing materials, treatments and finishes shall be similar to those of the original building. Where this is not possible the type and treatment of the materials to be used shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the development being carried out.

Reason: To ensure that the extension harmonises with the existing building.

(3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 7624 01 Rev B, 7624 02 Rev D, 7624 04 Rev D, 7624 05 Rev B, 7624 07 Rev B, 7624 08 Rev C, 7624 09 Rev A, 7624 33 Rev A and 7624 34 Rev A.

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

INFORMATIVES.

(1) This application has been assessed against the relevant policies of the London Plan 2011, Sutton's Core Planning Strategy 2009 and the Site Development Policies DPD 2012. The proposal is generally in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and for this reason planning permission is granted.

(2) The submitted application complied with the relevant planning policies and Sutton Council has accordingly granted planning permission.

**Appendix to Minutes:
Planning Committee
3 June 2015**

(3) The applicant is reminded that the development hereby approved shall only be used for office purposes and a separate grant of planning permission would be required for any alternative use.