

PLANNING COMMITTEE**2 September 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, Victoria Lower, Peter Nicholson, Andrew Vaughan and Andy Webber

50. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

51. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 12 August 2015 were approved as a correct record, and signed by the Chair with the following amendment; that item 48 read "To refuse" rather than "To grant".

52. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

53. WALLINGTON COUNTY GRAMMAR SCHOOL, CROYDON ROAD, WALLINGTON - APPLICATION NO. D2015/71844/FUL

The Committee considered a report on the above application for the erection of a part one part two storey extension to science block to provide additional classrooms and ancillary accommodation.

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. D2015/71844/FUL, subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives set out in the Appendix to these Minutes.

54. WALLINGTON LIBRARY CAR PARK, SHOTFIELD, WALLINGTON - APPLICATION NO. D2015/72023/FUL

The Committee considered a report on the above application for the installation of an additional electric vehicle charging point.

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

**Planning Committee
2 September 2015**

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. D2015/72023/FUL, subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives set out in the Appendix to these Minutes.

55. SECTION OF BOUNDARY WALL AT JUNCTION OF HONEYWOOD WALK AND NORTH STREET, CARSHALTON - APPLICATION NO. C2015/71769/LBC

The Committee considered a report on the above application for listed Building application for the demolition and rebuilding of part of a Listed Wall.

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. C2015/71769/LBC, subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives set out in the Appendix to these Minutes.

56. SECTION OF BOUNDARY WALL AT JUNCTION OF HONEYWOOD WALK AND NORTH STREET, CARSHALTON - APPLICATION NO. C2015/71860/3FR

The Committee considered a report on the above application for the demolition and rebuilding of part of a Listed Wall.

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. C2015/71860/3FR, subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives set out in the Appendix to these Minutes.

57. CIVIC CENTRE, ST NICHOLAS WAY, SUTTON - APPLICATION NO. B2015/72333/3FR

The Committee considered a report on the above application for the installation of an air conditioning unit with cage at ground level and two external ventilation louvres.

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

**Planning Committee
2 September 2015**

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. B2015/72333/3FR, subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives set out in the Appendix to these Minutes.

58. WESTBOURNE PRIMARY SCHOOL, ANTON CRESCENT, SUTTON - APPLICATION NO. B2015/72235/3FR

The Committee considered a report on the above application for the provision of two basketball courts with fencing and gates up to 3 metres in height together with hard 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. B2015/72235/3FR, subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives set out in the Appendix to these Minutes.

59. ST PHILOMENA'S SCHOOL, POUND STREET, CARSHALTON - APPLICATION NO. C2015/71900

The Committee considered a report on the above application for the erection of a two storey building to provide additional educational facilities to existing school and the installation of an external staircase to existing art building.

Officers clarified that the 18 trees which would be removed were on the footprint of the new building and were low-level self-seeded fruit trees.

Councillor Jill Whitehead, a ward councillor, addressed the meeting under Standing Order 31, and Mr Kieran Holliday, Ms Maria Noone and Mr Jim Pierce, the applicants, replied.

The principal issues raised by Councillor Whitehead were:-

- The majority of complaints received by ward councillors were regarding traffic and parking issues around St Philomena's School.
- Expansions had been ongoing on the site for a number of years and there had been increased issues associated with these.
- The surrounding roads do not have capacity for increased traffic and parking.
- The application did not include any additional parking spaces.
- Parking issues were chronic at school start and finish times.
- Ward councillors had met with the school and had made a number of suggestions, including staggering start and finish times and encouraging students to travel more sustainably.

**Planning Committee
2 September 2015**

- The school needed to enforce its travel plan and possible 'name and shame' repeat offenders.
- The removal of trees was a concern for residents as the site was within a conservation area and would impact residents view on Shorts Road.
- Trees should be replaced where possible and along Shorts Road to hide the new building.

In response to Member questions Councillor Whitehead stated that it was important that the school enacted the school travel plan and should work towards gold status. When ward councillors spoke to the school, they requested more buses to go by the school, however the buses were provided by Transport for London and it was felt there were already a number of buses which served the school.

The principal issues raised by Mr Holliday, Ms Noone and Mr Pierce were:-

- The Local Authority had commissioned 20 forms of entry at Primary level and it was now necessary to start secondary expansion.
- The school had worked constructively with the Local Authority to expand.
- The school provided outstanding education and it was the policy of the council to support expansion of outstanding schools.
- Preference for school spaces would be given to Sutton pupils who would be able to travel sustainably to the school.
- The school was able to expand by two forms of entry, but would be expanding by one only after taking into consideration resident views.
- The school coordinates entry to the school with the current four forms of entry.
- The development would be 30 metres away from the nearest residential properties, which was further than the recommended 20 metre distance.
- Neighbouring properties would not experience a loss of light.
- The school had undertaken public consultation in May 2015 which had been positive and had met with ward councillors to discuss proposals.
- The Headteacher planned to speak to Heads of other Sutton school to propose staggering start and finish times across the borough to avoid buses being unable to take additional passengers.
- The school had written to Transport for London to request additional buses and hoped to work with them to improve transport.
- The school had achieved a bronze award for its travel plan and had employed a senior member of staff to work on achieving silver this academic year.
- Additional bike racks would be provided and it was intended to include cycling on the PE syllabus.
- The site was shared with a primary school and so there was a health and safety risk if they allowed drop off within the school grounds.
- The school felt they had a good relationship with its neighbours.
- Where possible, trees would be replanted within the grounds.
- The school were happy to speak to parents regarding unsafe and inconsiderate parking on surrounding roads.

In response to Member questions Ms Noone acknowledged that the school site had a number of access points but that it was not possible to allow parents to drop off on the site due to the health and safety risks. Furthermore, it was felt that making it easier for parents to drive their child to school would not assist in increasing the number of students travelling sustainably.

The Highways officer stated that these reservations would be raised if access was granted for parents to travel on site, as there would be an increase in the number of vehicles manoeuvring on site and possible conflict between vehicles and pedestrians. A number of parking surveys had been completed over the years around the school, and Highways had requested a further study in light of this application and an expansion planned for the Primary School also. It was felt that there was just enough capacity in the area to take the increased traffic which would result from the two proposed expansions, however the school would require a strong travel plan. It was suggested that the travel plan should be reviewed annually to ensure it was responding to need.

Members were informed that the school were aiming to achieve a gold travel plan from Transport for London, with the support of the London Borough of Sutton officer. If the travel plan was not adhered to then the award would be removed and a punitive fine could be applied.

In response to Member questions Mr Pierce stated that a landscaping scheme would be submitted to officers which would consider the number of replacement trees which could be planted on the site.

Members discussed that the school site was at capacity, and the surrounding road were unable to take any additional traffic. It was suggested the school needed to reconsider access to the site and encourage students to travel more sustainably. The removal of the trees was felt to be unacceptable within the conservation area, and the condition should state the number that would be replanted.

Officers stated that the application was to remove two temporary buildings and replace them with a well designed building which was felt would make a positive contribution to the conservation area. It was suggested by officers that a landscaping plan could be brought back to the committee to agree, if permission were granted.

Members acknowledged the need for additional school places and thanked the school for working constructively with the Council, however the loss of trees was a concern, and parking and traffic issues needed to be mitigated.

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

To grant (3) Councillors Kevin Burke, Richard Clifton and Vincent Galligan

Against (6) Councillors Margaret Court, Patrick McManus, Hamish Pollock, Jason Reynolds, Tony Shields and Graham Whitham

Abstained (1) Councillor Samantha Bourne

A recommendation for deferral was proposed before reasons for refusal were discussed.

A poll vote on deferring consideration of the planning application was held in accordance with Standing Order 31.4, when there voted:

**Planning Committee
2 September 2015**

To defer (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 application No. C2015/71900/FUL be deferred to further consideration and resolution of concerns regarding traffic, parking and access to the school site, and replanting of trees.

**60. WALLINGTON SPORTS AND SOCIAL CLUB, 34 MOLLISON DRIVE,
WALLINGTON - APPLICATION NO. D2015/71533/FUL**

The Committee considered a report on the above application for retrospective application for outbuilding with canopy for storage purposes ancillary to the sports ground.

Officers clarified that the application was retrospective permission for an outbuilding and canopy, and would not affect the enforcement action being undertaken of the other applications that had been submitted. It was felt by officers that this application would consolidate the Sports and Social Club's requirements for storage. Officers stated that by permitting this application they felt that the Council's position would be strengthened if the applicant appealed the other applications, as it would show that the Council had worked with the applicant.

Mrs Florence Nkwan, an objector, addressed the meeting under Standing Order 31.

The principal issues raised by Mrs Nkwan were:-

- There are a number of applications that residents were concerned about.
- The building on the site is substantially larger than the applicant states and the previous building.
- There is a static trailer on the site which is not mentioned in any of the applications.
- Concerned that the site is being used for industrial and commercial use and not just storage.
- Residents have experienced loud noises, such as sawing, from 6am on some days.
- When enforcement officers arrive on site the applicant removes evidence of industrial and commercial activities from the site and replaces it once they leave.
- Concerned that giving permission to this application will enable the other activities, beyond storage and maintenance, to continue.

In response to Member questions Mrs Nkwan confirmed that the storage unit had been on site for two years.

Members were informed that the size of the storage building was as set out in the application. Hours of operation were discussed, however officers informed Members it would be difficult to include a condition on this as hours of use were for the building only and activity was taking place outside the building.

**Planning Committee
2 September 2015**

Officers confirmed that if activities beyond storage were taking place then enforcement action would be taken. It was stated that unannounced enforcement visits would need to take place.

Members requested that a report was brought to the Committee in future which outlined subsequent planning activity on the site. The Committee noted that the building was large and would be of sufficient size for storage needs and stated the need to ensure conditions were adhered to.

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

To grant (8) Councillors Samantha Bourne, Kevin Burke, Richard Clifton, Margaret Court, Vincent Galligan, Patrick McManus, Hamish Pollock, Jason Reynolds, Tony Shields and Graham Whitham

Against (1) Councillor Kevin Burke

Abstained (1) Councillor Patrick McManus

Resolved: That planning permission be granted for application No. D2015/71533/FUL, subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives set out in the Appendix to these Minutes.

61. MEADOWS PLUMBING, GREENFORD ROAD, SUTTON - APPLICATION NO. B2015/72062/FUL

This item was withdrawn from the agenda ahead of the meeting following Councillor Ali Mirhashem's re-delegation. The application was refused under delegated officer's power for reasons stated in the officer's committee report.

62. 92 BURDON LANE, CHEAM - APPLICATION NO. A2015/72099/HHA

The Committee considered a report on the above application for the re-modelling of dwelling, involving demolition of conservatory at rear and bays at front and rear. The erection of a part one part two storey side and front extension incorporating; roof accommodation and balcony, a ground floor rear extension with balcony over and alterations to elevations. The erection of a detached double garage at rear with gym and storage accommodation over with vehicular access onto Warren Avenue, new vehicular access onto Burdon Lane and decking at front and rear.

The application had been de-delegated by Councillor Ramsey.

Officers clarified that the property was outside the Burton Area of Special Local Character, but was on the boundary. The remodelling of the property would lead to the footprint of the property being similar to the current footprint.

The Committee queried whether the application was for a redevelopment of the property or remodel as it was felt that the changes would be significant. Officers stated that the original structure would be substantially retained which allowed it to be classified as a remodel.

**Planning Committee
2 September 2015**

Mr Peter Matthey, an objector, and Councillor Mary Burstow, a ward councillor, addressed the meeting under Standing Order 31, and the applicant, Mr Hashmi replied.

The principal issues raised by Mr Matthey were:-

- The property was on the boundary of the Area of Special Character.
- Residents were happy to see the property being updated and renovated
- The Residents Association had three remaining objections – design, dominating impact on the street scene and the proposed gates.
- The property was in a line of Edwardian villas with a cottage feel which the design of this building did not fit in with.
- There were no other properties in the area with a two storey side extension which went along the road.
- There would be removal of foliage which would make the property more visible and overbearing.
- The application was unclear with regards to the height of the proposed gates and they would not be transparent as other properties gates in the area were.

In response to Member questions Mr Matthey stated that the properties along Burdon Lane were of a consistent design despite the differences which could be found.

The principal issues raised by Councillor Mary Burstow were:-

- There was an eclectic mix of property designs along the road but the application had been designed to ensure the property stood out.
- That the applicant was going too far with the design of the property with the cedar panels and removing the bay windows.
- The gates should be reduced in height and should not be solid, but transparent.
- There is no other building within the area which goes up to the road.

Officers clarified that the gates would be an estimated 1.8 metres high, and that an additional condition could be included which would address boundary details.

The principal issues raised by Mr Hashmi were:-

- Cheam was a nice area and the aim was to enhance the road.
- The design of the property was to keep the features of the area with a pitched roof and gables.
- A modern design stimulates conversation which is beneficial.
- Feel that the design would enhance the area, however the property would be hidden behind trees and hedges which were to be retained.
- The application was to move the vehicular access which would make access safer.
- The garage at the rear of the property would provide privacy to neighbouring properties and to the application property.
- The gates were designed to provide privacy.

In response to Member questions Mr Hashmi confirmed the intention was to make to the alterations to the property and then for his family to live in it. Furthermore, he stated he would be willing to make the gates transparent if necessary.

**Planning Committee
2 September 2015**

Members discussed that there were a number of styles of properties along Burdon Lane and it was important to consider whether the design would enhance or damage the character of the area. Despite the property not being within the Area of Special Character it was important to consider it as a transition property into the area.

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, Hamish Pollock and Jason Reynolds

Against (3) Councillors Patrick McManus, Tony Shields and Graham Whitham

Resolved: That planning permission be granted for application No. A2015/72099/HHA, subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives set out in the Appendix to these Minutes.

The meeting ended at 9.56 pm

Chair:

Date:

This page is intentionally left blank