PLANNING COMMITTEE

6 November 2019 at 7.30 pm

MEMBERS: Councillor Kevin Burke (Chair), Councillor Drew Heffernan (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Ben Andrew, Vincent Galligan, Amy Haldane, Jill Whitehead, Eric Allen, Tony Shields and Tim Foster

ABSENT Councillor(s) Peter Geiringer

46. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
The Chair, Councillor Kevin Burke, welcomed those present.

The Chair informed the committee that agenda item 10, Application no. DM2019/01126 - land at rear of 33 Langley Avenue, Worcester Park, KT4 8PB, had been removed from the agenda.

47. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Geiringer with Councillor Gray attending as substitute.

48. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING
RESOLVED: that the minutes of the meetings held on 4 September, 10 September and 2 October 2019 be agreed as an accurate record.

At his request, it was noted that Councillor Shields abstained from the votes on adopting the minutes of the three previous meetings.

49. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
Councillor Shields declared an interest in item 5 as he is a member of Sutton Council and Sutton Council was the applicant for item 5.

50. APPLICATION NO. DM2019/01252 - LAND CORNER OF WELLESLEY COURT AND STONECOT HILL, SUTTON
The committee considered a report on the above application for the erection of a three-storey building comprising six two-bed, self-contained flats, provision of six car parking spaces, hard and soft landscaping, and bin stores.
The Chair explained that the item had been deferred from the previous meeting of 2 October 2019 for there to be a review of the balconies. For this reason, only members who both sat and voted on this item at the meeting of 2 October 2019 would be eligible to debate and vote on the item following its deferral.

Councillor Foster said that there had been Traffic Management Orders implemented over a large region of the London Borough of Sutton. In light of the development, he said that that comments on the application had been received by residents in Burleigh Road and suggested that the application therefore be looked at de novo.

Councillor Shields raised concerns on the application being considered during the pre-election period of purdah. Alison Letts, legal representative, clarified that during a period of purdah questions of major policy or strategy should be avoided. However, she clarified that there was no conflict in purdah in this instance, a decision which had also been confirmed by the council’s Monitoring Officer.

Councillor Shields asked why questions couldn’t be asked by members who did not sit on the 2 October 2019 meeting of the committee for this item, as to do so would be in the public interest. Matthew Stickley, the Committee Services Team Leader, advised that members who were not present at the 2 October 2019 meeting which first considered this application should neither participate in the debate nor vote as to do so would be in contravention of the constitution of Sutton Council. The Chair allowed Councillors Allen, Andrew, and Shields to ask several questions but did not allow for the votes of members not present at the meeting of 2 October 2019 to be recorded.

Following the presentation by Emmanuel Agyei, Planning Officer, Members requested clarification on several aspects of the application, including:

That the high-level windows are 1.7m from the floor. This is following existing government standards.

Grace Donnelly, an objector, and Councillor Dwight, a ward councillor, addressed the meeting under Standing Order 31, and the applicant replied.

The principal issues raised by objectors were:
- There will be a loss of available parking, which is already not monitored
- Residents bought the properties due to the available open, green space which will now be lost
- Loss of communal space, as balconies are counted as community space

The principal issues raised by the ward councillor were:
- Residents do not object to new social and affordable housing, but this application is not a sensible solution
- Even with the amendments made to the balconies, there will still be a reduction of natural light into Wellesley Court
- There will be increased stress on parking provisions as there is not a train station nearby so residents have a greater reliance on their cars
Having balconies included in the design will create an increased noise, which will disturb neighbours.

- The loss of 75% of the existing green space
- Poor air quality created by the increased number of cars queuing to leave the road
- Social and affordable housing should be built on brownfield sites, before green land is considered

The principal issues raised by the applicant/agent were:-

- There is significant need for housing in the borough; currently there are 17,000 people on the council’s housing waiting list, 500 of which are urgent cases
- The proposed building continues the form of the existing flats to ensure architectural continuity
- The proposal shields the green space between properties from noise and air pollution
- The windows will still provide adequate lighting
- The high-level windows will ensure that the privacy of existing neighbours is not impacted

In debate, members considered that:

There was agreement that there is a need for social and affordable housing. However, some members were concerned that there had been a lack of consideration to the surroundings.

Whilst some members agree that the initial concern about the balconies had now been solved, there were concerns raised about the privacy which the Burleigh Road residents will lose as the newly positioned balconies now look into their gardens.

Residents should be consulted on how to use the communal space.

There was concern about the impact on parking, which is currently not managed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM2019/01252 - LAND CORNER OF WELLESLEY COURT AND STONECOT HILL, SUTTON (Committee Report)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A poll vote on the officers’ recommendation to grant permission was held in accordance with Standing Order 31.4, when there voted:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESOLVED:** that planning permission be granted for application no. DM2019/01252 - Land Corner of Wellesley Court And Stonecot Hill Sutton, subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives set out in the planning portal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor Kevin Burke</th>
<th>For</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Drew Heffernan</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Ben Andrew</td>
<td>Not Eligible to Vote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
51. APPLICATION NO. DM2019/00998 - THE ROYAL MARSDEN HOSPITAL DOWNS ROAD, SUTTON, SM2 5PT

The committee considered a report on the above application for the erection of a six-storey detached building for health purposes with clinical care, research, administration, staff restaurant, ancillary uses involving the demolition of Sycamore House and part demolition of Orchard House, and cycle with car parking spaces, and associated hard and soft landscaping.

Following the presentation by Sarah Buxton, Senior Planning Officer, members requested clarification on:

- There are ongoing discussions with Transport for London regarding either creating or extending a bus route to serve the hospital

There will be a net increase of 22 car parking spaces.

Catherine Clarke, an objector, and Councillors Garrett and Hicks, ward councillors, addressed the meeting under Standing Order 31, and the applicant replied.

The principal issues raised by the objector were:-

- Low level of public transport serving the facility - there needs to be a review holistically at the whole site as the more funding invested into the site, the more pressure on transport infrastructure
- A net increase of 22 car parking spaces is not reflective of demand, given the nature of outpatient facilities
- An increase of traffic in Downs Road and Cotswold Road, which already has traffic issues
- Concerns that the junction at Cotswold Road is dangerous with a history of traffic accidents
The principal issues raised by the ward councillors were:-

- Both the ward councillors and residents are proud of the development.
- The design of the building is excellent and more interesting than existing buildings.
- The issue with public transport extends beyond Transport for London’s remit as there are visitors from all over South-East England. There needs to be strategic discussions between TfL and Surrey County Council, which borders the hospital.
- The nearest bus stop is not appropriate for use as it is a grass verge.
- The S3 used to drop visitors off in the hospital grounds, but this is now forbidden after the council bought the land, causing problems for both the hospital and school.
- Pedestrian access from Belmont station is not satisfactory for disabled access.
- Wave 1 of the Cancer Hub project proposed a multi-story car park be built and completed by 2018, which has not yet happened.
- The proposal would be effectively turning around the entrance around to Cotswold road which will need more thought for traffic management and improvements to the junction.

The principal issues raised by the applicant/agent were:-

- The cancer centre is rated the 3rd best in the world.
- There are around 900 clinical trials conducted, mostly in Sutton. There are 350 researchers dispersed around the site, and the new buildings will offer the opportunity for them to all be brought into one place.
- The new facilities will offer a rapid diagnostic centre for the first time on the site.
- The cancer hub links in with the aims of Ambitious for Sutton.
- There is a lot of support received from the community, including over 130 letters of support.
- The scheme is funded by philanthropists, therefore speed and delivery is key to keep donors happy.
- In relation to the 22 parking spaces, there is an assumption that there will be 44 new patients, and 50% will be on site at all times, therefore allowing all of them to potentially park.
- The applicants are happy to look at both the Cotswold Road access and pedestrian route from Belmont Station.
- The site will be accurately signed and further information will be provided in information packs to patients to ensure they know where to park.
- There are ongoing discussions with TfL regarding the return of the bus to the site and so far, these have been productive.

DM2019/00998 - THE ROYAL MARSDEN HOSPITAL DOWNS ROAD, SUTTON, SM2 5PT (Committee Report)

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

RESOLVED: that planning permission be granted for application no. DM2019/00998 - The Royal Marsden Hospital Downs Road, Sutton, SM2 5PT, subject to the conditions, reasons...
and informatives set out in the planning portal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>For</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Burke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew Heffernan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Andrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Galligan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Haldane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Whitehead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Allen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Shields</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Foster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Gray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agreed

52. APPLICATION NO. DM2019/01248 - REAR OF 304 TO 326 WRYTHE LANE AND STAVORDALE ROAD, CARSHALTON

The committee considered a report on the above application for the demolition of 22 garages and the erection of four two-storey semi-detached dwelling houses (4 x 2-bed) with 10 car parking spaces, new hard and soft landscaping works.

Following the presentation by Jimill Patel, Planning Officer, Members requested clarification on several aspects of the application:

The bedrooms will not have the same daylight conditions than habitable areas, such as the kitchen and living room. However, there are two window openings to allow light in.

The Sutton Local Plan allocated the space for 11 houses. However, having considered the site, four houses was shown to be a more realistic option.

The application would involve the loss of 22 existing garages from the site. Of these garages, the applicant has provided evidence that six garages are being used to store a vehicle, two for a motorbike, and one for a disused abandoned motor vehicle. Six parking spaces would, therefore, be provided to compensate for the loss of parking for six vehicles.
The cars parked outside the garage are done so illegally, as the leases state that cars are not permitted to park outside the garage. Therefore, these cars are not included in the displacement count.

The gardens are all above 40㎡, and the recycling and waste bins will be stored within these spaces.

The principal issues raised by applicants were:

- The application is part of a wider programme to deliver 38 units of affordable and social housing.
- The building of houses will be a positive contribution to a site associated with antisocial behaviour. This is through windows overlooking the site, additional lighting in the area, and increased vehicle movement.
- Sutton Housing Partnership has confirmed that the parking outside of garages is illegal and the parking will be monitored wither through a physical barrier or clasp post system.

---

**DM2019/01248 - REAR OF 304 TO 326 WRYTHE LANE AND STAVORDALE ROAD, CARSHALTON (Committee Report)**

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

**RESOLVED:** that planning permission be granted for application no. DM2019/01248 - Rear of 304 to 326 Wrythe Lane and Stavordale Road, Carshalton subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives set out in the planning portal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>For</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Kevin Burke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Drew Heffernan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Ben Andrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Vincent Galligan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Amy Haldane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Jill Whitehead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Eric Allen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Tony Shields</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Tim Foster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
53. ORDER OF ITEMS
The Chair announced that Item 9 would not be considered at this meeting and that Item 11 would be taken before Item 8.

54. APPLICATION NO DM2018/01559 - LAND EAST TO 41-52 ALEXANDRA GARDENS, CARSHALTON, SM5 4NG
The application was to amend the wording of conditions 20 and 21 relating to redevelopment of land east to 41-52 Alexandra Gardens, Carshalton SM5 4NG.

**DM2018/01559 - LAND EAST TO 41-52 ALEXANDRA GARDENS, CARSHALTON, SM5 4NG (Committee Report)**

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

**RESOLVED:** that the wording of conditions 20 and 21 relating to redevelopment of land east to 41-52 Alexandra Gardens, Carshalton SM5 4NG be amended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>For</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Kevin Burke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Drew Heffernan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Ben Andrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Vincent Galligan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Amy Haldane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Jill Whitehead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Eric Allen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Tony Shields</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Tim Foster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Catherine Gray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agreed
55. APPLICATION NO. DM2019/01250 - GARAGE BLOCK AT SOUTHWAY, WALLINGTON

The committee considered a report on the above application for the demolition of 30 garages and the erection of five two-storey dwelling houses (five two-bed) with five car parking spaces, new hard and soft landscaping works, and access from Southway.

Following the presentation by Jimill Patel, Planning Officer, members requested clarification on:

The width of the road was estimated at 3.7m

The will be one parking space allocated per dwelling

Verne Phillips, an objector, and Councillor Lewis, a ward councillor, addressed the meeting under Standing Order 31, and the applicant replied.

The principal issues raised by the objector were:-
- The lane is 11ft wide from kerb to kerb
- There is no designated path for the pedestrian to walk down
- There is inadequate parking on Southway
- He uses the rear access of the house for his disabled daughter, to avoid using steps. This will not be safe if there are cars going down the lane.

The principal issues raised by the ward Councillor were:-
- The officers have engaged with residents and some safety concerns have been addressed
- There will be increased traffic in the area
- There will be a loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties
- The new dwellings are a significant change of use which will impact residents
- There will be increased stress on parking due to the displacement of cars from the garage onto the neighbouring streets

The principal issues raised by the applicant were:-
- The width of the lane is around 3.48m
- The building of 5 houses will equal the amount of activity taking place in 22 garages.
- The applicant shares the concerns about shared access with pedestrians and motor vehicles and having spoken to Highways, they will enforce a traffic management system that is deemed fit.
- The chimney and larger windows offer greater natural ventilation
- The applicant’s analysis has suggested that the site is serviceable and sustainable

DM2019/01250 - GARAGE BLOCK AT SOUTHWAY, WALLINGTON (Committee Report)

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

RESOLVED: that planning permission for application no. DM2019/01250 - GARAGE BLOCK AT SOUTHWAY, WALLINGTON be refused on the grounds that:

- the access to the site from Southway had not been suitably designed;
- Inadequate width of the driveway for access by emergency services and refuse vehicles
- There are concerns for pedestrian safety whilst accessing the site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Kevin Burke</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Drew Heffernan</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Ben Andrew</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Vincent Galligan</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Amy Haldane</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Jill Whitehead</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Eric Allen</td>
<td>Against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Tony Shields</td>
<td>Against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Tim Foster</td>
<td>Against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Catherine Gray</td>
<td>Against</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rejected

56. ANY URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

The meeting ended at 10.45 pm

Chair:

Date: