

- Two representations were received from the applicant responding to letters of objection. The applicant noted in his opinion, that the application would result in an improvement to the residential amenity of the area, and also noted that a number of the objections were not genuine, did not concern material planning considerations or were politically motivated.

The Committee heard a representation against the application from Mr Pineles, a residents' association representative.

The Committee heard representations in support of the application from Mr Edwards, the applicant, and from Mrs Bailey and Mr Hamilton-Miller, who were local residents and members of REIC.

The Committee heard a representation read by Ms Wenman on behalf of Zac Goldsmith, the Member of Parliament for Richmond Park and North Kingston.

The Committee heard representations from Councillor Head and from Councillor Naylor, who spoke as interested Councillors.

The Committee discussed the proposed variation to the condition relating to use of premises (HM01). The nature of Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) was discussed and it was noted that allowing a wider use without having strong reasons for doing so would be contrary to the Council's policies regarding MOL. It was also noted that the application to vary the condition would mean that a wide range of interpretations of the use would be possible and hence it would be difficult to ensure the use did not have a harmful effect on the MOL. It would also be more difficult to ensure this if the permission were no longer personal.

The Committee debated whether relaxing the use and hours of operation would have a harmful impact on neighbouring residents in terms of noise. Members of the Committee felt that given the location of the application site within Metropolitan Open Land, the applicant would need to demonstrate clearly the benefits of removing or varying conditions. It was felt that the potential harm to the MOL outweighed any benefits which had been identified.

It was **RESOLVED**:

That the application be **REFUSED** for the reasons set out in the officer's report.

B. 10/3181/FUL - LAND ADJ TO LEVEL CROSSING, MANOR ROAD, RICHMOND (NETWORK RAIL)

Having declared that she had pre-determined her view, Councillor Harborne withdrew from the Committee for the duration of this item.

The Development Control Officer introduced the item and made the following amendment to the report:

- Add policy 'DM DC1' to reason for refusal.

The Development Control Officer reported receipt of the following correspondence:

Further letters objecting to the scheme, making the following comments:

- "Stairs are inadequate width.
- Fully enclosed bridge would not be used at night for fear of safety.
- Object to design.

- Unsuitable for elderly and disabled or those with pushchairs.
- Covered bridge not necessary when all others in area are open.
- Claustrophobic and threatening environment.
- Appears that many of those who support the bridge have not examined the precise design of the bridge but merely agree with the principle.
- Best option is to rebuild the existing bridge closer to crossing.
- Two bridges, twice the maintenance.
- Positioning will hinder maintenance vehicles.
- Results in people having to cross the road unnecessarily.
- Residents and commuters should not be made to pay for Network Rail's actions in positioning the signalling equipment.
- Impact on privacy, aspect and security would be unbearable.
- In terms of commuters, anyone alighting at North Sheen and wanting to move south would have to use the old bridge, cross the road and then use the new bridge.
- Caging of bridge unnecessary and is not present on other bridges in the area.
- Better control of times the barriers are down would be a better solution."

The Development Control Officer clarified that a total of 21 individuals had objected to the proposal. Additional correspondence was reported:

Two further letters received supporting the scheme including one from the 'Windsor Lines Passengers Association' (WLPA) making the following comments:

- "The WLPA has been campaigning for a long time to have the bridge at North Sheen Station restored to its full width to cater for passengers coming from the south side to the station and to make it possible for pedestrians to walk over the railway when it is closed.
- The WLPA urge the committee to find a modified design or alternative location if this application is rejected.
- Witnessed people crossing with the barriers down.
- The cage is sad reflection on idiots who think it is fun throwing shopping trolleys on to the line, if left off, Network Rail would probably be accused of negligence.
- Initially a new structure always has an impact but after it has been there a while it will just become part of the scenery.
- Question of the times the barriers are down needs to be addressed. This will be less of a problem for the vast majority of pedestrians when the footbridge is built."

Email from Network Rail:

- Network Rail has decided that it will proceed with planning permission for a caged footbridge, but when the bridge is built is will not be caged. If subsequent events prove that there is a health and safety need for the bridge to be caged, Network Rail will install caging.

The Committee heard representations against the application from Mr Brewster and Mr Ingle, who were adjoining neighbours.

The Committee heard representations in support of the application from Mr Carthew, a local resident and from Mr O'Brien, who was representing the applicant, Network Rail.

The Committee heard representations from Councillor Harborne and from Councillor Head who spoke as interested Councillors.

The Committee were concerned about the potential harm that the bridge might cause the residents of Manor Park in terms of being overbearing and visually intrusive. However, it was felt that the bridge would significantly increase pedestrian safety in the vicinity and that station users and local residents were likely to make frequent use of it. Though the Committee were mindful of the need to consider the application before them, it was debated whether an alternative location or size for a bridge would ever be feasible given the restrictions of the surrounding environment. The Committee considered that the potential harm caused by the design and siting of the bridge could be mitigated by conditions. Members felt that neighbouring residents should be given the opportunity to comment on the final design and materials to be used for the bridge in order to reduce visual harm.

It was **RESOLVED**:

- (i) That the application be **APPROVED**, for the following reason:

Reason for Approval: The proposal has been considered in the light of the Development Plan, comments from statutory consultees and third parties (where relevant) and compliance with Supplementary Planning Guidance as appropriate. It has been concluded that there is not a demonstrable harm to interests of acknowledged importance caused by the development that justifies withholding planning permission. The benefits of the proposal in terms of the increase in pedestrian safety are deemed to outweigh the potential detrimental overbearing and visually intrusive impacts on the properties in Manor Park. The potential impacts could also be mitigated by safeguarding conditions regarding external finish and large scale details.

subject to the following conditions and informatives as set out by the Committee:

Conditions:

- (i) Construction Method Statement
- (ii) AT01 - Development begun within 3 years
- (iii) Details to a specified scale: Prior to the commencement of development, a scheme of the following details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (this scheme shall be subject to public notification with all those originally consulted, and if objections are received the scheme will be referred to the Planning Committee for resolution):
- 1. Large scale details (1:20) of external finish, colour, paint and materials of bridge, canopy covering the bridge, new palisade fencing and CCTV column and camera
 - 2. Submission of materials of canopy / parapet on south elevation of enclosure of bridge to the rear of Manor Park properties
 - 3. Details of the anti-graffiti coating
 - 4. Details, materials and position of railings and at bottom of stair cases
 - 5. Details of hard surfacing at bottom of stair cases
- REASON: To ensure the scheme preserves the character, appearance and amenities of the site and area in general.
- (iv) The use of the bridge shall not commence until the canopy over the staircase to the south of the railway line, is installed, of which shall be thereafter maintained. REASON: To protect the privacy of nearby residents.

Informatives:

- Composite informative (reason for approval, building regulations, damage to public highway and principle policies)
- Highway: It will be necessary for part of the land to be adopted by the local highway authority. You are urged to contact the Highways Department (Ansar Hanif - 020-8891-7084) to discuss that procedure. Furthermore, as part of that process a Safety Audit will be required by the Transport Planners and in this respect you are advised to contact Mary Toffi (020 8891 7379).
- For the avoidance of doubt the Drawing(s) No(s) to which this decision refers are as follows:- Drawing numbers Design and Access Statement; General Arrangement Proposed Footbridge B109138/PL/100 Rev P0; Topological Survey; Existing Services Site Plan all received on 2nd November 2010.

C. 09/2564/FUL - DIAMOND HOUSE, FIRST FLOOR, 179-181 LOWER RICHMOND ROAD, RICHMOND (MR RASHED HUSSAIN ZIZA GROUP)

The Development Control Officer introduced the item and reported the receipt of the following:

- One additional representation received in objection to the scheme, reiterating points raised in previous objections and by other objectors.

No representations were heard.

The Committee were satisfied that the travel plan and the temporary period of permission would allow the authority to assess the impact on the highway. The Committee did not identify any potential harm and welcomed that fact that the change of use meant this part of the building would be occupied once more.

It was **RESOLVED:**

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.

D. 10/1992/FUL - DIAMOND HOUSE, GROUND FLOOR, 179-181 LOWER RICHMOND ROAD, RICHMOND (MR RAKESH RATHOD)

The Development Control Officer introduced the report. There were no late corrections to the report.

No representations were heard.

As with the application for the First Floor of Diamond House (09/2564/FUL) the Committee were satisfied that the local authority would have the opportunity to assess the impact on the highway given the temporary permission. The Committee did not identify potential harm and welcomed a new use for the vacant premises.

It was **RESOLVED:**

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and subject to the following additional condition:

LT09 - Hard and Soft Landscaping Required

E. 10/3328/FUL - 36B ROSEDALE ROAD, RICHMOND (MR D. CORBETT)

The Development Control Officer introduced the report and made the following amendments:

Delete conditions DV15 & DV16 and replace with – 'The rooflights in the south facing roofslope shall be permanently fitted with obscured glass and restricted in opening to 100mm in accordance with details which shall have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of the development.

REASON: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining occupiers and the area.'

Add conditions –

- Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, details of internal cycle parking facilities shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall not be completed other than in accordance with the approved details.
REASON: To accord with this Council's policy to discourage the use of the car wherever possible.
- Notwithstanding the details of refuse and recycling provision shown on the approved plans, revised details of the storage facilities shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. Thereafter the development shall not be completed other than in accordance with the approved details.
REASON: In the interests of highway and pedestrian safety together with the amenities of surrounding residential properties.
- No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a construction method statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The statement shall provide for:
 - i) size and routing of construction vehicles and holding areas for these on site;
 - ii) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - iii) the loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - iv) the storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - v) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding;
 - vi) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
 - vii) a scheme for recycling and disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction work;
 - viii) Construction contractors membership of the Considerate Contractors Scheme.REASON: In the interests of highway and pedestrian safety together with the amenities of surrounding residential properties
- Add car club membership to condition DV43A.

The Committee heard representations against the application from Mr Cabrelli and Ms Morgan who were neighbours.

The Committee heard a representation in support of the application from Mr Huntley, the agent.

The Committee discussed imposing a condition of the hours of use in order to mitigate the impact on the highway, but it was noted that it would not be deemed reasonable to impose such a condition. The condition contained within the report

which restricted parking permits was seen as an adequate method of preventing street parking. Though the Committee were mindful of the need to reach a decision on the application before them, they were also mindful of the fact that the premises could be converted to B1 use without planning permission. The Committee did not feel that there was a sufficient level of demonstrable harm in the proposal to justify a refusal.

It was **RESOLVED**:

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.

F. 10/2931/FUL - NEWLAND HOUSE SCHOOL, WALDEGRAVE PARK, TWICKENHAM (MR JEREMY MEAD AGENT ON BEHALF OF NEWLANDS HOUSE SCHOOL)

The Development Control Officer introduced the item. There were no late changes to the report.

The Committee heard a representation against the application from Ms Gandee, a neighbour.

The Committee were concerned about the development's impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties, in terms of noise level. However, it was noted that a 2m high enclosure was permitted development and the use of the enclosure was ancillary to the educational premises which could continue lawfully. As such enforcement against the structure itself would do little to address concerns of noise and disturbance. It was felt that a restriction on the hours of use would minimise the harm caused to the neighbouring properties to an extent.

It was **RESOLVED**:

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report, and subject to the following additional condition and informative:

- Condition U37148 - Limited access

No access to the enclosure shall be made by pupils other than before 3-30pm on a term time weekday.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity having regard to the close proximity of the enclosure with neighbouring private gardens.

- Informative U51444

The applicants are requested, having regard to the close proximity of the existing enclosure with neighbouring private gardens, to consider an alternative location within the school premises. Failing this additional/supplementary screen planting is requested along the boundaries with residential property adjacent to the enclosure.

G. 10/2777/FUL & 10/2780/FUL - 135 FAIRFAX ROAD, TEDDINGTON (MALCOLM WATTON FOR MR N JARVIS)

This application was deferred prior to the meeting and would be heard at a later date.

CHAIRMAN

The meeting, which started at 6.30pm, ended at 10:10 pm.

This page is intentionally left blank

- Awkward, out-of-proportion features - glazing (compare widths - rhythm discordant), canted sign fascia (alignment and height - white render strident)

The retail unit is clearly welcome but no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the retail unit cannot come forward within a scheme of lesser units

- *Planning is an evidence based process and without key information on build costs and Gross Development Value, it has not been demonstrated that the enabling part of the proposed development is only of the scale needed to render the scheme viable as a whole*

If a high density scheme is to be supported, and officers are more than happy to work with the applicant, the building needs to be better mannered in terms of both design and neighbourliness

Residential standards

- Poor external amenity space provision

*More of a why
what is the standard
- require to be*

Other Matters

- If scheme considered acceptable - recommendation will need to be approve subject to S106
- Sustainability and ground contamination by condition
- CSH - rating 3, BREEAM retail - excellent
- Energy - renewables 20%
- Conditions to be drafted by officers

Rejection - need of caution - this was a site for Sainsbury's

1) Highlight Addendum

2) point out crucial from agent re S106

3) point of clarification 9 units, general AI

not specific to building - could be a clothes shop

Mr Wilson - his application to be approved / agreed in

- responsible for design
- located with 4/centre car showroom not listed with 100m
- 1/3 story red brick building in high street with render
- character - credit due to signage etc
- street concerns

Design influenced by site requirements

curved building - narrow, upright but

relates to other high street modern commercial deco

invest to time - landmark building

- creates sense of dynamic interest
- H/S requires access to roof
- design to provide natural surveillance

element - officer report states 7 stars character you saw

3-4 why?

character of building high it to have accent at end

Lv - medium, but not deco

Chair - brave and innovative approach - but will not take

Mr Parsons - app refused in 9 minutes but agreement on

various issues - addendum report

S106 / legal agreement conditions removed & agreed

for 4 reasons

already explained - very subjective 100% achieves

should not impact back etc

Non-technical awards

20-25m gap means not heard

5.5 - 7m to 5 years average

but agreed to plant tree houses

2nd floor level - kitchen, obvious glassed protected zone

4. Had grant of 50m requirement 200

Public exhibition held - support given to mass

Does meet requirements -> matter of judgement

Elementary exhibition - All use or specify a user

user - user was referred to but plans etc don't

general public know its surroundings?

Design - subjective, others report first time is

in context of appeal decisions - proper

agreed by person but exhibit should support

Design various comments about field another

pass

design

getting metal ceiling built

Elementary app 11 to 11 use not

- Review shows a particular quality

question

to the plan surroundings in like happens to provide them

Chair

Disturbance Surroundings

interest & affect to plan area

Chair

plan area to 10% design criteria met

Person - not correct

Mr Gilman - local resident

Chairman part of panel

studies a design fellow - wants to see regeneration

passionate

don't know that AT would include something

add - fantastic feature for high street

has many charity shops - Sainsbury would open
want both businesses so people spend money etc

Tesco - near AT - 15% shop on high street as well as more

want convenience such as fuel & something

not enough here - want to shop there

Sainsbury / AT would be last main building - almost other

shops - increased jobs etc

- give employment - 15% - 20/25%

no night time schools / evening - restaurants

pls need to come to whether to shop, near there, don't

Camille, David - interested in miller

600 parking 1 day - original objectives with design then

v important to written - can't miss

planning clearly need for auto parking

reaching the car - improvements

planning through built - something

crossway might look into one from by pass there

10-15 shops in area - 1 flat

mix of family & new family

more affordable

encourage better housing types etc

car improvements to high street - can't start with

design subjective like it - message numbers will

likely natural surveillance

leaving buildings - should open

Canalter Mathias - what investment - something

- M+S doesn't stand out
white becomes gray

Can response is conditioned to be maintained

→ paper built - don't have it etc.

→ design will endure, can be iconic detail

Dengens - miss - resisted original design - we resisted
and get a development that fits well

Redding - respected height of high street

elliptical - out of scale with area here

response - iconic - not idiosyncratic

1st - has white squares

20% architecture with towers - modern, takes the place

Means - precedence

regardless of who is making or why break
design policies?

elliptical response - late design - fits 9' limit - having etc

height is central point - design cues - still look
at community wall

miss - 5' limited to vertical

→ something comes onto another one but in

have gone against our policies - what

guard's called in, why? means? who is
in different

elliptical - whether is in decline, area is underutilized
in due need of regeneration

Meaning - how much regulation on design?

elliptical - low type, will also high street - ideas

→ prediction

pages

Local App notes

only 2 objections, 9 letters of support

Elengans - facade is nice height of others in high street
is this acceptable or
what signage takes the form well

Morris - letters of support / letter of objection
1000 letters of objection but have planning policies
not just for within, for whole borough
agree getting another key step is important
but must be careful to go against officer recommendation
this will be brought up

Elliot - needs of within as town centre
design within high street
compact site - generating everything within
needs

Mathias - where is well -> fundamental
- community wall - Elliot explained reasons

Camille Day - not police discretion
Elliot -> key thing is create national council
and book would go to council
- improve on equality of use

Camille Day interested council

Trying to get Sandhurst in within but to get them into
cc-cc. make people in within desperately want one
in there - longer than locals is that officer's going
to turn down Sandhurst

- modest savings are
except developer parking banks
- do we need a main flats?
→ not parking one way or the other
- worry about consultation but not invited committees
gather in savings
could come down with height + loss density
savings might nullify any gain
can see why problems will arise

Memo - Memo to notes - agree that savings could nullify any

use question why are we breaking planning policies
Canary Wharf height, density, design etc
CJesp - response - density with some economic regeneration
whether or not. It to be said for it going through
economic regeneration benefits strong judgement
all

Committee - what other consultation has been published?

Can signpost consultation - council website. Lots of detail
not same formal consultation as well

Chair - shed some light on pre-application hand del stage?
planning dept painted unympathetic - can't be better
from better

- CT normally take part pre-app or before advice
outlining our views etc - explain process
not submitted without pre app

However agree that some issues addressed

scaling + neighbouring concerns still concern
no awarded drawings not

agreed to bring to committee due to sensibleness limited
- Statement of community involvement substantial
Chair - has advice been ignored?

CT - yes some aspects taken on board but other
part not listened to
effect - area return to null

Detail 1

- economic regeneration is not of a proportion
exp. less to see expansion of retail + residential mixed
use - are willing to support
clearly compliant with draft local plan + local plan
to retail in town centres

however many issues of merit
There are elements that are unacceptable
scaling + neighbour's issues

see 3 stores 5m per year garden, ^{system} ~~unacceptable~~

accept that design detrimental to personal preference but
scaling, massing + design should be considered

lack of real figures - per density 9 units 106 per hectare
major recommend 23-28 units
but can 400/ha
major - not greater than 250

high density not a reason for refusal on its own
but street scene issues - 400 put many objections

effect - review for retail inhibited claim?

CT - major the main reason @ scaling design
street scene

Q - rose analysis, have to get it
over

Other reasons can be dealt with by conditions
+ legal agreement

credibility condition not completely satisfied

• reasonable 20% reduction

and continuation - repeat message

given that site manager (retail org)

• social responsibility, ensuring sufficient benefit cycle & not
can be swept up in 50% ^{not distributed} _{market}

agreed with Mr. Khan to contribute a benefit
of client

• contribute towards improvement of site allowing
street parking in structure

external elements difficult to address req. 50% + 10% can be
steps required for this scheme

not tenable could be unacceptably relaxed but
at earliest could

however, scale rises a priority not acceptable

Next sounds like lot of advice taken on board

Views

Views - app is positive but regrettable -

ambiguity
to come back

if have something in response
would be set back with scheme

→ most jarring ever given pp
for so far from policy
is a difficult to go with

Chair: opening views?

no opening views

USA

referred on all grounds all voted against
all voted against

pp with