

All minutes are draft until agreed at the next meeting of the committee/panel. To find out the date of the next meeting please check the calendar of events at your local library or online at www.merton.gov.uk/committee.

DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

24 AUGUST 2023

(Time Not Specified - Time Not Specified)

PRESENT Councillors Councillor Aidan Mundy (in the Chair),
Councillor Matthew Willis, Councillor Sheri-Ann Bhim,
Councillor Michael Butcher, Councillor Edward Foley,
Councillor Billy Hayes, Councillor Dan Johnston,
Councillor Thomas Barlow and Councillor Martin Whelton

ALSO PRESENT Jonathan Berry (Head of Development Management and
Building Control), Stephen Hill (Planning Officer), Jayde Watts
(Democratic Services Officer)

ALSO PRESENT Sarath Attanayake (Transport Planning Project Officer)
ONLINE

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr McGrath with Cllr Galea in attendance as substitute.

2 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST (Agenda Item 2)

There were no declarations of interest.

3 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Agenda Item 3)

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the following meetings were agreed as an accurate record:

- 26 April 2023
- 15 June 2023
- 20 July 2023

4 TOWN PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Agenda Item 4)

The Committee noted the amendments and modifications to the officer's report. The Chair advised that the agenda would be taken in the published agenda order. Please note that members of the public, including the applicant or anyone speaking on their behalf, are expressing their own opinions and the Council does not take any responsibility for the accuracy of statements made by them.

5 565 KINGSTON ROAD, RAYNES PARK, LONDON SW20 8SA (Agenda Item 5)

The Planning Officer presented the report.

The committee received presentations from one objector who stated:

- They were not against the development but was opposed to the scale which would impact traffic and neighbours.
- Although they were aware that the site was in need of development the scale felt like an unnecessary overdevelopment.
- Even though consideration was given to the impact on traffic and neighbours they haven't fully addressed the reality of having a school for 180 children with specific learning needs who were likely to be dropped off to school.
- Many residents work from home so consideration would be needed during construction.

The committee received representation from the applicant Michael Wood who raised points including:

- The proposed development was for a SEN school facility which specialised in the needs of neurodiverse children between the ages of 9yrs old and 13yrs old.
- The development provided additional community facilities and 9 new homes.
- Merton's School Places Strategy identified a growing need for SEN placements.
- The development was specifically designed as a middle school and would be co-educational to help with the current shortfall of available places, particularly for girls with neurodiverse challenges.
- The scheme included a ministry hub.
- The 9 apartments would help fund the development and contribute to the Council's housing needs.
- The proposal was compliant with all local, regional and national policies.
- The NPPF required planning authorities to give great weight to the need to create and expand educational provisions.
- The design of the scheme was carefully thought out and aspired to compliment the adjoining successful development.
- They appreciated the concerns raised by neighbouring residents around loss of light and overshadowing. The application included a detailed daylight and sunlight assessment and amendments were made based on recommendations.
- NPPF Para. 125 encouraged flexibility when applying the BRE guidelines, particularly Brownfield sites and sustainable locations.
- To address traffic and transport, the school promoted sustainable modes of transport and had a car free model with no parking facilities onsite.
- There would be improved drainage performance on the site, increased green spaces and was overall was a development which contributed to the character of the street scene.
- They intended to be a considerate construction build and would want to periodically have check-ins with the community so that concerns could be

addressed. There would be no objection for a condition to establish a resident liaison group

In response to questions raised by the committee, Planning Officers advised:

- In relation to light there was daylight, sunlight and a sense of enclosure to consider which were all assessed in slightly different ways. Daylight and sunlight above the church was assessed as acceptable and met the guidelines on the upper floors. The second and third floors did not necessarily meet the guidelines but there were good mitigating factors for why the BRE guidelines should be applied flexibly, as outlines in the BRE guidelines para. 125. It would be unreasonable for a development not to come forward which was of the same scale as an existing property. In relation to the sense of enclosure, the build was out of necessity to accommodate the apartment of the existing property and would not have an impact on privacy as it was seven to ten meters away. This was looked at carefully and due to the mirroring of the two developments they considered the impact to be acceptable.
- The applicant spoke about Kiss and Walk, which was not an expectation but rather an arrangement which similar schools used to help children get to school safely.
- There would be no impact to privacy on the west of the building as windows suggested in the pre application were removed.
- Solar panels were added but no battery storage was proposed.
- The air quality officer was consulted and had no concerns subject to the existing conditions. No measurements were conducted but as the development was in an air quality management area there conditions to address this.
- If the applicant wanted to change the cycling provision once it was built they could change it if it was not material which it may well not be. If it was material they would need to apply

The Chair invited the applicant to respond to clarify details raised within questions from the committee.

The applicant informed the committee of the following:

- Windows on the west of the building were removed due to privacy concerns raised in the pre application.
- The roof plan was amended to increase the number of solar panels which did not result in any loss of greenspace.
- Battery storage was considered but cost was a factor to consider especially as the development received a high carbon efficiency score. There was an offset contribution of £14000 for the shortfall of achieving net zero but due to the size of the development, this was a low amount.
- As part of the air quality assessment, which was submitted with the planning application, the development was air quality neutral and wouldn't worsen the air quality in the area. Movement would be measured to track air quality and the condition in place required continued compliance.

- A travel plan was submitted which included measures to explore and encourage sustainable transport methods. Kiss and Walk could be one of those measure, but they were not able to guarantee this yet as they were unsure on where those facilities would be.
- The school would mainly focus on dyslexia, dyspraxia and dyscalculia and they have sought advice from the country's leading expert. Such conditions are not linked to behavioural issues but are memory processing issues.
- They would be keen to introduce Kiss and Walk but as of yet do not have the necessary arrangements in place.
- Dining and play would have to be staggered.
- As part of the noise assessment there were measures to provide mitigation that would be implemented.
- They would be happy to reintroduce the use of the playground as a car park, particularly on Sundays.
- Although they were not specialist SEN architects, they have sought advise and would be happy to speak with consultants if help was needed.
- There was a ground floor fire strategy plan. The link between the school and church would be operated by key cards so pupils could not enter the church building.
- They were committed to being as green as possible but now recognised that support for staff parking may be something that would be beneficial to the children.

The Chair moved to the vote on the Officers' recommendation with the following additional conditions and informatives: Votes For – 10, Against – 0, Abstentions – 0.

CONDITIONS AND MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED IN s106 AS AMENDMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO THOSE SET OUT IN OFFICER'S REPORT:-

- It was first suggested that the condition related to no stopping would be updated to the following: The applicant has agreed in the course of further meetings with the Council to have regard to the parking arrangements that shall apply along Kingston Road between the junction of the lower Downes Road and Raynes Park Station and any arrangements that are so agreed will be confirmed, and at the Councils discretion, reflected upon a transport discussion regarding the signing of a 106 agreement. This was subsequently amended following input from Head of DM to (wording TBC): The development either should not be commenced or be occupied until a new traffic management order has been implemented in the area unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
- Residents be allowed parking permits limited to one per unit if they drove emission free car. Teachers with zero carbon cars would have a similar scheme. Capacity for the resident and teacher scheme would be measured by number of spaces available against permits issued, in order to reassure residents. The teacher scheme would align with the existing Teacher Permit scheme. It was also agreed that a parking survey would also be carried out of the immediate area by the Council's Transport Consultant to assess what the capacity is now, particularly during the day, and to assess how the parking

pressure in the local area would be impacted by the proposals for the new residents and teacher permits.

- No heavy work to take place on a weekend. If there were exceptions the applicant must apply for permission.
- Change to 106 for best endeavours for Kiss and Walk.
- The appointment of a Resident Liaison Officer to work with residents and communicate key moments of heavy works
- Vehicles must leave the site in forward gear drive.
- Reasonable endeavours to explore incentives for teachers to drive zero carbon cars and the provision of charging bays.
- Reasonable endeavours to appoint a SEN specialist to comment on playground design

INFORMATIVES:

- For the applicant to work with immediate neighbours to address concerns related to dust.
- Provision for playground to be used as a car park on Sundays

RESOLVED: That the Committee GRANTED Planning Permission Subject to Conditions and Informatives and the conclusion of a s106 Agreement.

6 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS (Agenda Item 6)

The report was noted.

7 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - SUMMARY OF CURRENT CASES (Agenda Item 7)

The report was noted.

8 GLOSSARY OF TERMS (Agenda Item 8)

9 MODIFICATION DOCUMENT (Agenda Item 9)