

# Agenda Item 3

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](http://www.merton.gov.uk/committee).

## DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

15 AUGUST 2024  
(7.15 pm - 8.56 pm)

PRESENT Councillors Councillor Stuart Neaverson (in the Chair),  
Councillor Matthew Willis, Councillor Sheri-Ann Bhim,  
Councillor Billy Hayes, Councillor Martin Whelton,  
Councillor Thomas Barlow and Councillor Edward Foley

ALSO PRESENT Jonathan Berry (Buildings and Development Control Manager),  
Tim Bryson (Area Manager – Development Management),  
Wendy Wong-Chang (Principal Planner), David Gardener  
(Principal Planner) and Richard Seedhouse (Democratic  
Services Officer)

### 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Hicks, Butcher and Johnson. Cllrs Galea, Syeda and Manly attended as substitutes.

### 2 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST (Agenda Item 2)

Cllr Galea declared that one of the architects involved in an application was a former employer, but this would not impede her impartiality in decision making.

### 3 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Agenda Item 3)

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 11 July 2024 are agreed as an accurate record.

### 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 with the exception of bringing Item 9, Canons Madeira Road forward to between items 5 and 6.

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 19 WORPLE ROAD (Agenda Item 5)

The Planning Officer presented the report.

The Committee received representation from an objector who raised the following points:

- In general they were supportive of the plans, and had sought collaborative response, but important objections had been ignored
- 2 additional storeys will have an impact on apartments facing, being overlooked and have an impact on privacy and light
- Extensions at the rear were not part of the approved plan and moved the block closer to apartments in Block 1 impacting on light, unlike in Marcel Rd
- Experience of residents since December 23 did not reflect commitment to noise control and working hours promised, and residents are therefore likely to suffer for the next 3 years during construction
- Asked the committee to reject the proposal for rear extensions, ensure design consistency for the side and rear, in particular with regard to the sawtooth windows, ensure that controls are in place to control site works and times and suitable penalties for infringements.

The applicant raised the following points:

- They had hosted consultation events across 50 hours and learned from neighbours about the area and the evolving role of the town centre
- The project includes spaces for creative space for local traders and community event space available for local residents
- They had made changes in response to feedback, using red brick, removing 10<sup>th</sup> floor, removing terraces, reduced glazing by 30% to protect privacy
- The project will provide over 100 jobs and add £3.5million to the local economy.

In response to questions, it was confirmed that:

- Condition 10 required provision to control dust and smells, it could be amended to include cleaning of Wimbledon Central if necessary and can be included in S106. The applicant was content with this.
- A contribution to EV charging had not been requested as there was no on site carparking
- 20 long stay cycle spaces complied with the London Planning Standard, so we can't request more.
- The applicant wanted to provide opportunities for local people in the construction and operational stages, and so will do everything they can to meet London Living Wage
- It's difficult to plant trees in the area and give them capacity to grow, there is a condition on landscaping, which planning officers will work with the developer to address.
- The development is not encroaching any further than the existing office building, hotel rooms are not generally occupied during the day, the 20m distance between neighbouring buildings is usually regarded as sufficient for

privacy and so the developer had not been requested to use opaque/frosted windows

VOTE with inclusion of amendment to 106

In favour 10

## 6 FARM ROAD (Agenda Item 6)

The Planning Officer presented the report.

There were no representations made on this item.

In response to questions, it was confirmed that:

- Condition 4 could be amended to restrict parking permits only for the houses within the CPZ and any adjoining future CPZs and allow visitor permits for all properties.
- The Urban Greening Factor score has increased from 0.16 to 0.19, the site is congested and while alternatives had been explored the developers were unable to add more planting on this site.
- Surface Water Drainage is conditioned.
- The development will include Swift boxes.

VOTE with amended condition around parking.

10 in favour, unanimous.

## 7 RALEIGH GARDENS CAR PARK (Agenda Item 7)

The Planning Officer presented the report.

In response to questions it was confirmed that:

- Given the location of the site it had not been possible to identify any sites nearby to upgrade existing provision in greening/play spaces, but it was felt that the overall benefits of the scheme outweighed the lack of such provision.
- When the schemes originally went through planning they were designed for private rental, the most advantageous way to deliver affordable housing was to not redesign all the plans but work with the existing offer.

- It cannot be guaranteed that third party landowners nearby would agree to improvements of their existing provision of play space, but it would be possible to include a condition for reasonable endeavours (rather than best, given third party) by the developer, to contribute to a local scheme.
- The ecologist had recommended replacing the boundary wall with hedging and this can be conditioned.  
There could not be planting where windows had been removed as this could be a fire hazard.
- 30 out of 36 units are one bed apartments and are unlikely to have children staying in them needing outside play space
- There are 3 accessible units and 3 accessible parking spaces and they are equipped with EV charging points

VOTE with 2 recommended additional conditions securing EV charging point provision and a scheme to secure reasonable endeavours to provide playspace upgrades

10 in favour, unanimous

## 8 ELM NURSERY (Agenda Item 8)

The Planning Officer presented the report.

In response to questions it was confirmed that:

- It would be possible to add an informative to encourage the applicant to make reasonable endeavours to have defibrillators on site.
- Increasing the walls internally rather than externally, to minimise footprint increase meant removing the ensuite bathrooms to maintain acceptable living space and/or storage.
- The car park is being used by SGN now, and this will continue until works commence.
- There are 2 accessible units and 2 parking spaces, they don't EV points due to fire hazards.
- Cycle parking provision is compliant with the London Plan

VOTE with informative added

10 in favour, unanimous.

## 9 CANONS MADEIRA ROAD (Agenda Item 9)

The Planning Officer presented the report.

The committee received representation from one objector who raised the following points:

- As much has been approved, residents were not aware of this project in 2019
- 50 trees were being removed and replaced with 18 shrubs, all the trees are over 35ft in height, this was not comparable
- With occupants not likely to use public transport, how will parking provision be catered for, during the day nearby carparks are over 80% filled, and over capacity in evening without extra events such as a football. One car blocking Madeira Rd can have a wide ranging impact on the area
- The living rooms overlook the bedrooms of families across from the development.
- The area is too small for what is being planned.

In response to questions it was confirmed that:

- The only tree of significance to be retained is T1, otherwise no change in the layout of this scheme compared to the consented scheme
- Site supervision has been conditioned for monthly updates to be sent to the Tree Officer until completion.
- Traffic/Parking management on Madeira Rd would fall outside this meeting but could be raised as a Members enquiry to Highways
- There is a condition requirement for a construction logistics plan covering deliveries and removals
- 9 bricks higher is necessary for building controls for the safety of maintenance of the solar panels on the roof, so there is no scope to reduce that
- There are cycle stores included within the scheme, and in the amendment have been upgraded as much as possible.

Vote

10 in favour, unanimous

## 10 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS (Agenda Item 10)

The Building and Development Control Manager introduced the report.

It was RESOLVED that the Committee noted the contents of the report.

## 11 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - SUMMARY OF CURRENT CASES (Agenda Item 11)

The Building and Development Control Manager introduced the report.

It was RESOLVED that the Committee noted the contents of the report.

12 MODIFICATION SHEET (Agenda Item 12)