

**Merton Council**  
**Development and Planning**  
**Applications Committee**

**15 June 2023**

**Supplementary agenda**

12 Modification Document

1 - 34

This page is intentionally left blank

## Planning Applications Committee

15<sup>th</sup> June 2023

### Supplementary Agenda

### Modifications Sheet.

#### Contents Page

Pages 1 – 22	<u>ITEM 6 HIGH PATH ESTATE SOUTH WIMBLEDON SW19 2TG</u>
Pages 23 - 30	<u>ITEM 7 - EDDIE KATZ 42 STATION ROAD COLLIERS WOOD LONDON SW19 2LP</u>
Pages 30	<u>ITEM 8 - PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - SUMMARY OF CURRENT CASES</u>
Pages 30	<u>ITEM 9 - CLARION WANDLE BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION</u>
Pages 30	<u>ITEM - 10 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS</u>

## ITEM 6 (6 HIGH PATH ESTATE SOUTH WIMBLEDON SW19 2TG)

### KEY FACTS (provided by applicant)

<b>Approved 29.04.2019</b>	<b>Proposed Revised Outline for Phases 4-7B</b>
<b>Application Ref. 17/1721</b> Amended by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 21/P1932 (non-material change to wording in description of development, no change to scheme)</li> <li>• 21/P2806 (amends to parameters in Phase 3)</li> <li>• 22/P1740 (amends to energy strategy)</li> <li>• 23/P0515 (non-material change to planning condition wording to allow discharge on a plot basis)</li> </ul>	<b>Application Ref. 22/P3686</b>
<b>Type of Application:</b> Outline, all matter reserved	<b>Type of Application:</b> Outline, all matter reserved
<b>Application for:</b> OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION (WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED, EXCEPT IN RELATION TO	<b>Application for:</b> OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION (WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED, EXCEPT IN RELATION TO

<p>PARAMETER PLANS) FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE PHASED REGENERATION OF HIGH PATH ESTATE COMPRISING DEMOLITION OF ALL EXISTING BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES; PROVIDING UP TO 1570 RESIDENTIAL UNITS (C3 USE CLASS); PROVISION OF UP TO 9,900 SQM OF COMMERCIAL AND COMMUNITY FLOORSPACE (INC REPLACEMENT AND NEW FLOORSPACE, COMPRISING: UP TO 2,700 SQM OF USE CLASS A1 AND/OR A2, AND/OR A3 AND/OR A4 FLOORSPACE, UP TO 4,100 SQM OF USE CLASS B1 (OFFICE) FLOORSPACE, UP TO 1,250 SQM OF FLEXIBLE WORK UNITS (USE CLASS B1), UP TO 1,250 SQM OF USE CLASS D1 (COMMUNITY) FLOORSPACE; UP TO 600 SQM OF USE CLASS D2 (GYM) FLOORSPACE); PROVISION OF NEW NEIGHBOURHOOD PARK AND OTHER COMMUNAL AMENITY SPACES, INCL CHILDREN'S PLAY SPACE;</p> <p>PUBLIC REALM, LANDSCAPING, LIGHTING; CYCLE PARKING (INCL VISITOR CYCLE PARKING) AND CAR PARKING (INC WITHIN GROUND LEVEL PODIUMS), ASSOCIATED HIGHWAYS AND UTILITIES WORKS.</p>	<p>PARAMETER PLANS) FOR REVISED PROPOSALS FOR PART OF THE PHASED REGENERATION OF THE HIGH PATH ESTATE, COMPRISING DEMOLITION OF ALL EXISTING BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES AND THE ERECTION OF BUILDINGS TO DELIVER NEW HOMES, FLEXIBLE NON-RESIDENTIAL FLOORSPACE (INCLUDING RETAIL, LEISURE, BUSINESS AND COMMUNITY USES); PROVISION OF PUBLIC OPEN SPACE (INCLUDING REMAINDER OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PARK) AND OTHER COMMUNAL AMENITY SPACES, INCLUDING CHILDREN'S PLAY SPACE; PUBLIC REALM, LANDSCAPING, LIGHTING; CYCLE PARKING AND CAR PARKING, TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED HIGHWAYS AND UTILITIES WORKS. THE APPLICATION RELATES TO PHASES 4-7B (BASED ON THE ILLSUTRATIVE PHASING).</p>
<p><b>Housing:</b> up to 1570 homes (Phases 2-7)</p> <p>[134 homes separately approved for Phase 1 ref: 16/P3738]</p> <p>Total homes across masterplan – up to 1,704</p>	<p><b>Housing:</b> up to 1,651 homes (Phases 4-7B)</p> <p>[134 homes approved for Phase 1 113 homes approved in Phase 2B 374 homes proposed in Phase 3C]</p> <p>Total homes across masterplan – up to 2,272</p> <p>Uplift of 568 homes</p>
<p><b>Wheelchair:</b> 10%, up to 157 homes</p>	<p><b>Wheelchair:</b> 10%, up to 227 homes</p>
<p><b>Non-residential floorspace:</b></p> <p>Up to 9,900sqm (Phases 2-7), comprising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• up to 2,700 sqm of Use Class A1 and/or A2, and/or A3 and/or A4 floorspace,</li> <li>• up to 4,100 sqm of Use Class B1 (office) floorspace,</li> <li>• up to 1,250 sqm of flexible work units (Use Class B1),</li> <li>• up to 1,250 sqm of Use Class D1 (Community) floorspace; and</li> </ul>	<p><b>Non-residential floorspace:</b></p> <p>Up to 5,000sqm (Phases 4-7B), comprising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• up to 1,750 sqm Class E(a) and E(b) retail, cafes and restaurants</li> <li>• up to 1,250 sqm Class E(d) indoor sport, recreation and fitness</li> <li>• up to 750 sqm of Class E(c), E(e) and E(f) financial and professional services, medical or health services, creche, day nursery or day centre.</li> <li>• up to 1,750 sqm Class E(g) employment</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• up to 600 sqm of Use Class D2 (Gym floorspace);</li> </ul> <p>Total: up to 9,900sqm across masterplan</p>	<p>Plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• up to 500 sqm Sui Generis (drinking establishment)</li> <li>• up to 750sqm Class F1(f) and/or F2(b) places of worship / halls / meeting places for the local community</li> </ul> <p>Plus up to 2,200sqm in earlier phases</p> <p>Total: up to 7,200sqm across masterplan</p>
<p><b>Affordable Housing:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 357 affordable homes, replacing homes for existing tenants. Residents return on the same tenure basis.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Affordable Housing:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 410 within phases 4-7B</li> <li>• Up to 584 across all phases</li> <li>• (Net uplift of up to 227 homes (equivalent to 40% of uplift in homes – 40% x 568 = 227))</li> <li>• All replacement homes would be in social rent tenure.</li> <li>• The additional 227 affordable homes would be split 60% social rent and 40% shared ownership</li> <li>• LBM will have 100% nomination rights on the additional affordable homes</li> </ul>
<p><b>Car Parking</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 304 car parking spaces across all phases</li> </ul>	<p><b>Car Parking:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 361 car parking spaces across all phases</li> <li>• Uplift of 57 spaces – all for disabled users (equivalent to 10% of the uplift in homes)</li> <li>• 4 car club bays</li> </ul>
<p><b>Layout</b></p> <p>The proposed layout remains broadly consistent with the approved masterplan. The layout parameters continue to seek to ensure the creation of a series of perimeter blocks which allow for the creation of a series of direct north to south, and east to west access routes through the masterplan. This will re-instate an urban grid pattern connecting to the street network to the north on the opposite side of Merton High Street. A centrally located Neighbourhood Park for public use is proposed linking Merton High Street to High Path.</p>	
<p><b>Access and Movement Strategy</b></p> <p>There is no change proposed to the movement strategy. The proposals will re-connect the Estate with the wider street network, prioritising pedestrian and cyclist movements. Pedestrian routes and cycle routes are to be improved across the Site with high quality new and retained streets and shared surface areas. The routes created will provide north to south and east to west routes through the neighbourhood improving permeability.</p>	

The proposals will provide numerous access points from High Path, Merton High Street, Morden Road and Abbey Road for pedestrians and cyclists, with direct and legible routes created, in contrast to the poor connectivity on the existing estate. The proposals include the provision of a new cycle route link between the existing east to west cycle track along Merton High Street with the existing west to east cycle track along High Path.

**Storey Heights**

- Range of heights across the masterplan from 2 to 12 storeys, with the tallest blocks adjacent to the station (up to 12 storeys), along Morden Road (up to 11 storeys) and along the park (up to 10 storeys)
- Up to 4 storeys along Abbey Road
- Up to 5 storeys along High Path
- Up to 5 storeys along Nelson Grove Road
- Up to 6 and 7 storeys along Merton High Street

**Storey Heights**

- Range of heights across the masterplan from 3 to 13 storeys, with the tallest blocks adjacent to the station (up to 12 storeys), along Morden Road (up to 11 storeys), along the park (up to 13 storeys) and western Garden Street (up to 13 storeys)
- Up to 4 storeys along Abbey Road
- Up to 4 and 5 storeys along High Path
- Up to 3 and 5 storeys along Nelson Grove Road
- Up to 6 and 8 storeys along Merton High Street

**Carbon savings / Energy strategy:**

- Originally CHP based energy centre which was to provide a district wide heat network.
- Revised energy strategy approved via amendments in 2022, which switched the energy source from gas based CHP to Air Source Heat Pumps. PV panels also proposed in original and amended strategy.

**Carbon savings / Energy strategy**

- Connection to ASHP based energy centre, and solar PV panels.
- 63% reduction in CO2 emissions compared to current (2021) building regulations.

**Trees:**

The tree removals and retention strategy remains consistent with that approved. The tree planting strategy for the masterplan will result in a significant uplift in trees across the neighbourhood (over 300 trees are proposed to be planted vs 138 approved for removal), and will involve careful selection of trees to maximise urban greening and biodiversity net gain.

**Play Space:**

The play strategy is proposed to be upgraded to ensure that a minimum 10sqm of playspace is provided per child. For the revised masterplan, based on the illustrative accommodation schedule, there is a requirement for 7,758 sqm. It has been demonstrated that this level of play can be accommodated as part of the masterplan through a variety of playspace to suit all age ranges.

**Urban Greening:**

- This was not a policy measure at the time – the calculation did not exist.

**Urban Greening:**

- 0.35, maximised via planting, green roofs provision, tree planting, etc...

**Biodiversity Net Gain:**

- This was not a policy measure at the time – the calculation did not exist.

**Biodiversity Net Gain**

- 87% net gain predicted in ecological value

## Summary of Changes

### Changes

The revised proposals are an evolution of the approved masterplan. They have been designed to retain many of its principles such as the access and movement strategy, the layout and street network, open space and public realm strategies, and principles of high quality architecture and landscaping. The main revisions involve an amended scale and massing strategy, which will enable the delivery of a greater number of new homes, including affordable housing. A summary of the key changes is provided below:

- Net uplift in housing – increase of up to 568 new homes, with 227 of these being affordable homes
- Introduction of shared ownership tenure, 40% of 227 affordable homes will be provided in this tenure.
- Reduction in non-residential floorspace to take account of the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic.
- Increased scale and massing introduced across the masterplan, albeit careful consideration given to relationship with surrounding neighbourhoods and design quality, by retaining lower scale development along Abbey Road, embedding stepped height increase along Merton High Street, and where necessary lowering heights along the east-west blocks (along Nelson Grove Road and High Path) to ensure appropriate levels of light can reach the courtyard gardens and new homes.
- Strengthening of Design Code where necessary to ensure a high design quality is delivered.
- Increased playspace provision to take account of uplift in homes.
- Enhanced consideration given to sustainability in developing the outline masterplan principles – to be taken forward when developing the reserved matters, including in relation to carbon reductions, whole life carbon, circular economy principles, urban greening and ecological enhancements.

## **ADDITIONAL OBJECTION FOLLOWING COMMITTEE REPORT**

### Objection received

I own [REDACTED] (consisting of 3 flats and a shop), I have objected to this and the previous application on the basis that the proposed buildings overshadow my property and we will not be able to access the gas meters that are on the side of the building. I am very concerned with regard to the report that is being put in front of the committee on the 15th of June as it states under paragraph 6.1.2 Table 1 my objection and the Officer's response "that they have inspected the neighbour's property in question and is

situated at a distance 106.13m (348.19ft) from the nearest part of the development." Is he talking about Plot 6, 7, or 8 the nearest plot to me is Plot 1 and that looks like it's next door less than 1 meter away, and find his response very misleading. I believe that the Council officers have not correctly looked at my objections as they seem to think my building is on the other side of Abbey Road.

### **Officers' response**

Officers can confirm that site visits were undertaken to view any potential harm that may arise on this neighbour including the row of properties that bound the proposed development along Merton High Street. To explain the methodology used when assessing impact on neighbouring amenities, officers had considered any potential harm that would arise from the nearby development and also any likely harm from the tallest part of the development. It is acknowledged that officers could have put their wording more clearly when responding to this specific objection in the neighbour consultation section of the committee report. However, officers confirm that the correct assessment had been undertaken to assess impact on this neighbouring and adjoining properties.

Daylight/sunlight/overshadowing assessments had been undertaken on the neighbouring properties along Merton High Street, as noted in paragraph 15.1.17 of the committee report. The assessment on daylight and sunlight had followed the BRE guidelines (Building Research Establishment) to determine impact on daylight, using the VSC (vertical skyline component) and NSL (No-Skye Line) This would determine the level of daylight that would enter the habitable rooms of adjoining properties.

A similar assessment was undertaken to assess impact on sunlight levels to neighbouring properties due to the proposed development. The method that was used is known as a PSH, this basically applies probable sunlight hours calculations, taking regard of the south, east and west facing windows of neighbouring properties.

In terms of overshadowing impact, as noted in paragraph 15.1.23 of the committee report, an assessment for this was also undertaken by the applicant and examined by case officers. Amenity areas belonging to surrounding properties located mainly to the east, west and north of the site were assessed for overshadowing impacts from the Proposed Development. The results of the analysis revealed that there will be no significant negative impact on most of the surrounding amenity areas from the Proposed Development. Noting that the site is in an area designated for intensification of development and considering that at present the site is in low density use, as such the scale of impact is considered not significant.

In terms of impact from the scale and massing of the proposed development on neighbouring properties, officers had assessed the proposed parameter plans against the neighbouring properties situated South of Merton High Street and North of the proposed development. Paragraph 12.1.20 of the committee report provides an assessment to any likely impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties and explains the methodology of height increases and reduction within parts of the estate. Officers acknowledge and confirm that the objection received from the neighbouring site adjoins plot 1 of the proposed development. It is noted that the proposal (plot 1) would comprise of height increase of 2.5m, however this increase in height (which is close to this neighbour) would have a setback design approach with the edges of the additional floor being set away from the permitted building height below. This design approach (setback floor) would help reduce impact upon this neighbour as it would not be clearly visible from ground level or the neighbours upper-level windows and would not have a material impact on the light assessment beyond the already permitted building heights in the extant permission. It should also be noted that there would be height reduction on part of plot 1. In the officer's original



response, it was noted that the neighbour who has objected is situated 104m from the nearest part of the development along Abbey Road. Officers acknowledge that the wording used was not as intended and was not clear. What officers meant to have said was that the development in relation to the neighbour who has objected is situated approx. 106m from the tallest part of the development located on plot 7 and plot 8. Officers confirm that site visits were undertaken early in the application process and also visited with section managers to ensure that the appropriate assessment was undertaken.

It is also worth pointing out that the top floors of most of the blocks resulting in height increase would comprise of setback at top floors as indicated in the submitted design code, which will be shown in illustration form at PAC presentation.

Following the extensive review and assessment which included site visits over the period of 6 months since receipt of this application, officers are satisfied that any impact resulting in loss of daylight, sunlight, overshadowing, scale and massing from the proposal on neighbouring properties would not be considered significant based on the assessment undertaken. This was also considered in the context of the approved outline planning permission for phases 2-7 reference 17/P1721.

In terms of the gas meter located on the flank wall of the neighbouring property in question, officers acknowledge previous responses and that the wording was not clear. Officers also acknowledge and make it clear that the gas meters would be located on the flank wall close to the proposed development. However, officers would also note that this proposed outline application is an illustrative design and only assessing the parameter plans. The gas meters on the flank wall of neighbouring property would be dealt with via a Party Wall agreement between the applicant and the neighbouring property. This would take place once a detailed reserved matters has been submitted and approved. The likely timetable for reserved matters submission of phase 4 is 2026, with indicative commencement of development date 2027. As such prior to the commencement of any development both parties would have to undergo legal requirements covered under the Party Wall Act.

### **Late support to committee report**

I was pleased to see the outline planning application for High Path phases 4-7. I have worked closely with families living on the High Path Estate for the last ten years. During this time, I have come to understand the problems families face because of living in overcrowded or damp properties. Families need good quality housing with adequate space so that children can play. Poor quality housing and cramped conditions have a negative impact on children's development. The proposals for phases 4-7 will provide a good supply of high-quality housing for local families who desperately need it. Constructing these new homes for families will have a positive impact on the health and wellbeing of children in our local community.

### **Amendments to the report**

<b>ParagraphNumber</b>	<b>Applicant Comments</b>
<b>3.3.1</b>	Correction: "...Parts of the <del>masterplan</del> <u>park</u> are to be delivered within Phase 3A and 3C, with the remaining areas being completed in Phases 4-7B."
<b>4.13.1</b>	Correction - 19/P1852 – this application relates to Phases 2A and 2B, not application ref: 21/P2806.
<b>5.1.5</b>	The applicant has responded to TfL comments and is awaiting a reply. Additional information has been requested from TfL.
<b>5.1.12</b>	As above
<b>7.1.1</b>	Add:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Merton's Draft Local Plan which is currently being examined by Inspectors appointed by the Secretary of State.</li> </ul>
<b>7.2.2</b>	Add Policy H11 Build to Rent
<b>9.1.21</b>	Clarification: The remaining phases of the High Path masterplan will deliver 2.3 years of housing supply. The three regeneration schemes in total will deliver up to 3,272 homes. 155 homes have already been built. The remaining homes to be built (up to 3,117 homes) will deliver 3.4 years of Merton's housing supply.
<b>11.1.12</b>	Typo, should refer to: ...40 per cent of the additional residential properties...."
<b>13.1.13 and 13.1.26</b>	Clarification: St Johns Church, High Path and No. 25 Abbey Road are locally listed buildings.
<b>15.1.14</b>	Correction: Overall, the <del>proposed uplift</del> <u>neighbouring properties</u> would retain a good level of daylight in accordance with the BRE guidelines.
<b>18.1.7</b>	Clarification: New conditions would be attached with any such consent to ensure the applicants provide an <del>ecology and biodiversity assessment</del> <u>ecological management plan</u> in line with the requirements of national and local planning policies.
<b>18.1.7</b>	Clarification: the RHS (Royal Horticultural Society) and Buglife (The Invertebrate Conservation Trust) both publish lists of plants recommended for the enhancement of biodiversity.
<b>21.1.9</b>	Add: This will be secured in the s106 Deed of Variation.
<b>23.1.9</b>	<p>Update: The Applicant has provided further swept path analysis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In terms of delivery/servicing vehicles, the Applicants transport consultant has undertaken swept path analysis for both a 7.5 tonne (8 m length) box van and a 10 m length rigid truck. It is expected that the 10 m length rigid truck will be the largest type of delivery vehicle to service the proposed retail/commercial units, although smaller-type retail/commercial units are often serviced using smaller types of vehicles, such as 7.5 tonne (8 m length) box vans, transit vans, or similar. A 10 m length rigid truck therefore represents a robust 'worst case' in terms of delivery requirements for the proposed retail/commercial units.</li> </ul> <p>In terms of the Phase 3C retail/commercial units to the north of the site (to be delivered under the extant outline permission), the largest type of vehicle that will need to service these units will be a 7.5 tonne (8 m length) box van; it is reasonable to expect that this will be the same for the Phase 7 retail/commercial units as well.</p> <p>It is expected that the 7.5 tonne (8 m length) box van will generally be the largest type of delivery vehicle to service the proposed residential units, although residential units are often serviced using smaller types of vehicles, including transit vans. In the event that residential units need to be serviced by a vehicle longer than 8 m in length, which is understood to be unlikely, it is expected that additional manoeuvrability could be achieved by reversing manoeuvres, overseen by a banksman / traffic marshal.</p> <p>Deliveries and Servicing will be managed via a Management Plan which has already been secured in the s106 agreement (Schedule 8), and this will also be required for the new permission should consent be granted.</p>
<b>31.1.3</b>	We suggest a condition is included to ensure the officer's recommendation that this is assessed further at Reserved Matters.
<b>Conditions</b>	As above, add new condition.
<b>Amend Condition wording</b>	<p>Updated condition wording:</p> <p>Prior to Below Ground Works <u>in each Plot</u> detailed plans should be submitted to the Local Planning Authority demonstrating the provision of sufficient ducting space for full fibre connectivity infrastructure within the development in line with London Plan Policy SI6.</p>
<b>Plan</b>	This is showing the boundary of Phases 2-7B. This should be replaced with a drawing which shows the boundary of Phases 4-7B.

<b>Plans</b>	The following missing drawings should be added: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building Heights</li> <li>• Proposed Site Cross Sections</li> <li>• Proposed Indicative Phasing Plan 1 Demolition</li> </ul>
--------------	---

**Additional conditions recommended**

	Conditions	Maximum Unit Numbers	<p>Updated condition wording:</p> <p><b>6. <u>Unit Numbers and Housing Accommodation Schedule</u></b></p> <p><u>The development hereby approved shall comprise no more than 1651 residential units.</u></p> <p>Applications for approval of Reserved Matters submitted pursuant to this permission relating to layout, scale and appearance for each relevant phase of development including if built out as a single phase (other than those relating to Enabling Works), shall be accompanied by a Housing Accommodation Schedule. This document shall explain and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The type and mix of units proposed;</li> <li>• Whether the units are to be provided as affordable and what tenure;</li> <li>• The gross internal floor areas of each dwelling; and</li> <li>• A cumulative position statement on the provision of housing, including to take account of those dwellings delivered under outline planning permission ref: 17/P1721 or subsequent amended permissions.</li> </ul>
	Conditions	Maximum Non-Residential Floorspace and Uses	<p>New Condition</p> <p><b><u>Flexible Non-residential Uses</u></b></p> <p><u>The development hereby approved shall comprise no more than 5,000 sqm (GIA) of non-residential floorspace (Use Class E, F and Sui Generis), consisting of:</u></p> <p>A. <u>No more than 4,500 sqm (GIA) of Class E Commercial, Business and Service uses (flexible, taking account of maximum quanta below)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Up to 1,750sqm (GIA) of Use Class E(a) and E(b) floorspace</u></li> <li>• <u>Up to 1,250sqm (GIA) of Use Class E(d) floorspace</u></li> <li>• <u>Up to 750 sqm (GIA) of Use Class E(c), E(e) and E(f) floorspace</u></li> <li>• <u>Up to 1,750 sqm (GIA) of Use Class E (g) floorspace</u></li> </ul> <p>B. <u>No more than 500sqm (GIA) of Sui Generis Use Class floorspace (public houses, wine bars, or drinking establishments, and/or drinking establishments with expanded food provision)</u></p> <p>C. <u>No more than 750sqm (GIA) of Use Class F1(f) floorspace (Public worship or religious instruction) and / or Class F2(b) floorspace (Halls or meeting places for the principal use of the local community).</u></p>

**MEMBER QUESTIONS**

1. How many of the accommodation units are single aspect only and which way do they face –

Officer response - As discussed in section 6 of the committee report, the current proposal is still at outline application stage. The internal layouts will be worked up later at reserved matters stage. The layout of the blocks will be designed to consider impact on neighbouring amenity and the provision of suitable internal layouts in accordance with the submitted

Design Code. This is to ensure the development maximises the potential for dual aspect homes. Officers are satisfied that this will be further investigated later at reserved matters stage.

2. Given the heights of some of the blocks (12 and 13 storeys) are there existing plans to ensure those buildings are compliant with the new requirement of double staircase exits, and if not, can we require them (I appreciate this is outline only at this stage) –

Officer response - Please refer to paragraph 29.1.1 of the committee report. As required for an outline planning application, the applicants have issued a fire statement report with expert advice noting that the proposal in its current design, scale, layout is capable of creating dual internal stair core access to deal with fire safety. The details for internal layout will be examined further at reserved matters stage. Health & Safety Executive (HSE) were consulted and provided response (as per paragraph 29.1.5) stating they had no comments to make at this stage and will provide a response at reserved matters stage.

4. By how much do the planned buildings exceed the London Plan density matrix and what is the effect of that on the amenity of future occupants and neighbours –

Officer response - Please refer to paragraph 9.1.13, 9.1.18, 9.1.19, 9.1.20 & 10.1.11. The application site is located within the urban area, with public transport accessibility of 4-6a. The site is considered to be an intensification area noted in the London Plan. The density of the proposed development is supported by the Estates Local Plan, which is an adopted plan that assists in shaping the future of all the three estates.

5. How tall will the taller buildings be in metres by block (I seem only to have them in storeys, though I may have missed this information) –

Officer response - The tallest buildings will be 44.55m high. These will be located adjacent to the proposed neighbourhood park, which would comprise of substantial separation distance between the blocks.

6. In terms of the daylight impact, please can you clarify which (and how many) windows will face tall blocks 20m away and which will have their daylight reduced, and by how much this will breach the BRE standard –

Officer response - As noted in section 6 (Table 1) and 15 of the committee report; The Applicant has submitted a daylight, sunlight and overshadowing assessment. This demonstrates that the scheme has the potential to receive good levels of daylight and sunlight, above the minimum BRE targets and also assess the impact on surrounding neighbouring properties in terms of loss of daylight and sunlight. At reserved matters stage, further testing will be carried out to inform the internal layout and elevation design in order to achieve sufficient levels of daylight. It is proposed that a planning condition will be attached to secure the assessment of internal light levels (see condition 8).

7. Please could you refer me to the comments by the Urban Design Officer, which you requested to have uploaded on 24.2.23 (apologies if I have simply missed these) –

Officer response - Please see link (scroll down to see Urban Design Comments). [Microsoft Outlook - Memo Style \(merton.gov.uk\)](#)

8. Were you able to confirm, as requested by the Air Quality Officer, that the residential units fronting onto Merton Road are 1<sup>st</sup> storey and above –

Officer response - The Air Quality Officer was satisfied that this will be further assessed once detailed reserved matters applications and relevant air quality conditions have been submitted at later stage. As per paragraph 22.1.4 of the committee report. Members should also note that relevant conditions which seek to ensure control of dust and air quality impact during the demolition and construction stage and monitored and safeguarded are proposed to be attached. As per the S106 legal Agreement, Schedule 12, Part 2, the developer will be required to pay a Noise and Air Quality Monitoring Contribution where the Council is to monitor compliance with the agreed Demolition and Construction Management Plan.

9. What is the distance from roadside to façade for those blocks fronting Merton Road and Merton High Street –

Officer response - The proposed Plots 5 & 6 fronting Merton High Street would be situated approximately 25m from the buildings on the other side of the road. The proposed Plot 10 fronting Morden Road would be situated approximately 31.2m from the buildings on the other side of the road.

10. Can we condition adequate mechanical ventilation for any ground and first floor flats that front Merton Road or Merton High Street –

Officer response - Air Quality officers have reviewed the assessment and are satisfied that the development can be considered as 'air quality neutral' in terms of transport emissions and no further site-specific mitigation is required. However, some mitigation measures are recommended for the most at-risk properties situated close to the Merton High Street and Morden Road. So yes, a condition would be imposed to deal with this.

11. Given the height of these buildings, can we condition swift boxes –

Officer response - As per paragraph 18.1.8, An Ecological Walkover was undertaken by the applicant, which recommends that a selection of bird and bat boxes would be installed within the façade of the new buildings aimed at urban and local priority/protected species such as house sparrow and swifts. We also have a condition relating to biodiversity assessment to be provided when the reserved matters application has been submitted. Should there be a need for further mitigation measures then the Council would have further control to ensure the applicants provide necessary biodiversity and ecology protection measures.

12. Have the "Active Design" principles suggested by Sport England been included in the design to ensure healthy living for residents and if so, please can you direct me to where these have been implemented –

Officer response - This guidance is likely to be followed upon detailed reserved matters stage. The applicants are fully aware of this.

13. Given the observations of the Designing Out Crime officer and the increase in the theft of pedal cycles, how secure is the cycle storage provision, and could this be improved –

Officer response - cycle parking facilities, to include; adapted (comprising specially adapted bicycles), cargo style (sheltered) and other larger cycle provisions. Officers would ensure at the detailed reserved matters stage that these facilities would incorporate the secured by design principles in terms of providing; adequate and safe access, natural surveillance, better lighting and adequate provision to lock the bicycles.

14. Has a swept path analysis been done to ensure the use of 11m utility vehicles is viable –

Officer response - As the assessment on layout is a reserved matter, the applicants will at that stage undertake a swept path analysis to ensure the 11.0m long service vehicles can safely negotiate within the internal road network. This has been done successfully for phase 1, which has already been constructed/occupied and working appropriately. Phase 2 reserved matters also approved a swept path analysis and commencement on site is expected soon.

15. Have historical links to Lord Nelson and Emma Hamilton been investigated, as suggested –

Officer response - As noted in paragraph 27.1.1 of the committee report, an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment was undertaken by the applicant. The study noted that the eastern part of the site is considered to have a moderate to high potential for 19th century remains associated with Nelson's former home. These remains are likely to be of local to regional significance.

16. Has there been an archaeological field evaluation yet, and if not, will it be conditioned pre-commencement –

Officer response - As noted in paragraph 27.1.2 of the committee report, a pre-commencement condition would be imposed to ensure a programme of archaeological trenching targeted on areas of archaeological interest would be applied and to be discharged with every phase.

17. Can a pre-commencement planning condition be imposed to ensure archaeological trenching of targeted areas –

Officer response - Yes, please see response to question 16.

18. Will an Arboreal Method Statement be conditioned to mitigate the removal of 112 mature trees, 35 of them Category B - As noted in paragraph 25.1.1 & 25.1.2 of the committee report –

Officer response - To mitigate impact from identified tree removals as a result of the proposed development, appropriate landscaping and planting plans would be required to deliver a planting strategy that includes a mix of species, accompanied by a landscape management plan. The illustrative scheme indicates that approx. 190 trees will be planted to replace the 92 to be removed in phases 4-7B. Condition 18 requires an arboriculture method statement/tree protection plan to be submitted. This shall explain the total number of trees to be removed, together with details of the proposed replacement planting, to ensure an overall increase in the number of trees across all phases of development, which is required to be undertaken with good arboriculture practice in line with the relevant British Standards.

19. Given the expansion of ULEZ from August this year, can we increase the EV provision above 20% by condition or negotiation –

Officer response - In accordance with the latest London Plan, all remaining spaces will be provided with passive EVCP provision to allow simple conversion in future should demand require it. Noting your point however, we could look at adding a condition (in agreement with the applicant) which requires the applicant to monitor the need for EVCP at each reserved matters stage. We would consider this to be a reasonable compromise.

20. Can you confirm why 40% affordable housing is the agreed percentage?

Officer response - As noted in paragraph 5.1.68 of the committee report, the applicant has committed to providing 40% of the uplift in homes (over and above the original outline permission) as affordable housing. The revised outline planning application would therefore deliver 227 additional affordable homes out of the 568 additional homes that are being proposed in phases 4-7B. The percentage of affordable homes to be provided in this revised outline planning application will be 40%. This revised outline planning application is therefore compliant with London Plan Policies H4 & H8, Merton's adopted Core Planning Strategy Policy CS8 and Merton's adopted Sites and Policies Planning Policy DM H3.

21. The London Plan states that it is a requirement for 50% affordable housing across a portfolio. What reassurances do we have that this is in fact the case?

Officer response - London Plan Policy H4 requires affordable housing providers with agreements with the Mayor to deliver at least 50 % affordable housing across their development programme, and 60% in the case of strategic partners. The percentage requirement is not required for every site, but is the average across the providers development programme. This is because some schemes will deliver more than this percentage and some schemes less. Clarion have advised that in the 2022/23 financial year, nationally they delivered 78% affordable housing, and in London they have delivered 89% affordable housing. As strategic partners of the Mayor, they will meet the 60% requirement for the relevant period.

In relation to High Path, this application forms part of a long-term 15-year regeneration project across three estates, including 7 phases of delivery as part of the High Path estate re-development. The approved s106 legal agreement requires a review of the scheme viability at regular intervals (including mid-stage and late-stage reviews). The Applicant will be required to provide up-to-date viability appraisals at these times, and officers and the Councils independent viability assessors will assess whether additional affordable housing could be provided to increase provision to 50% affordable housing.

22. What scope do we have in terms parking at the development?

Officer response - As stated in paragraph 12.1.21 of the committee report, a total of 361 car parking spaces are proposed across the Estate (against approximately 422 existing spaces) in Phases 1-7B. A total of 304 car parking spaces were approved in the extant permission. Phases 4 to 7B would provide an uplift of up to 57 spaces (equivalent to a parking ratio of 0.1 taking account of the uplift of 568 homes). The additional spaces will be provided as wheelchair accessible bays. 286 car parking spaces are associated with Phases 4-7B, which represents approximately 0.17 spaces per unit for the proposed 1,651 units. The London Plan requires car-free development (other than the provision of disabled parking) on sites with excellent accessibility to public transport. This would apply to High Path; however, in this case, given that existing residents with cars will be returning to the estate it would be appropriate to allow for car parking provision to meet their needs. New residential developments should not exceed the maximum parking standards set out in table 10.3 of the London Plan (Policy T6.1 Residential parking). The proposal would therefore accord with the parking standards set out in the London Plan.

23. Regarding affordable homes, what is the net increase and how many will be for new families?

Officer response - Paragraph 11.1.5 of the committee report provides an assessment on affordable housing to be delivered on site. The proposals will deliver an uplift of 227 units as affordable housing. The approved affordable housing under the extant permission comprises of 357 homes. Therefore, a total of 584 affordable homes will be secured for High Path. The affordable homes will continue to be provided in the social rented or affordable rented tenure in accordance with the terms of the S106 agreement. In relation to the additional affordable homes, Merton Council will have 100% of the nomination rights. Based on the illustrative housing mix provided by the Applicant, approximately 199 affordable 2-bedroom homes will be delivered in Phases 4-7B, plus an additional 74 in earlier phases. Approximately 59 of the affordable homes in Phases 4-7B will provide 3+ bedrooms, with 35no. 3+ bed affordable homes delivered in the earlier phases.

24. Regarding the parking, 20% have electric charging points. Could we suggest increasing this to 100%?

Officer response - As noted in paragraph 23.1.6 of the committee report, in accordance with the London Plan, 20% of parking spaces should be provided with Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCP), with all remaining spaces provided with passive EVCP provision to allow simple conversion in future should demand require it. The provision in Phases 4-7B will accord with this requirement. TfL's London's 2030 electric vehicle infrastructure strategy: Executive summary document (published in December 2021) confirmed that around 12.5% of new cars registered in London in 2020 were electric; therefore, the 20% initial provision should meet current demand and provide additional headroom to encourage further take up. Officers acknowledge members interest on the future potential increase of EVCP use. In this case, committee could consider including an informative or condition for applicants to provide a monitoring assessment to inform the likely need for EVCP at the point of each reserved matters application.

It is also noted that the Applicant will need to comply with the latest policies and legislation at the time of the reserved matters applications (which will come forward over several years); therefore, if these evolve to require greater provision of charging points, then these updated policies will need to be taken into account by the Applicant.

25. Would it be possible to include an informative to have an entrance at the rear of South Wimbledon Station, as well as step free access?

Officer response - Members should note that there is currently a door at the back of station, the developer has been in discussions with TfL to ensure that the proposals future-proof for the provision of a second entrance to the station as well as step free access. At present TfL do not have plans to allow for a second entrance at the back of Wimbledon South Station. As noted in the s106 Heads of Terms within the Committee report, TfL have asked for contributions to fund a feasibility study for providing step free access. Due to the constraints of the station it has not been confirmed that step free access is yet possible. This is subject to ongoing negotiations between TfL and the applicant, and LBM officers will undertake the tests to determine acceptability of any contributions.

26. Officers to secure confirmation of current portfolio mix. What does this mean? Assume across the estates rather than across all Clarion homes in Merton?

Officer response - London Plan Policy H4 relates to affordable housing mix requirements across developments across London rather than the estates or Clarion homes in Merton. The policy requires that at least 50% of all new homes delivered across London are genuinely affordable. To achieve this part 3) of the policy requires that all affordable housing



providers with agreements with the Mayor deliver at least 50 per cent affordable housing across their development programme, and 60 per cent in the case of strategic partners. As noted above, in 2022/23, Clarion has advised that they delivered 78% affordable housing across its national development portfolio and 89% across its London portfolio. Clarion will meet their 60% requirement in London over the relevant period.

27. Officers to break down the net increase in affordable homes across the phases of this development.

Officer response - As stated in paragraph 10.1.14 of the committee report, this outline planning application provides an indicative housing mix. At each Reserved Matters stage the applicant will be required to specify the breakdown in housing mix proposed for that phase, and that will be considered by the Local Planning Authority against the statutory development plan and other material considerations in place at the time of the application

The indicative housing mix, including breakdown of affordable and private mix by phase, is shown in the table below (for the revised outline application phases 4-7B, and the other phases 1-3). In total 227 additional affordable homes are proposed; this will be secured through the s106 agreement.

Phase	Housing		Total		Total		Total		Total		Total		Total		Total	Total	Total
	Res.	Avail.	Res.	Avail.	Res.	Avail.	Res.	Avail.	Res.	Avail.	Res.	Avail.	Res.	Avail.			
<b>Car Club (Maximum Accommodation) (Phase 1-3)</b>																	
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total (4-7B)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Other Phases</b>																	
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total (1-3)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Maximum Illustrative Accommodation Schedule

28. Considering the overall population, the car club spaces seem small, what conversations have taken place to address this? - Officers take this away and discuss with applicant for reporting in mod sheet.

Officer response - A: As stated in paragraph 23.1.5 of the committee report, in addition to the total 361 car parking spaces to be provided across High Path estate, an additional total of 4 car club spaces are proposed throughout the Estate, of which 2 will be provided within Phases 4-7B. This is considered to address the needs for car club provision for the estate in accordance with London Plan Policy T6.1. This policy acknowledges the importance of car club spaces in being able to support the local community by enabling multiple households to make infrequent trips by car. There are no set standards within the London Plan that would determine the amount of car club spaces required in new residential developments. The appropriate number is usually determined by the overall need for car club spaces within the site. In this case, the applicant has engaged with private car-club operators to determine the need for such facilities having regard to existing car clubs bays in the area, anticipated usage and costs of provision.

29. As there are many mature trees on the development, what thought has gone into the replacement of such trees? - Officers take this away and discuss with applicant for reporting in mod sheet.

Officer response - As noted in paragraphs 25.1.1 & 25.1.2 of the committee report, an Arboriculture Impact Assessment report was prepared on behalf of the applicant by Greengage. They undertook a tree survey of the site. The survey had noted a total of 112

trees within the site, the surveyed trees showed a mix of species, life stages and condition. There are no Category A trees on the Site. Of the 112 trees included within the survey, the proposed development requires the removal of 35 Category B, 45 Category C and 12 Category U trees. The remaining surveyed trees are proposed for retention within the development. The proposal would provide a significant net uplift in trees when compared to the existing (the illustrative scheme indicates that approx. 190 trees will be planted to replace the 92 to be removed in these phases). The tree removal and retention strategy has not changed from that which has been approved by the Council previously.

A detailed Arboriculture Method Statement (AMS) and Landscape and Planting Strategy would be required, and this is to be secured via planning condition attached with any such approval. The latter document, in particular, would set out the appropriate trees to mitigate for trees lost.

In pre-application discussions for Phase 3C (outside of the remit of this application) it was recognised that one of the London Plane trees located in the group along Merton High Street would need to be removed to facilitate development. In this instance it was agreed that the tree would be replaced by a London Plane of at least semi-mature stature in an existing gap within the group. It is expected that the applicant and officers would work together in the same fashion in pre-application for later phases.

Furthermore, it is noted that Clarion has already started growing a selection of trees from nurseries for High Path at Morden Recreational Ground.

30. There are 2970 cycle storage units? What evidence is there of demand for these many spaces, and what configuration?

Officer response - London Plan Policy T5 (Cycling) requires developments to provide cycle parking in accordance with the minimum standards set out in Table 10.2 and Figure 10.3, ensuring that a minimum of two short stay and two long-stay cycle parking spaces are provided. The proposed cycle parking provision is indicative (and is based on the illustrative housing mix and non-residential floorspace proposed), however the principle of delivering this and the amount of cycle parking that would be provided for this development is in accordance with London Plan policy T5. The design, layout and composition of cycle parking is a detailed matter which will be confirmed and agreed as part of subsequent reserved matters submission. In terms of configuration, the Design Code outlines that the development will include secure, conveniently located and sheltered cycle storage for new homes. Cycle storage could be provided within individual dwellings (houses or flats), in communal storage areas (apartment blocks) or integrated in the public realm (for visitors). This will be assessed at the reserved matters stage.

31. 23.1.4 makes clear there is a deficiency of 465 car parking spaces according to the London Plan compliance. What assessment has been made of this deficiency in parking spaces?

Officer response - The report does not state any such deficiency in parking spaces. Paragraph 23.1.4 of the committee report relates to disabled parking. The London Plan provides maximum parking standards therefore a lesser provision would be fully compliant, as is the case here. For High Path where there is excellent access to public transport, the London Plan requires a car-free development (i.e. no car parking, other than provision for parking for disabled people). In this case the assessment has taken account of the fact that this is an estate regeneration scheme where existing residents who own cars will be returning to the new homes, such that car parking would be necessary.

It was agreed that 304 parking spaces would be acceptable in the approved masterplan. This proposal seeks to add 57 car parking spaces, which would be equivalent to 1 space per wheelchair user unit. As such, this is an acceptable level of provision which would accord with planning policy.

32. 23.1.5 Why is the number of car club spaces so low? Are these planned to be sited on or off site?

Officer response - Officers have provided a response above to this point raised. The 4 car club bays are proposed to be provided on-site. Two bays are proposed within an earlier phase (Phase 3C) with the remaining to be delivered in Phases 4-7B. Clarions transport consultant has engaged with two car club operators (Enterprise and Zipcar) to discuss the feasibility of the car club provision and this has informed the number of bays proposed at this stage. This takes account of:

- The fact that there are a number of existing car club bays within walking distance of the site
  - The excellent levels of public transport accessibility
  - Levels of car parking provision proposed
- Subject to utilisation of the bays proposed in Phase 3C, the feasibility of additional bays will be considered by Clarion.

33. 23.1.9 Where will Deliveroo and other deliver/collection vehicles wait?

Officer response - Space has been set aside for waiting and loading bays to facilitate the delivery and collection of goods. As per paragraph 1.1.9, s106 legal obligations have been imposed which require the applicant to provide detailed documents demonstrating strategies and plans for the following; parking management plan, estate road maintenance and access plan, roads plan and specification, and the delivery and service management plan. The applicants will be required to demonstrate such provision with the detailed reserved matters submissions.

34. What is the loss of 2700sqm equivariant to?

Officer response - There is no loss of existing non-residential floorspace. There is instead proposed to be a reduction in non-residential floorspace proposed. This responds to the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic.

35. In Section 14.1.1 What is the impact estimated to resident health of removing gym but supporting a bar.

Officer response - The same types of non-residential floorspace are proposed as previously approved. As stated in paragraph 14.1.1 of the committee report, the proposal would provide flexible Use Class E and/or Class F1(f) and/or Class F2(b) and/or Sui Generis ('Drinking Establishment'). The masterplan seeks to deliver up to 1,250sqm of Class E(d) use floorspace for indoor sport, recreation or fitness. This could be provided as a gym at High Path. So, there is no intention of replacing any gym use for a drinking establishment. Each reserved matters application will provide a proposal for the type of non-residential use proposed within that phase, which will take into consideration a use that is specific to that phased design and characteristic.

36. In Section 14.1.5 where will Clarion's site office be? Does the 106 require this already?

Officer response - The Stock Transfer Agreement signed in 2010 requires Clarion to have a Merton office which is located at Apollo House in Morden. There is also already a site office present at High Path where residents can meet Neighbourhood and Regeneration Managers from Clarion.

A new larger site office will be delivered as part of the High Path regeneration; however, the specific location has not yet been confirmed. Clarion are currently working on an Estate Management Strategy which will determine the most appropriate location to take advantage of the estate's proximity to South Wimbledon Underground Station and bus links which makes it accessible to a greater number of residents across Merton.

There is no policy requirement for Clarion to provide a site office on site; therefore, it cannot be secured through s106 obligations as this would not meet the legal tests for planning obligations. However, there are already s106 obligations requiring Clarion to submit for the Council's approval strategies for the maintenance and management of Estate Road and Open Space.

37. Are there any matters that were reserved in 17/P1721?

Officers - As noted in paragraph 1.1.4 of the committee report, the outline planning application that was presented to the Planning Applications Committee in March 2018 (and granted on the 29<sup>th</sup> April 2019 ref; 17/P1721) was granted with all matters reserved, meaning that all details relating to scale, layout, access, landscaping and appearance were to be assessed in the submission of future reserved matters applications.

38. Can you explicitly list what issues using non-planning terms what issues are in and what issues remain reserved?

Officer response - As stated in paragraph 1.1.5 the proposed revised outline planning application also seeks approval with all matters reserved (scale, layout, access, landscaping, and appearance), as such these matters remain reserved. The approval under this outline planning application only seeks consent for the proposed parameter plans and the Design Code. Paragraph 1.1.6 goes on to provide further guidance using non-planning terms on the five reserved matters which will come forward for approval via reserved matters applications (please see explanation below extracted from the committee report).

- 'Access' – the accessibility to and within the site, for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians in terms of the positioning and treatment of access and circulation routes and how these fit into the surrounding access network.
- 'Appearance' – the aspects of a building or place within the development which determine the visual impression the building or place makes, including the external built form of the development, its architecture, materials, decoration, lighting, colour, and texture.
- 'Landscaping' – the treatment of land (other than buildings) for the purpose of enhancing or protecting the amenities of the site and the area in which it is situated and includes: (a) screening by fences, walls or other means; (b) the planting of trees, hedges, shrubs or grass; (c) the formation of banks, terraces or other earthworks; (d) the laying out or provision of gardens, courts, squares, water features, sculpture or public art; and (e) the provision of other amenity features;
- 'Layout' – the way in which buildings, routes and open spaces within the development are provided, situated and orientated in relation to each other and to buildings and spaces outside the development.
- 'Scale' – the height, width and length of each building proposed within the development in relation to its surroundings.

39. Can the design code be updated without the notification of the committee?

Officer response - As noted under condition 5, found at the end of the committee report, the applicants will be required to deliver the reserved matters in accordance with the Design Code. Any changes to the design code will need to be reviewed and agreed in writing by the LPA.

40. Has the application in its current form been reviewed by the design review panel?

Officer response - As stated in paragraph 16.1.1 of the committee report, that the original masterplan was developed, following a Green Verdict from DRP. Therefore, given that many of the principles of the masterplan remain unchanged in these proposals, Officers considered that it was not necessary to present to DRP. However, relevant reserved matters proposals would be reported to the Design Review Panel; this being a requirement of the Estates Local Plan.

41. If the design code is updated will the application need to come back to committee.

Officer response - If the Design Code requires amendments, then this will need to be agreed firstly with the LPA via an application to amend the relevant condition (5) relating to Design Code.

42. In Section 5.1.6 - What are the details require resolution

Officer response - This relates to the energy related documents that has been provided by the applicants to the GLA. This will be dealt with by GLA officers prior to taking the application to stage 2.

43. In Section 10.1.12 How are we measuring borough wide tenure split and what is the current split across the borough?

Officer response - As stated in paragraph 11.1.9 of the committee report, the borough wide policy on Tenure Split is captured in Core Planning Strategy Policy CS8 which sets out a target tenure split of 60% social/affordable rent and 40% intermediate. Tenure split and mix of homes delivered across the borough is recorded in the Council's Annual Monitoring Report.

44. In Section 11.1.10 - Policies cannot be applied. Why?

Officer response - As explained in paragraph 11.1.10, the Draft Local Plan is currently at Examination Stage, with the Inspector's Report due. Whilst the materiality and weighting of the emerging Local Plan has increased, given its advanced stage, policies within it cannot be given full weight until it is fully adopted. Until then, Merton's Adopted Core Strategy and Sites and Policies Plan applies, which includes Policy CS8 and Sites and Policies Plan Policy DM H3.

45. Para 5.1.68 states the affordable housing is compliant however H4 states the portfolio needs to be 50% or needs to be increased to 50%. Have you confirmation that its presently 50% across their portfolio? Also our emerging local plan requires a higher standard and has material impact.

Officer response - See answers provided above.

46. Q: In Section 9.1.2 What steps are being taken to secure these jobs for residents in the borough?

Officer response - The construction of the estate regeneration is expected to generate approximately 175 construction jobs annually. Once complete the development is expected to generate 230 operational jobs. Clarion have advised that all employment and training opportunities are automatically targeted at local residents first. External agencies are only engaged where vacancies remain unfilled at the end of that process. This is done by:

- Advertising all employment and training opportunities in newsletters and updates
- Advertising opportunities on community boards fixed to the hoarding on all construction sites
- Careers support, site visits and work placements with local schools
- Pre-employment training, apprenticeship support and CSCS training provided locally through Clarion's charitable arm Clarion Futures

Clarion's Social Impact officer (based within the Regeneration team) will oversee this process, producing regular reports on performance, ensuring contractors deliver against their social value targets and broadening the offer by engaging local training providers and colleges. Clarion will work with Merton partners to develop an Employment and Skills Strategy (ESS) as well as a Local Labour Delivery Plan (LLDP) with main contractors. The LLDP will reflect how the ESS will be delivered for each phase of construction and be reviewed regularly to monitor impact against targets for employment and training. Clarion will work collaboratively with partners to deliver the ESS and LLDP which includes workstreams such as responding to current and future skills requirements of construction employers as well as supporting increased levels of construction and end-use apprenticeships and/or employment opportunities. Working with delivery partners and main contractors will be integral to ensuring access to employment opportunities for local residents.

47. In Section 9.1.8 What are the residents losing. We already know they are losing car parking spaces.

Officer response - When the Applicant acquired responsibility for all of the borough's housing stock, they committed to improving the quality of accommodation to improve the quality of life for residents. However, in working towards this goal, stock condition surveys identified that significant refurbishment and maintenance work as well as financial investment was required. They therefore began a comprehensive review exercise across all their estates to determine whether it might be more beneficial and sustainable to replace homes in the poorest condition with new properties.

This process began with analysis to determine the impact that upgrading homes would have and was then augmented by further reviews based on the deliverability of potential regeneration programmes. These work streams concluded that three estates: Eastfield's, Ravensbury and High Path, had the most viable regeneration potential. In committing to the regeneration proposals, in summer 2015 a Residents Offer was made, offering existing affordable housing tenants a new home in the new development with the same tenancy rights. The Offer also made provisions for private homeowners. This offer remains valid and extant.

Residents will benefit from much improved homes built to modern standards that will meet the needs of this generation and those in the future; resolve overcrowding currently experienced by 1 in 3 households; provide private amenity space to all homes as well as a 1.8 acre neighbourhood park; and local employment and training opportunities.

As set out above, there is no loss of car parking. Sufficient parking will be provided for existing residents staying or returning to High Path; this was previously assessed and found to be acceptable for the 2019 permission.

From the outset Clarion has committed to providing sufficient parking for existing residents, so there is no loss of provision. However, reflecting High Path's excellent access to public transport, car club access and cycling support, any future resident choosing to live on High Path will do so in the knowledge that there is no additional parking over and above blue badge spaces.

48. In Section 11.1.6 references viability - Want to see a copy of the assessment please? if that is not available, please answer whether profit was assessed at 20, 17.5 or 15 percent or another figure. If other, what was that figure?

Officer response - A: The minimum profit requirement referenced in the viability reports reflects the agreed metrics contained in the S106 agreement for the current permission. This assumes 20% on GDV return requirement for market sale and market rent housing, 6% for affordable housing and 15% for commercial development.

The viability assessment compares the outturn surplus / deficit recorded, against the minimum blended return requirement. At this point the project is generating a cash deficit (i.e. no profit) and so falls below the minimum blended return requirement.

49. In Section 19.1.1 Is blind tenure to access all court yards secured?

Officer response - Yes. All dwellings are tenure blind. Access to the communal courtyards is available to all residents of the buildings that form a courtyard e.g. residents of Building A can access courtyard A.

50. 25.1.2 What steps has the applicant taken to replace the 92 felled trees with semi mature rather than saplings?

Officer response - See answer above.

51. What food sources will be provided for swifts

Officer response - Swifts feed on insects caught on the wing. The Biodiversity Impact Assessment identifies the potential for the site to achieve a Biodiversity Net Gain in excess of 80%. This would include the introduction of planting of high value for insect life which in turn will provide food for swifts. Detailed landscaping proposals and specifications of plants etc. will be considered at reserved matters stage, including natural food sources for local biodiversity and wildlife.

## **OTHER APPLICATIONS CURRENTLY SUBMITTED RELATED TO MERTON'S ESTATE REGENERATION PROJECT**

### **Phase 3BC Reserved Matters Application**

Application ref. 22/P3688 submitted 15th December 2022. The scheme is currently on pause until further clarification is received from the Government on second staircase requirements. This is anticipated to be received in October 2023.

## **S.96 (non-material amendment) application to include 'Plots'.**

Application ref. 23/P0515 submitted 21st February 2023

This application was submitted to introduce 'Plots' to the conditions of the Outline permission.

The High Path regeneration will be completed in phases. Given the nature and scale of development in each phase, the sequence of delivery will mean that occupation could occur on some plots within a phase before the entire phase has been completed. To take account of the stages of delivery and to avoid new homes sitting empty, amendments are proposed to the planning conditions and obligations to introduce consideration of the Plots to be delivered rather than the Phases. The benefits of this approach are that it will allow the earlier occupation of homes, thus avoiding completed homes from sitting vacant. In the earlier phases, it would also support the earlier decant of existing residents.

Example wording change is as follows

### **9 Sustainable Design & Construction**

Prior to occupation of each relevant Plot phase of the development, verification that the energy strategy as per condition 8 above, has been implemented in accordance with the approved details, must be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with National, Regional or Local Policies. This shall include verification of carbon dioxide emissions reductions and water efficiency measures.

A request for a Deed of Variation to the s106 Agreement to achieve the same goal has also been made and this will be included in the work for Phases 4-7B.

### **Phase 2B Conditions 8 and 10 – Detailed Energy Strategy and District Heat Network**

Application ref. 22/P3628 submitted 13th December 2022

Condition 8 of the extant planning permission requires approval of a detailed energy strategy for each phase prior to commencement of below ground works of that phase and condition 10 requires details of how each phase of development will connect to the district heat network.

The extant Outline permission granted in 2019 included a gas-fired energy centre to serve all phases of the High Path estate. Both conditions 8 and 10 were discharged following the submission of relevant detail based on this strategy.

In October 2022 the outline permission was amended to allow the gas-fired energy centre to be replaced with one powered by Air-Source Heat Pumps. As a result the conditions require to be discharged again.



## **ITEM 7 (EDDIE KATZ 42 STATION ROAD COLLIERS WOOD LONDON SW19 2LP)**

### **RESPONSE FROM APPLICANT (ON COMMITTEE REPORT)**

Added as an appendix 1

### **DRAWING NUMBERS (PAGE 105)**

Following changes to revision numbering and inclusion of a CIL Phasing plan the drawing a document list are as follows;

DL0221-BPTW-S01-00-DR-A-0101 SITE LOCATION PLAN C02,  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-00-DR-A-0106 BLOCK PLAN C03,  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-00-DR-A-1100 LEVEL 00 - S73 GENERAL ARRANGEMENT PLANS C07,  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-01-DR-A-1101 LEVEL 01 - S73 GENERAL ARRANGEMENT PLANS C04,  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-02-DR-A-1102 LEVEL 02 - S73 GENERAL ARRANGEMENT PLANS C04,  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-03-DR-A-1103 LEVEL 03 - S73 GENERAL ARRANGEMENT PLANS C04,  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-04-DR-A-1104 LEVEL 04 - S73 GENERAL ARRANGEMENT PLANS C04,  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-05-DR-A-1105 LEVEL 05 - S73 GENERAL ARRANGEMENT PLANS C04,  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-06-DR-A-1106 LEVEL 06 - S73 GENERAL ARRANGEMENT PLANS C04,  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-07-DR-A-1107 LEVEL 07 - S73 GENERAL ARRANGEMENT PLANS C04,  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-08-DR-A-1108 LEVEL 08 - S73 GENERAL ARRANGEMENT PLANS C04,  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-09-DR-A-1109 LEVEL 09 - S73 GENERAL ARRANGEMENT PLANS C04,  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-10-DR-A-1110 LEVEL 10 - S73 GENERAL ARRANGEMENT PLANS C04,  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-11-DR-A-1111 LEVEL 11 - S73 GENERAL ARRANGEMENT PLANS C04,  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-12-DR-A-1112 LEVEL 12 - S73 GENERAL ARRANGEMENT PLANS C04,  
DL221-BPTW-S01-13-DR-A-1113 LEVEL 13 - S73 GENERAL ARRANGEMENT PLANS C04,  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-00-DR-A-1200 C01, CIL- Phase 2  
DL0221-BPTW-B01-ZZ-DR-A-2061 Block A - S73 West Elevation C01,  
DL0221-BPTW-B01-ZZ-DR-A-2062 Block A - S73 South Elevation C01,  
DL0221-BPTW-B01-ZZ-DR-A-2063 Block A - S73 East Elevation C01,  
DL0221-BPTW-B01-ZZ-DR-A-2064 Block A - S73 North Elevation C01,  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-00-DR-A-2065 Block B - S73 West Elevation C02,  
DL0221-BPTW-B02-ZZ-DR-A-2066 Block B - S73 South Elevation C01,  
DL0221-BPTW-B02-ZZ-DR-A-2067 Block B - S73 East Elevation C03,  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-00-DR-A-2068 Block B - North Elevation C01,  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-00-DR-A-2069 S73 East Elevation - Site Wide C03  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-00-DR-A-2070 S73 West Elevation - Site Wide C02,  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-00-DR-A-2071 S73 South Elevation -Site Wide C01,  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-00-DR-A-2201 S73 Site Section N-S C02  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-00-DR-A-2202 S73 Site Section Thru S Block C01  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-00-DR-A-2203 S73 Site Section Courtyard C01  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-00-DR-A-2204 S73 Site Section Thru N Block C02  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-00-DR-A-2210 Block B - S73 E-W Section C02  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-00-DR-A-2211 Block B - S73 N-S Section C02  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-00-DR-A-2212 Block A - S73 E-W Section C  
DL0221-BPTW-S01-00-DR-A-2213 Block A - S73 N-S Section C01  
DL0221-BPTW-XX-XX-SA-A-0102 Block A Plot Schedule SA C03  
DL0221-BPTW-XX-XX-SA-A-0103 Block B Plot Schedule SA C04  
DL0221-BPTW-XX-XX-DO-A-0601 Section 73 Application Comparator Design Report C03  
DL0221-FH-XX-00-DP-L-0102 P03 Illustrative masterplan ground floor,  
DL0221-FH-XX-00-DP-L-0101 P03 Gen. arrangement plan ground floor

### **Documents:**

- Landscape Comparator Amended March 2023 & subsequent appendices.
- Architectural Comparator Document (May 2023)
- Transport Statement (June 2023)
- Arboricultural Impact and Method Assessment Rev B, prepared by ACD
- Tree Protection Plan dated 30.09.22
- Energy Statement Addendum ref. DL0221-WWT-ZZ-ZZ-RP-CS-00103, prepared by Wallace Whittle
- Biodiversity Net Gain Report dated Oct 2022, prepared by Greengage
- Fire Statement prepared by Design Fire Consultants (Revision 3), dated 10 March 2023

**KEY FACTS (provided by applicant)**

<b>Approved 08.11.22</b>	<b>Proposed S73 - received 23/11/2022</b>
<b>Application Ref. <a href="#">21/P1907</a></b>	<b>Application Ref. <a href="#">22/P3385</a></b>
Link to <a href="#">planning statement</a>	Link to <a href="#">planning statement</a>
<b>Application for:</b> <i>Phase 1: demolition and removal from the site of all existing buildings and structures and all waste materials arising from demolition; and Phase 2: provision of a mixed-use development comprising commercial floorspace (Class E) and residential apartments (Class C3) across two separate buildings together with associated car and cycle parking, hard and soft landscaping works and associated infrastructure including the construction of a footbridge.</i>	<b>Application for:</b> <i>“Application for variation of Condition 2 (approved plans) and deed of variation to S106 Legal Agreement attached to LBM planning application 21/P1907 relating to phased redevelopment of the site comprising: Phase 1: demolition and removal from the site of all existing buildings and structures and all waste materials arising from demolition ; and Phase 2: provision of a mixed-use development comprising commercial floorspace (Class E) and residential apartments (Class C3) across two separate buildings together with associated car and cycle parking, hard and soft landscaping works and associated infrastructure including the construction of a footbridge. The variations include increasing the level of affordable and family housing on site by reducing the overall number of units, alterations to external elevations, reduced footprint of the north block, internal reconfiguration including provision of a second internal stairwell to the northern block (Block B) and revisions to landscaping.</i>
<b>Housing:</b> 116 x new homes 15 x Studio      13% 39 x 1 bed      34% 51 x 2 bed      44% 11 x 3 bed      9%	<b>Housing:</b> 98 x new homes 48 x 1 bed      46% 26 x 2 bed      20% 24 x 3 bed      34%
<b>Wheelchair:</b> 12 x homes (10.3%)	<b>Wheelchair:</b> 12 x homes (12.2%)
<b>Non-residential floorspace (Class E):</b> 433 sqm	<b>Non-residential floorspace (Class E):</b> 508.8 sqm
<b>Affordable Housing:</b>	<b>Affordable Housing:</b>

46 homes (39.6%) affordable homes, of which - 24 homes (52%) intermediate - 22 homes (48%) affordable rent).	98 homes (100%) affordable housing (social rented)
<b>Car Parking</b> 3 blue badge	<b>Car Parking:</b> No change
<b>Storey Heights</b> Block A – part 7, part 10 storey building Block B – part 8, part 13 storey building	<b>Storey Heights</b> No change
<b>Carbon savings / Energy strategy:</b> Air source heat pumps, solar PV  Produces 1,170 tonnes of carbon	<b>Carbon savings / Energy strategy</b> Air source heat pumps, water source heat pumps and solar PV  Reduction in carbon to 1,111 tonnes of carbon pa
<b>Trees:</b> 14 trees removed 21 trees re-planted	<b>Trees:</b> 15 trees removed 15 trees re-planted
<b>Play Space:</b> 218 sqm dedicated play	<b>Play Space:</b> 306 sqm dedicated play 300 sqm additional playable landscape
<b>Urban Greening:</b> 0.45	<b>Urban Greening:</b> 0.57 (improvement)
<b>Biodiversity Net Gain:</b> 20%	<b>Biodiversity Net Gain</b> 20%

### Summary of Changes

<p><b>Changes to Northern Block</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction in overall building length, circa 1850mm. This has resulted in minor differences in appearance along the ‘shoulder’ portion of the building (ground floor to 8th floor).</li> <li>• Revised spacing between balconies in order to achieve higher levels of privacy to each unit (Eastern Elevation)</li> <li>• Reduced number of windows to the east elevation in upper levels (9th to 12th floor).</li> <li>• Revised layouts to accommodate new unit mix and second stair case.</li> <li>• Reduced floor plate from ground floor to 8th floor, circa 20sqm.</li> <li>• Communal terrace omitted and replaced with an intensive green roof.</li> <li>• Larger plant room and smaller refuse store to serve the northern block only.</li> </ul>
--

- Smaller cycle store
- Reduced commercial space in Block B of 64 sqm (90 sqm to 64 sqm)

#### **Changes to Southern Block**

- No change to the number of windows and balconies. Small adjustments to spacing between windows and inclusion of additional decorative 'window blanks' to east and west elevations.
- Relocated bike store (two separate stores on GF to accommodate the remaining cycles from the northern block)
- Refuse store reduced to serve southern block only.
- Additional commercial space in Block A of 444.8 sqm (365.8 sqm to 444.8 sqm)

### **WASTE OFFICER COMMENTS**

The officer was consulted on the reversion to the originally approved waste strategy for a waste store in each tower with a dedicated waste storage collection area and confirmed that this was satisfactory.

### **MEMBER QUESTIONS**

1. I am concerned about the loss of the green terrace, and the loss of the (really rather good) cycle facilities originally approved. On both grounds it seems unarguable that the quality of the development would be materially diminished between permission and completion, but is there any way of cherry-picking, or forcing Clarion to maintain these features ? The proposed changes to these will be a definite loss for future residents;

Officer response - As set out in the committee report, this is a matter of judgment for members to consider. If members consider this to be an issue, officers can raise this with the applicant before the PAC meeting to see if there is any movement on their position.

2. My other main area of concern is safety and security. Is there a way in which we can ensure the public do not have unrestricted access to communal outside areas?

Officer response - Matter for member consideration. From an officer perspective this was not part of the previous approval (so precedent has been set) and if blocked off then this would require some sort of barrier (which has visual impact).

Generally, officers don't want to block off spaces (like gated development), as development should be inclusive for all.

Why the space would not be safe and secure would be a matter for member discussion. If the space (without restricted access) is a concern, then members need to consider if this would be grounds for refusal. However, this needs to be carefully considered, especially in light of the arrangement of the previous approval on the site.

Again, if this deemed to be an area of contention, officers could raise this with the application prior to PAC meeting.

3. Can we condition that the replacement trees are semi-mature?

Officer response - The submitted reports state the proposed replacement tree sizes which the Council's trees officer has confirmed are either semi mature of heavy standard size and this would be secured by the condition to undertake the works in accordance with the submitted plans and documents.

4. Given the proximity to the Wandle and the green corridor, can we condition hedgehog tunnels if there are any blocking external barriers?

Officer response - We can raise this with the applicant. Can include requirement in a planning condition.

5. Can we condition swift boxes (I am not sure at what height these would be most effective)?

Officer response - We can raise this with the applicant. Can include requirement in a planning condition.

6. In conditions 4 (p138) and 13 (p140) could we add the words "and maintained" so that the cycle storage and refuse facilities are to be "retained and maintained"

Officer response – Yes can be added to conditions.

7. There appears not to be a site office. How will residents get support? Note the big issue found in Highpath and Eastfields previously was lack of access to Clarion personnel.

Officer response – The applicants have stated

*'It was decided that the most appropriate location for the site office is in High Path rather than Station Road. This is due to a number of factors, with the first being High Path's proximity to South Wimbledon Underground Station. It will therefore be more accessible to a greater number of residents across Merton in this location who may wish to have an in person meeting with the Clarion team. We will be providing welcome packs that advertises the arrangement, key telephone numbers, and that there is presence at the site office at High Path. Furthermore, there is already an office present at High Path where residents can meet Neighbourhood and Regeneration Managers from Clarion. High Path will also have the capacity to offer parking for Clarion staff members using the office, whereas Station Road does not have the space required to offer this. In addition, there will be two caretakers that will provide regular patrols at Station Road'.*

8. Why does this site not have shoots enabling residents to dispose of waste on the floor or to direct underground source?

Officer response – Neither this nor the consented scheme were designed with this feature and there is no policy requirement for it. The Council's Urban Design Officer has advised that such systems can present more difficulties than benefits. Shoots block easily, they require almost constant maintenance to deal with waste falling from such great heights, they need larger receptacles which require larger lorries to remove from site and there are issues of ensuring waste type segregation (food waste, recycling etc).

The applicants have added

*'The option of looking at URS was explored during the design stage however it was considered not possible for a number of reasons mainly relating to lack of space. The site is a constrained site, there are attenuation tanks and infrastructure/services below ground which limit the ability to incorporate URS at Station Road. It is important to note, we are implemented the strategy already approved and found acceptable by Members at the original planning stage'.*

9. How will 7.14.4 (Refuse collection method) be secured?

Officer response – The applicants have explained that

*Station Road will be managed internally by the Clarion Asset Management team. They will be responsible for dragging the bins from each block out to the collection point on the day of collection. The current strategy is that there will be two caretakers from the Clarion Asset Management team present on the day of collection to manage this process. This presents a similar strategy to what was proposed on the permitted scheme with Clarion managing this internally rather than it being managed by an external company. A condition for a Refuse Management Plan could be imposed to secure this.*

10. What are the plans for commercial space - who would rent it in a place where you have reduced footfall? How do we prevent non desirable commercial occupation

Officer response - The proposed commercial space use would be restricted to uses falling within Use Class E which includes; Use, or part use, for all or any of the following purposes—

- a) for the display or retail sale of goods, other than hot food, principally to visiting members of the public,
- b) for the sale of food and drink principally to visiting members of the public where consumption of that food and drink is mostly undertaken on the premises,
- c) for the provision of the following kinds of services principally to visiting members of the public—
  - (i) financial services,
  - (ii) professional services (other than health or medical services), or

(iii) any other services which it is appropriate to provide in a commercial, business or service locality,

d) for indoor sport, recreation or fitness, not involving motorised vehicles or firearms, principally to visiting members of the public,

e) for the provision of medical or health services, principally to visiting members of the public, except the use of premises attached to the residence of the consultant or practitioner,

f) for a creche, day nursery or day centre, not including a residential use, principally to visiting members of the public,

g) for—

(i) an office to carry out any operational or administrative functions,

(ii) the research and development of products or processes, or

(iii) any industrial process, being a use, which can be carried out in any residential area without detriment to the amenity of that area by reason of noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, soot, ash, dust or grit.

If a proposed use falls within that Use Class it would be deemed acceptable unless a list of uses within Use Class E were specifically conditioned to be exceptions.

The applicants have stated

*'Clarion are reviewing options for the commercial unit and the intention is to provide a cycle café or similar café or restaurant at the site. The proposal is for Class E use and this opens up the space for a range of potential end-users, again, this is still being reviewed and will be decided following the grant of planning consent. Clarion will only select a tenant that is viable and appropriate for the site and residential context'.*

#### 11. Condition for semi-mature trees

Officer response – The submitted reports state the proposed replacement tree sizes which the council's trees officer has confirmed are either semi mature or heavy standard size and this would be secured by the condition to undertake the works in accordance with the submitted plans and documents.

#### 12. Condition for measures to prevent mounted cycling through the site

Officer response – A condition requiring details to be approved for methods for the control of mounted cycling within the site could be imposed for reasons of pedestrian safety.

#### 13. Condition for measure to provide details prior to occupation regarding resident support office

Officer response – There is no policy requirement and therefore basis upon which to force this condition upon the applicant

#### 14. Condition fast charge disabled bays

Officer response – The applicant intends to install the cabling infrastructure for passive charging for two of the three bays with one active bay. There are issues of cost, impacts of vandalism, management of the bays and need to keep pace with evolving technology and therefore the applicant proposes to monitor demand. If they are for residential use there would be no need for them to be fast charging as they can utilise lower cost power overnight to charge the vehicles.

## **ITEM 8 - PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - SUMMARY OF CURRENT CASES**

No mods

## **ITEM 9 - CLARION WANDLE BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION**

No mods

## **ITEM - 10 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS**

No mods



## Applicant Comments on Station Road Officers Report to Planning Committee

Page No	Paragraph Number	Topic	Applicant Comments
N/A	N/A	N/A	<p>General point: There doesn't seem to be mention that the S73 scheme was amended with additional plans to incorporate a second stair core into the northern block. The S73 was originally submitted with the following mix:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 45 x 1 bed</li> <li>• 20 x 2 bed</li> <li>• 33 x 3 bed</li> </ul> <p>Following the need to accommodate a second stair core in light of proposed amendment to Approved Document B, the mix was adjusted to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 48 x 1 bed</li> <li>• 26 x 2 bed</li> <li>• 24 x 3 bed</li> </ul>
Page 106 Page 31	N/A	Documents	<p>Should add:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Architectural Comparator Document (May 2023)</li> <li>• Transport Statement (June 2023)</li> <li>• Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Assessment Rev B, prepared by ACD</li> <li>• Tree Protection Plan dated 30.09.22</li> <li>• Energy Statement Addendum ref. DL0221-WWT-ZZ-ZZ-RP-CS-00103, prepared by Wallace Whittle</li> <li>• Biodiversity Net Gain Report dated Oct 2022, prepared by Greengage</li> </ul>
Page 106	N/A	Drawing Ref.	<p>Should amend the following plan:</p> <p>DL0221-BPTW-S01-10-DR-A-1110 LEVEL 10 - S73 GENERAL ARRANGEMENT PLANS C03<sup>4</sup></p> <p>DL0221-BPTW-XX-XX-SA-A-0102 Block A Plot Schedule SA C02<sup>3</sup></p> <p>DL0221-BPTW-XX-XX-SA-A-0103 Block B Plot Schedule SA C03<sup>4</sup></p> <p>DL0221-FH-XX-00-DP-L-0101 P02<sup>3</sup> Gen. arrangement plan ground floor</p> <p>To note: A new CIL Phasing Drawing Plan should be included in the references. Please note drawing: <b>DL0221-BPTW-S01-00-DR-A-1200 C01</b></p>
Page 108	2.3	Existing Use	To note:

			The existing building was used as a charitable meanwhile use under October 201, and it was then vacated after this to allow for demolition
<b>Page 109</b>	3.2	Reference to previous scheme	To note: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The previous scheme also included intermediate and social rent units in the south block.</li> </ul>
<b>Page 109</b>	3.2	Reference to new owners and housing numbers	Worth noting that the mix is driven by Clarion decant requirements from Eastfield Estate
<b>Page 109</b>	3.3	Scheme amendments	External changes to the northern block include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communal terrace omitted and replaced with an intensive green roof.</li> </ul> <p>To note: the reduction in windows on the east elevation is as a result of the reduction in homes overall.</p>
<b>Page 109</b>	3.5	Scheme amendments	Internal changes to the northern block include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Larger plant room adhering to requirements from M&amp;E and smaller cycle room.</li> <li>Reduced commercial space in Block B to 64 sqm (90 sqm to 64 sqm).</li> </ul> <p>To note: The report doesn't appear to identify the internal changes to the south block. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional commercial space in Block A of 444.8 sqm (365.8 sqm to 444.8 sqm)</li> <li>Additional cycle store in southern block to account for the smaller store in northern block (two stores)</li> <li>Refuse store reduced in size</li> </ul>
<b>Page 109</b>	3.7	Scheme amendments	To note the following corrections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The refuse strategy is the same as the original planning. We reverted back to this as shown in DL0221 - BPTW - S01 - 00 - DR - A - 1100 LEVEL 00 - S73 GENERALARRANGEMENT PLANS C07</li> <li>Commercial increased to 508 sqm</li> </ul>
<b>Page 111</b>	5.2.1 – 5.2.3	Public objections received	At this section it would be beneficial to note that these issues relate to matters resolved through the original permission. Therefore, not to be considered as part of this application.
<b>Page 113</b>	5.2.7	Public objections received	Worth noting that the scheme responded to latest fire safety requirements and incorporated an additional staircase in the northern block.
<b>Page 114</b>	5.3	Public objections received	Worth noting that many of the objections, such as pedestrian footbridge, relate to matters that have been previously agreed.
<b>Page 115</b>	5.6	Designing out crime	There appears no mention of the changes made in relation to SBD comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Double leaf doors to single leaf doors.</li> <li>Relocation of external cycle stores to near to commercial entrance.</li> </ul>
<b>Page 120</b>	5.10	Urban design comments	The comments refer to a consolidated bin store , however, this was amended to the original approved strategy
<b>Page 121</b>	5.12	Transport planner comments	Commercial space is 509.8 sqm and not 519.5 sqm

Page 122	5.19	Building Control Officer	Compliance received against Building Regulations should be noted given that the additional staircase is a pressing issue.
Page 125	7.2.1	Principle of development	No reference to the need for the decant of Eastfields residents. Refers to additional family housing but doesn't provide the figures (i.e. proposed 24 from 11 permitted)
Page 125	7.2.3	Employment floorspace	Commercial space is 509.8 sqm and not 519.5 sqm
Page 125	7.3.1	Housing mix	It would be better to say that the mix has been driven based on the decant requirements
Page 127	7.7.1	Fire Safety	No mention whether the proposal has been accepted by Merton's building control.
Page 128	7.9.1	Child playspace	Should clarify why the original S73 mix was amended due to compliance with emerging fire regulations. The revised mix generated the figure of 816 sqm.
Page 128	7.9.2	Child playspace	The original scheme had a requirement for 413 sqm (not 400 sqm). The original scheme only provided 218 sqm whereas the revised S73 provides 306 sqm of defined play alongside 300 sqm of playable landscaped areas across the site. No mention.
Page 131	7.11.2	Safety and Security	Officer has just copied our response across. Does not conclude that the scheme is considered safe and secure from officers perspective.
Page 132	7.12.2	Impact on amenity	Officers do not note the reduction in building length and reduced floor plate which would help to improve any impact to neighboring properties.
Page 133	7.13.9	Commercial cycles	S73 scheme proposes 3 long stay bays and 26 visitor bays. Officer report mentions different numbers.
Page 134	7.14.3	Refuse	It should be noted that the refuse arrangement has now reverted back to the planning approved.
Page 135	7.17.4	Trees	Alongside the new 15 trees, it should also be noted that the Applicant is planting 19no. specimen shrubs, of which 5 are within the cluster location referenced in the report (i.e. T22 – T34)
Page 136	9.1	Conclusion	Refers to a reduction in 16 units whereas it is a reduction in 18.
Page 139	Condition 8	Vehicle Parking	The new S73 Plan should be referenced rather than the original approved. New plan reference: DL0221-BPTW-S01-00-DR-A-1100-C07-A2 - LEVEL 00 - S73 GENERAL ARRANGEMENT PLANS
139	Condition 11	Construction Logistics Plan	This Condition is partially discharged under 23/P0084 in relation to the demolition works
Page 140	Condition 14	Tree Protection Plan	This Condition needs to be updated to account for the new information in the S73 Tree Details Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement Rev B prepared by ACD Environmental Tree Protection Plan dated 30.09.23
Page 140	Condition 16	Demolition and Construction Environmental Method Plan	This Condition was discharged in full under 23/P0084
Page 141	Condition 17	Landscape Management Plan	This section of the report is not clear. Seems to fall under the title of conditions being discharged, however, this is not the case for this Condition.

<b>Page 141</b>	Condition 18	Co2 reductions (residential)	This section of the report is not clear. Seems to fall under the title of conditions being discharged, however, this is not the case for this Condition.
<b>Page 141</b>	Condition 19	Co2 reductions (non-residential)	This section of the report is not clear. Seems to fall under the title of conditions being discharged, however, this is not the case for this Condition.
<b>Page 142</b>	Condition 20	DHN	This section of the report is not clear. Seems to fall under the title of conditions being discharged, however, this is not the case for this Condition.
<b>Page 142</b>	Condition 21	Post construction Life Cycle	This section of the report is not clear. Seems to fall under the title of conditions being discharged, however, this is not the case for this Condition.
<b>Page 142</b>	Condition 23	Demolition and Construction Management Plan	This Condition was discharged in full under 23/P0084
<b>Page 143</b>	Condition 25	Contamination	This section of the report is not clear. Seems to fall under the title of conditions being discharged, however, this is not the case for this Condition.
<b>Page 143</b>	Condition 26	Verification Report	This section of the report is not clear. Seems to fall under the title of conditions being discharged, however, this is not the case for this Condition.
<b>Page 143</b>	Condition 27	Contamination not previously found	This section of the report is not clear. Seems to fall under the title of conditions being discharged, however, this is not the case for this Condition.
<b>Page 144</b>	Condition 29	Pilling	This section of the report is not clear. Seems to fall under the title of conditions being discharged, however, this is not the case for this Condition.
<b>Page 144</b>	Condition 31	Noise	This section of the report is not clear. Seems to fall under the title of conditions being discharged, however, this is not the case for this Condition.
<b>Page 145</b>	Condition 33	WSI	This Condition was discharged in full under 23/P0084
<b>Page 145</b>	Condition 34	SBD	This section of the report is not clear. Seems to fall under the title of conditions being discharged, however, this is not the case for this Condition.

Page 145