

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

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

16 MARCH 2023
(7.15 pm - 8.32 pm)

PRESENT Councillor Aidan Mundy (in the Chair), Councillor Sheri-Ann Bhim, Councillor Michael Butcher, Councillor Edward Foley, Councillor Dan Johnston, Councillor Gill Manly, Councillor Martin Whelton, Councillor Thomas Barlow, Councillor Kirsten Galea, Councillor Mathew Willis.

ALSO PRESENT Tim Bryson (North Area Manager), Wendy Wong Chang (Principal Planner), Leigh Harrington (Planning Officer) Jayde Watts (Democratic Services Officer)

IN ATTENDANCE Amy Dumitrescu (Democracy Services Manager)
REMOTELY

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Simon McGrath and Councillor Susie Hicks. Councillor Kirsten Galea and Councillor Matthew Willis attended as substitute.

2 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST (Agenda Item 2)

There were no declarations of interest.

3 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Agenda Item 3)

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 9 February 2023 were agreed as an accurate record.

4 TOWN PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Agenda Item 4)

The Committee noted the amendments and modifications to the officer's report. The Chair advised that the agenda would be taken in the published agenda order.

Please note that members of the public, including the applicant or anyone speaking on their behalf, are expressing their own opinions and the Council does not take any responsibility for the accuracy of statements made by them.

5 115 KINGSTON ROAD, WIMBLEDON, LONDON, SW19 1LT (Agenda Item 5)

The Planning Officer presented the report.

There were no objectors registered to address the Committee on this item.

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

- Waste facilities would be in a communal area. The 3-bedroom unit could access this by walking around the side of the development.
- The two bins provided were more than the required amount for 7 units. The bins would be collected from the front of the communal refuse space and then returned by the bin collectors.
- The soft landscaping condition protects the landscaping for five years.

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

The applicant informed the committee of the following:

- Although there would be space for a wheely bin closer to the 3 bedroom unit, from experience this was not a preferred option as it would be easier for waste to be collected from the same place.

The Chair moved to the vote on the Officers' recommendation which carried: Votes For – 8, Against – 0, Abstentions – 1.

RESOLVED: That the Committee GRANTED Planning Permission Subject to Conditions

6 310-356 GRAND DRIVE, RAYNES PARK, LONDON, SW20 9NQ (Agenda Item 6)

The Planning Officer presented the report.

There were no objectors registered to address the Committee on this item.

The committee received presentations from the applicant, Thomas Rumble, who raised points including:

- The brownfield land development benefited from permitted development rights granted under part 20 of GPDO which allowed for the addition of floors to an existing building to help meet minimum housing needs.
- Parking survey concluded that the development would not cause undue parking stress.
- The additional floor would match the existing three levels below with windows vertically aligned and material treatments to match.
- All flats met space standards.

- There was substantial distance from neighbours to the west and east which exceeded development management standards.
- Refuse facilities to encourage greater recycling levels had been secured through the suggested refuse and recycling condition and was agreed by the Environmental Services Officer.
- A Construction Logistics Plan and Working Method Statement had been suggested as part of a condition.
- The application would maintain the character and appearance of the area as well as the addition of six new flats.

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

- Although the parking survey demonstrated a capacity for parking, the applicant has agreed to restrict future applicants from applying for a resident parking permit if a CPZ came into force in the future. This would safeguard the possibility of increased parking pressure.
- As no on-site parking was provided, a request for electric charging points was not made.
- Cycle parking could not be provided on the site as the applicant does not own much land outside of the footprint to the building.
- There was a general push to promote sustainable modes of transport and as this development is car free, there is an opportunity to promote this further.
- As per the London Plan, the submission of a fire safety statement is only required for major applications. This would not fall within the remit of the planning committee.

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

The applicant informed the committee of the following:

- As this was a zero-parking scheme, it was thought this would fail the CIL regulations test in relevance terms to ask for an electric charging point on this application. The London Plan would typically encourage a parking free development and would always encourage cycle parking which would make this a justified contribution. This scheme would generate approximately £10,000 of investment in cycle parking infrastructure.

The Chair moved to the vote on the Officers' recommendation and the below condition which carried:

Votes For – 9, Against – 0, Abstentions – 0.

- Relating to the removal of car parking permits, that paragraph 10.1, obligation 3 would be removed.

RESOLVED: That the Committee GRANTED Planning Permission Subject to Conditions

7 153 LINKS ROAD, TOOTING, LONDON, SW17 9EW (Agenda Item 7)

The Planning Officer presented the report.

There were no objectors registered to address the Committee on this item.

The committee received presentations from the applicant, William Yardley, who raised points including:

- The property was previously a 5 bedroom rental and the application now presented was for a 6 bedroom HMO which could possibly mean only one more resident.
- If not for the introduction of Article 4 in November this application would have been a permitted development and would not have required planning permission.
- Work on the development began in May 2022 before Article 4 was introduced, with over £170,000 invested in the development.
- The HMO would be targeted at young professionals and key workers.
- The planning officer visited the property and agreed that it was of a very high standard.
- The property would be managed by Urban Home, a local award winning company that worked across South London.
- The Council's HMO officer confirmed that the proposal met the standards required and raised no objections.
- Due to Article 4, a compensation claim for investment costs and the difference in value between a 5 bedroom HMO and a standard residential dwelling could be made. This could be in the region of £200,000.
- Although it would be a last resort, if the application was not approved there would be no option other than to make a compensation claim due to significant financial loss. This would be a poor use of local taxpayers' money.
- The accommodation would be in line with core strategy policy CS8

In response to William Yardley the chair advised:

- The committee will not be threatened by developers and will act in the best interest of local residents.
- The applicant and developers watching these proceedings will be better placed using their speaking time to talk to the merits of their applications and not threaten the committee.

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

- Expressed a low likelihood of anti-social behaviour or damage to property from tenants.

- The previous requirement was for each resident to have a general refuse, recycling, paper and a food caddy. The requirement has now changed and was based on the number of residents living in the property so there would be a shared 250 litre bin.
- The application was for six person unit with the 7th room possibly used as a work from home space. If this room was used as a 7th bedroom it would be a breach of the planning application and a potential breach of the license issued by the HMO department.

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

The applicant took this opportunity to apologise for threatening the committee with legal action if they did not approve the scheme in his opening remarks.

The Chair moved to the vote on the Officers' recommendation which carried:

Votes For – 9, Against – 0, Abstentions – 0.

RESOLVED: That the Committee GRANTED Planning Permission Subject to Conditions

8 OBJECTION TO THE MERTON (NO.784) TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2022 AT 12 THURLESTON AVENUE, MORDEN, SM4 4BW (Agenda Item 8)

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

9 DECISION LOG (Agenda Item 9)

The report was noted.

10 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS (Agenda Item 10)

The report was noted.

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

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

12 GLOSSARY OF TERMS (Agenda Item 12)

13 MODIFICATION DOCUMENT (Agenda Item 13)

