Minutes
BOROUGH PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

19.15 Tuesday 22 May 2012

Committee Rooms D&E, Merton Civic Centre, Morden SM4 5DX

Councillors:

- Maurice Groves (substitute for Cllr Chris Edge)
- Philip Jones
- Ian Munn (Chair)
- Diane Neil Mills (vice Chair)
- Henry Nelless
- Geraldine Stanford

Substitute members: Nick Draper, Maurice Groves

Also attending: Cllr Andrew Judge; James McGinlay (Merton Council, head of Sustainable Communities) Paul McGarry (Future Merton Manager); Tara Butler (Future Merton policy manager).

For Agenda Item 7: Rainbow Industrial Area presentation: Jonathan Shelton (Workspace Group); Angus Boag (Workspace Group), James Santer (AHMM Architects) Peter Caneparo (TTP Consulting (traffic and transport)); Sarah Taylor (Rolf Judd – planning)

Please note that the order of the items on the agenda was revised during the meeting and the notes here reflect the new order of matters discussed.

1. **Declarations of interest** – received from Ian Munn as a former Post Office employee and player on Southey Bowls Club and Maurice Groves as a board member of Merton Priory Homes (proposed policy on affordable rent)

2. **Apologies for absence** – Councillor Chris Edge, substituted by Cllr Maurice Groves.

3. **Minutes of the Borough Plan Advisory Committee meeting** held on 10 January 2012 – Members approved the minutes
4. **Agenda item 6 - Rainbow Industrial Estate – draft planning brief for consultation**

4.1 Jonathan Shelton (Workspace Group) led a presentation to attendees on the proposals for Rainbow Industrial area, recommending public consultation on a draft planning brief (supplementary planning document) for the site which would outline proposals for employment led regeneration of the site.

4.2 Councillors asked questions on the proposals including (in no particular order):

i. Layout of the site and whether the amenity of the residents occupying the new homes near the site entrance would be affected by the traffic from the businesses;
   - Workspace explained their reasoning behind the proposed layout of the site and thought that there wouldn’t be a negative impact on future residents of the new homes nearest the entrance due to the nature of the vehicle movements and the design of the residential development

ii. Scale and massing of the proposed developments, including potential views of new buildings from outside the site, e.g. from Firstways;
   - Workspace’s response: due to the distance between the buildings and the height of the railway embankments surrounding the site it is likely that only the tops of the roofs on some buildings will be visible from Firstways and similar streets. The view from West Barnes Lane will be improved by the redevelopment. The consultation material will contain diagrammatic cross-sections to illustrate the proposed height of the buildings

iii. Size of business units and Workspace’s view on potential demand for SME businesses in that location;

iv. Size and types of new homes proposed, including affordable homes;

v. Parking and transport issues: Workspace stated that parking would be provided in line with Merton’s policy on car parking provision. Workspace also explained how their ownership of No.9 Grand Drive could help to facilitate formalising the “kiss & ride” dropoff point outside Raynes Park station.

4.3 **RESOLVED**: Borough Plan Advisory Committee resolved to recommend public consultation for six weeks on the draft supplementary planning document for the site.

5 **Agenda item 7: Redevelopment of Hartfield Road car park (P3) and The Broadway car park (P4)**

NB: contrary to the statement in the agenda circulated for this meeting, no part of the report or its appendices was exempt from disclosure.

5.1 Paul McGarry introduced the report and Councillors raised the following matters:
i. Whether retail development was the most appropriate use for P3, and questioned whether the provision of retail floorspace on P3 would displace retail occupiers from elsewhere within Wimbledon, especially along The Broadway.

ii. The value of residential development to this town centre location.

iii. The extent of the loss of car parking (numbers, whether short term or commuter parking) on P3, P4, and elsewhere in Wimbledon town centre, considering the potential redevelopment of Queens Road car park via the Sites and Policies DPD, and raised concerns over the total capacity of Wimbledon’s car parks to support a vibrant town centre if P3 and P4 were to be redeveloped. Officers said that research into parking in Wimbledon and Morden town centre was proposed for June 2012 which would provide quantitative evidence on car parking in Wimbledon.

iv. It was questioned whether there was any benefit in pursuing redevelopment of P3 given the 1999 legal agreement which requires the provision of at least 150 car parking spaces on the site until 2019.

v. Councillors questioned whether a primary school would be viable on P4, given the pressure on school places identified in the Wimbledon area.

vi. Councillors viewed car parking as essential to sustaining a successful town centre, particularly close to the Wimbledon and Polka theatres. The car parking on P4 (beside Wimbledon Theatre and close to the Polka theatre) is considered essential to enable the theatres to compete with the West End.

vii. For P4, development would be supported where it enhances Wimbledon town centre and the theatres.

5.2 **RESOLVED**: that officers would update the Borough Plan Advisory Committee on further progress on these sites at the meeting of 20 September 2012 and that local ward councillors would be kept up to date as to progress with these sites.

6 **Agenda items 4 and 5: feedback on January-April consultation; additional sites and policies proposed for public consultation**

6.1 Members reviewed the reports and made comments.

6.2 Officers agreed to review the consultation summary to ensure all comments received were summarised under their correct site or policy issue, especially following Cllr Philip Jones comments on the errors.

6.3 Cllr Maurice Groves asked if the proposed policy DM.D3 on heritage assets could be strengthened.

6.4 Councillors also asked officers to consider a policy position that only supported mixed use schemes in appropriate locations; councillors cited examples of mixed use commercial and residential schemes where the commercial element is never occupied due to its unattractiveness for commercial occupiers (e.g. remote location, size constraints etc).
6.5 Councillors considered the 15 potential development sites and raised a number of matters including:

(i) concern over the deliverability of 74 Southey Bowling Club given the need to retain bowling facilities and the site’s restricted access and proximity to existing homes

(ii) the need to balance new residential development with the protection of employment land and the provision of local amenities including school places. Officers said that all recommendations had been taken with these issues in mind and that planning officers were working closely with officers in Merton’s Children’s Schools and Families department to assess how and where current and future need for school places will be met.

(iii) The use of planning obligation, including the application of the Community Infrastructure Levy and Merton’s current Planning Obligations SPD 2006 in mitigating the loss of employment land

(iv) The approach to protecting open space set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

6.6 Officers undertook to:

(i) send Councillors a copy of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

(ii) send Councillors a copy of the Cabinet report on affordable rent (07 November 2011 meeting)

(iii) circulate two reports for information (these were circulated on 23 May 2012 to members of the Borough Plan Advisory Committee and Planning Applications Committee and published on the Council’s website)

a. Application of Merton’s UDP policy E.6 (loss of employment land) in line with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and 2011

b. Review of the National Planning Policy Framework against Merton’s Unitary Development Plan 2003 (open space – UDP policies L.5 and L.7)

6.7 RESOLVED: that the additional sites and policies (Stage 2a draft Sites and Policies DPD) be recommended to Cabinet for six weeks of public consultation between 13 June and 25 July 2012 apart from the following recommended change:

(i) That Site Proposal 69 Sibthorp Road car park, Mitcham be deleted from the proposed consultation and be retained as a car park to serve local residents

6.8 RESOLVED: that the Director for Environment and Regeneration in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration be authorised to approve changes to the documents prior to public consultation and other consequential matters in accordance with the appropriate Regulations.