

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 14th JULY 2016

UPRN	APPLICATION NO.	DATE VALID
	16/P1918	09/05/16

Address/Site Land at 17 Ridge Road, Mitcham, CR4 2ET

(Ward) Graveney

Proposal: Erection of new mid terrace, two bedroom dwelling, between existing houses at 17 and 18 Ridge Road, involving demolition of existing garage.

Drawing Nos: Site location plan & RR-2-10, 09, 04, 03, 01.

Contact Officer: Leigh Harrington (020 8545 3836)

RECOMMENDATION

Subject to any resolution at Full Council on 13th July pertaining to the issue of affordable housing contributions, grant permission subject to a S106 obligation/ Unilateral Undertaking and conditions

CHECKLIST INFORMATION.

- Heads of agreement: Affordable housing.
- Is a screening opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental Statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Impact Assessment been submitted – No
- Design Review Panel consulted – No
- Number of neighbours consulted – 7
- Press notice – No
- Site notice – Yes
- External consultations: N/A
- Density – 93 h.r.p.h
- Number of jobs created N/A

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application is brought before members of PAC due to the level of objection and at the request of Cllr Linda Kirby.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site is land to the rear and side of 17 Ridge Road which has been separated from the existing dwelling by the erection of close boarded fencing. The existing house has retained a site area totalling approximately 90 sq m, while the application site is approximately 430 sq m. There is an attached side garage at 17 Ridge Road which would be demolished in order to create a new mid terrace house between 17 and 18 Ridge Road.

2.2 The site is in a residential area, bordered to the north by Tramlink (land which is designated as SINCL. To the east of Ridge Road are allotments designated as a Green Corridor. A shared vehicle accessway runs to the south of the site, between houses in Caithness Road and the rear boundaries of Ridge Road houses. Alleygates have recently been installed at both ends of this accessway.

2.3 The site is not shown to be at significant risk of flooding, is not within a conservation area or Archaeological Priority Zone. There are no controlled parking zones nearby and the site has poor public transport accessibility (PTAL level 2).

3. **CURRENT PROPOSAL**

3.1 In July 2011 members agreed to grant permission (LBM ref 11/P1129) subject to conditions and a S106 agreement (education contributions) for the Demolition of existing garage at the side of 17 Ridge Road and erection of a new mid terrace, 2 bedroom house between existing houses at 17 and 18 Ridge Road. The permission was never implemented and has lapsed. This application is identical to that granted permission by members in 2011.

3.2 The new house proposes matching ridge and eaves lines and roof pitches, with external materials including plain clay tiles and white rendered walls to match 17 Ridge Road. The proposed house is part two/ part single storey with the additional ground floor space projecting in line with an existing single storey extension at 17 Ridge Road. The internal layout shows lounge, W/C and kitchen/diner at ground floor and 2 bedrooms and bathroom at first floor.

3.3 Existing vehicle crossovers would allow front garden car parking to be retained for both the house at 17 Ridge Road and the proposed dwelling.

4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 10/P0912 - Refused and dismissed at appeal - Erection of a detached building, comprising 2 x 2 bedroom dwellings, across the rear part of the application site.

Reasons for refusal: The proposal by reason of size, position, design and massing, would result in an unsatisfactory overdevelopment of the site being visually overbearing and detracting from the visual amenities of neighbouring occupiers in Ridge Road and Caithness Road, contrary to policies BE.15, BE.16, and BE.22 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (2003) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (New Residential Development - September 1999).

The proposed development would generate additional pressure on educational facilities in the area. In the absence of a legal agreement securing a financial contribution toward education provision locally the proposals would fail to offset their impact within the area, and would be contrary to policies ST.36 and C.13 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (October 2003) and Supplementary Planning Guidance: Planning Obligations (2006).

5. CONSULTATION

5.1 The proposal has been publicised by means of a site notice and letters to neighbouring occupiers, to which there have been 21 letters that include objections on the following issues:

- Overlooking and loss of privacy
- Loss of visual amenity and light
- Out of character and loss of visual amenity
- Design of the house is unattractive and will spoil the look of number 18
- Over development of the site
- Increased strain on sewers and water supply;
- Increased risk of flooding
- Road is so narrow off street parking space wont be used
- Increased traffic will be a safety and security issue
- Noise and disturbance from construction process
- Site notice not displayed
- Difficulties with construction to ensure no detriment to the external appearance or structure of the existing house at number 18;
- Failure to provide adequate information on energy, water efficiency, capture and storage
- Applicant has indicated desire to tarmac over the rear garden and erect garages for rent but not shown on the plans.
- Concreting over the front garden would cause flooding
- Increased noise
- Lack of contribution towards education

5.2 The North Mitcham Plot Owners Association also objected against commercial garages being erected at the rear of the plot and the tarmacking of the rear garden which are not part of the application.

5.3 Transport Planning confirm that Ridge Road is a narrow residential road off Streatham Road, with poor access to public transport (PTAL level 2) and not in a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). Subject to a condition in respect of construction management there are no objections on grounds of highway safety.

6. POLICY CONTEXT

6.1 The relevant policies in the Adopted Core Strategy (June 2011) are;
CS 8 Housing choice.
CS 9 Housing targets
CS 13 Open spaces
CS 14 Design
CS 15 Climate Change
CS 20 Parking servicing and delivery

- 6.2 Relevant policies in the London Plan (March 2015) are;
 - 3.3 Increasing housing supply
 - 3.4 Optimising housing potential
 - 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
 - 3.11 Affordable housing targets.
 - 5.1 Climate change mitigation
 - 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
 - 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
 - 6.13 Parking
 - 7.4 Local character
 - 7.5 Public realm
 - 7.6 Architecture
 London Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (2016)

- 6.3 Relevant policies in the Merton Sites and Policies Plan 2014
 - DM D1 Urban design and the public realm
 - DM D2: Design considerations
 - DM D3: Alterations and Extensions to Buildings
 - DM 02 Nature conservation
 - DM T3 Car parking

7. **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 7.1 The key planning considerations include housing targets and the standard of accommodation; siting and design, including impacts on the Ridge Road streetscene; impacts on neighbour amenity and highway safety. However, members have previously given consent for an identical application on this site and therefore consideration needs to relate to any changes in policy since that consent was granted that may impact the acceptability of the proposals.

- 7.2 Housing Targets.
 Currently Policy CS. 9 within the Council's Adopted Core Strategy [July 2011] and policy 3.3 of the London Plan [July 2015] state that the Council will work with housing providers to provide a minimum of 4,107 additional homes [411 new dwellings annually] between 2015 and 2025. The proposal will provide a new two bedroom house thereby promoting the objectives of current policies.

- 7.3 Standard of accommodation
 Permission was previously granted with reference to minimum standards set out in the adopted SPG "New Residential Development" (1999): Space standards are now found in London Plan (2016) policy 3.5 which sets out sets out the minimum Gross Internal Area requirements for new housing and the Nationally described space standards (2015). The internal layout has been adjusted so as to confirm to the Nationally described space standards. This two bedroom three person unit requires a minimum GIA of 70 sq.m and provides 79sqm which exceeds requirements. Externally the subdivision of the site to provide two houses will still retain sufficient outdoor amenity space to allow both houses to enjoy more than the minimum 50 sq.m of private and usable amenity space as required by SPP policy DM D2.

7.4 Siting, Design and Streetscene.

UDP Policies BE.16 and BE.22 both required proposals for development to complement the character and appearance of the wider setting and they have been superseded by London Plan policy 7.4, Sites and Policies Plan policies DM D1 (Urban design), DM D2: (Design considerations) and DM D3: (Alterations and Extensions to existing Buildings) as well as LBM Core Strategy Policy CS14 which are all policies that are also designed to ensure that proposals are well designed and in keeping with the character of the local area. Members previously considered that the proposals met these standards and there have been no changes in policy requirements or goals that would justify refusing the same proposals on design grounds. As the site is relatively constrained a condition removing permitted development rights is again recommended.

7.5 Neighbour Amenity:

Members previously considered the application with reference to Adopted UDP policy BE15 that required that orientation and design of new buildings provides adequate levels of sunlight and daylight to adjoining buildings and land, with good levels of privacy for adjacent occupiers. Although this policy has now been superseded by London Plan policy 7.6 and SPP policy DM D2, they also require that proposals will not have a negative impact on neighbour amenity in terms of loss of light, privacy visual intrusion or noise and disturbance. Given that the proposals are identical to what was previously approved and the policies remain broadly similar, again there would be no grounds to justify a refusal of permission.

7.6 Traffic and parking:

This issue was a common reason for objection from neighbours. LDF Core Strategy Policy CS 20 is concerned with issues surrounding pedestrian movement, safety, serving and loading facilities for local businesses and manoeuvring for emergency vehicles as well as refuse storage and collection. While the scheme results in the loss of an existing garage, there is currently no requirement for this to be used for car parking and no evidence therefore that the scheme would result in undue increased pressure for on street parking to an extent that would compromise highway safety or cause detriment to neighbouring occupiers. Vehicle crossovers to the existing house and the garage are to be retained to allow front garden parking for both dwellings.

7.7 Affordable housing

At the time of submitting the previous application the Council had not adopted its Local Development framework. LDF policy CS.8 seeks the provision of a mix of housing types including affordable housing. Financial contributions towards affordable housing for schemes creating between 1 and 9 additional units are sought under the terms of adopted policy. In May this year the Court of Appeal decision upheld the Government's position that local planning authorities should not pursue requirements for affordable housing financial contributions on small sites (1-10 dwellings). In the event that Full Council (13th July) resolves that the Council considers Merton should currently stop

seeking affordable housing contributions from small sites of 10 homes / 1,000 square metres or less within planning decisions then no contribution would be sought on this application. In the event that such a resolution is not endorsed then permission would be granted subject to the completion of a S106 to secure such a financial contribution.

7.8 Other matters

A number of objections were received relating to suggestions that the rear garden would be covered in tarmac and garages built. A condition requiring a landscaping scheme for the back gardens is therefore recommended to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the development.

7.9 The applicant will still need to enter into an agreement with the neighbouring occupiers with regards to party wall matters

8. **SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS**

8.1 The proposal does not constitute Schedule 1 or Schedule 2 development. Accordingly, there are no requirements in terms of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).

8.2 Although the Code for Sustainable Homes has been withdrawn a condition requiring the development to be constructed so as to meet the equivalent Code Level 4 standards relating to energy and water consumption is however permissible and is recommended.

9. **CONCLUSION**

9.1 The scheme is identical to one approved by the Planning Applications Committee in 2011, Because that permission was not implemented within 3 years it lapsed it necessitated the submission of the current application. Whilst the UDP and London Plan policies have been superseded updated since consent was granted there have been no changes in those policies that would cause the proposals to be considered contrary to current policy and thereby justify a refusal of permission.

9.2 Proposed room sizes and layout are compatible with adopted current guidance and there is appropriate provision for amenity space and off-street parking. The proposal is therefore recommended for planning approval subject to appropriate conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

Subject to any resolution at Full Council on 13th July pertaining to the issue of affordable housing contributions, grant planning permission completion of a Section 106 obligation covering the following heads of terms:

1. Provision of financial contribution towards
2. The developer agreeing to meet the Council's monitoring and reasonable legal costs in preparing, drafting and monitoring the Section 106 Agreement.

And the following conditions:-

1. A.1 Commencement of development (full application)

2. A.7 Approved Plans (Site location plan, RR-2-10, 09, 04, 03, 01)
3. B.1 External materials to be approved
3. B6 Levels
4. C.1 No Permitted Development (Extensions)
5. C.6 Details of refuse storage
6. D.11 Hours of construction
7. H.10 Construction Vehicles/ Wash down facilities
- 8 F1 Landscaping
10. Non Standard Condition (Sustainability) No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until evidence has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority demonstrating that the development has achieved not less than the CO2 reductions (ENE1) (a 25% reduction compared to 2010 part L regulations), and internal water usage (WAT1) (105 litres/p/day) standards equivalent to Code for Sustainable Homes level 4. Informative: Evidence requirements in respect of condition 13 are detailed in the "Schedule of evidence required for Post Construction Stage from Ene1 & Wat1 of the Code for Sustainable Homes Technical Guide. Reason for condition: To ensure the development achieves a high standard of sustainability and makes efficient use of resources and to comply with policies 5.2 of the Adopted London Plan 2015 and CS 15 of the Adopted Merton Core Planning Strategy 2011.

NPPF Informative.

To view Plans, drawings and documents relating to the application please follow [this link](#)

Please note that this link, and some of the related plans, may be slow to load

This page is intentionally left blank