

## PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 19 JANUARY 2017

	<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<b>DATE VALID</b>
	16/P2454	14.06.2016
<b>Address/Site</b>	45A Crusoe Road, Mitcham, CR4 3LJ	
<b>(Ward)</b>	Colliers Wood	
<b>Proposal:</b>	Demolition of warehouse and the erection of 4 x 3 bedroom and 2 x 4 bedroom houses with cycle and refuse storage and associated landscaping work.	
<b>Drawing No's:</b>	Site location plan and drawings; 294A/LP/0.01 REV E, 294A/LP/1.00 REV F, 294A/LP/1.01 REV F, 294A/LP/1.02 REV F, 294A/LP/1.03 REV E, 294A/LP/2.00 REV E, 294A/LP/2.01 REV C, 294A/LP/2.02 REV A, 294A/LP/3.00 REV E, 294A/LP/3.01 REV E, 294A/LP/3.02 REV E, 294A/LP/8.00 REV A, 294A/LP/8.01 REV A, 294A/LP/8.02 REV A, 294A/LP/8.03 REV A, 294A/LP/8.04 REV A & 294A/LP/8.05 REV A	
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	Leigh Harrington (020 8545 3836)	

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Grant permission subject to conditions.

### **CHECKLIST INFORMATION.**

- S106 Heads of agreement: Yes
- 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 – 55
- Press notice – No
- Site notice – Yes
- External consultations: Environment Agency,
- Number of jobs created – n/a
- Density – 85 Dwellings per ha

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The application is brought before members due to the objection, regarding loss of light to a window, not being a matter that can be addressed by condition and therefore falling outside the scheme of delegation to officers.

## **2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 0.07 hectare site located on the north side of Crusoe Road in Mitcham. The site is occupied by a vacant warehouse that has a ridge height slightly lower than the ridge height of the adjacent houses of around three storeys with a saw tooth roof design. Adjoining the site to the east is a terrace of two storey brick built houses with similar properties directly opposite the site as well as to the north. To the west of the site it is adjoined at 45B by a tyre fitting business, while the two storey building at 45C is in use by the Rhema Church Ministries and two other companies.
- 2.2 The site is not within a Conservation Area or an Archaeological Priority Zone but is located within an area currently under consultation for designation as a Controlled Parking Zone (CW3) and is located within a critical drainage area and southern boundary is susceptible to surface water flooding.
- 2.3 The application site enjoys reasonable access to public transport, (PTAL level 3).

## **3. CURRENT PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 The proposal involves the demolition of the existing vacant building and the erection of a terrace of 6 houses, 4 x 3 bedroom and 2 x 4 bedroom. The design of the terrace has evolved through a series of on-going discussions with officers and has the terrace aligned with the existing building line and each house would have a small front garden with a front wall that also aligned with the existing residential street layout, providing space for a refuse area.
- 3.2 Although the houses form a terrace they are not equally sized in terms of width or floor area but they do have similar internal configurations. On the ground floor each house has a hallway leading to a lounge at the front of the house. The hallway also serves the staircase, internal cycle store and a ground floor WC before leading to an open plan combined kitchen/dining/living room with access to a rear patio and garden via sliding doors. This rear element would be mostly within a single storey element featuring a green roof area.
- 3.3 The first floor of each house would accommodate bedrooms, bathrooms and storage areas. The second floor of each house is set back from the front elevation and would accommodate a further bedroom, bathroom and storage area.
- 3.4 Externally the houses would be finished primarily in exposed semi glazed brickwork with precast lintels and timber and aluminum composite double and triple glazing and timber front doors and each house would feature a gable fronted upper floor to reflect the roof design of the original building with the new roof being finished in clay tiles.

#### 4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 The planning history for the proposal site has various entries however the following are considered most relevant to the current proposal.
- 4.2 The application under reference MER931/74 for the use of unit 1, 45 Crusoe Road for preparation of pates, hams and pork sausages was granted in December 1974.
- 4.3 The application under reference MER690/73 for alterations and division of factory under clause iii within the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1972 was granted in in July 1973.
- 4.4 15/P2655 The demolition of the existing building (Use Class B1c light industrial - 1200 square metres) and erection of 2 three storey residential blocks providing 17 self-contained flats (7 one bedroom and 10 two bedroom)with associated nine off street car parking, cycle storage , refuse storage and landscaping. Reasons for refusal.  
**The proposal, by reason of its size, sitting and design would represent a visually intrusive and unneighbourly form of development that would fail to achieve a high standard of design that would fail to preserve the privacy of neighbouring occupiers or enhance the character of the area. It would constitute an insensitive and overly dominant development that would be to the detriment of the amenity of local residents and to the character and suburban nature of the Crusoe Road streetscene, contrary to policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015, DM D2 of the Adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan 2014 and policy CS.14 of the Core Planning Strategy (2011).**

And

**The proposed design and layout of the development would fail to provide a safe and secure layout for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicular traffic, fails to encourage the development of active transport measures and fails to provide the standards of suitable, accessible and secure cycle parking and electric vehicle parking spaces that are required by the London Plan 2015. Therefore the proposal fails to accord with the requirements of policy 6.1 in the London Plan 2015, policy CS.18 in the LDF Core Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2, DM T1 and DM T3 of the Adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan 2014.**

And

**The proposed development would fail to contribute to meeting affordable housing targets and in the absence of a legal undertaking securing a financial contribution towards the delivery of affordable housing on-site would be contrary to policy CS.8 of the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011).**

## **5. CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 The planning application was publicised by means of site notices and letters were sent to 55 neighbouring occupiers. In response 2 letters were received from local residents raising the following issues:
- The houses should have their own parking facilities on site due to parking pressures in the area.
  - Parking survey appears inaccurate, road nearly always full of cars and more than 42% of homes have a car.
  - The new walls will be closer to some the bedrooms leading to loss of light.
  - The proximity of the new wall will make maintenance of the neighbour's wall difficult.
- 5.2 Transport Planning. Officers commented that;
- Based on the information supplied, the parking impact will not be severe.
  - Cycle storage under the stairs is not good practice and a preference would be for secure external storage.
  - Due to the nature of the site and its residential nature a Construction Management Plan should be required by condition.
  - The applicant should enter a s278 agreement to remove the two existing footway crossovers and reinstate the pavement along the length of the site as well as paying for the cost of amending the traffic management order to allow for the removal of the loading bay.
- 5.3 Environmental Health. No objections subject to the imposition of suitable conditions in relation to possible site contamination given its previous commercial uses and for a Construction Method Statement.
- 5.4 Environment Agency. No objections to the proposal. Given the historic use of the site conditions relating to land contamination and preventing the infiltration of surface water drainage should be imposed.
- 5.5 Climate change. No objections. The proposed energy approach to the development is policy compliant.

## **6. POLICY CONTEXT**

- 6.1 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 Development), 3.8 (Housing Choice), 5.1 (Climate Change), 5.3 (Sustainable Design and Construction), 5.13 (Sustainable drainage), 6.9 (Cycling), 6.13 (Parking), 7.4 (Local Character), 7.5 (Public realm), 7.6 (Architecture), 7.15 (Reducing and managing noise).
- 6.2 Relevant policies in the Core Strategy (July 2011) are CS8 (Housing Choice), CS9 (Housing Provision), CS11 (Infrastructure), CS14 (Design), CS15 (Climate Change), CS 16 (Flood risk management).CS 17 (Waste

Management), CS18 (Active Transport), CS19 (Public Transport), CS20 (Parking, Servicing and Delivery).

- 6.3 Relevant policies in the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan 2014 are DM D1 (Urban Design and the Public Realm), DM D2 (Design considerations in all developments), DM D3 (Alterations and extensions to buildings), DM EP 2 (Reducing and mitigating against noise), DM EP 4 (Pollutants), DM F2 (Sustainable urban drainage systems), DM T1 (Support for sustainable transport and active travel), DM T2 (Transport impacts of development), DM T3 Car parking and servicing standards.
- 6.4 The site is identified as Proposal Site 80 in the Sites and Policies plan (2014) with an allocated use for residential purposes.
- 6.5 London Housing SPG 2016
- 6.6 DCLG- Technical housing standards 2015

## **7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 7.1 The main planning considerations include establishing the principle of this development that will a) include the loss of the existing industrial employment floor space and the acceptability of this location for the proposed use; b) assessing the standard of the proposed residential accommodation c) assessing the impact of the development on the amenities of adjacent residential occupiers and d) assessing the potential impact on traffic, car parking and transport.

### 7.2 Loss of the existing employment floor space;

The principle of losing the existing employment floor space on the site at 45A Crusoe Road and the acceptability of residential use on this site has been assessed separately by the Council through the process of adopting the Sites and Policies Plan 2014. As proposal site 80, the adopted Sites and Policies Plan confirms that the Council's preferred land use for this site is residential and this proposal provides 6 family sized homes for which there is an identified need.

### 7.3 Standard of Accommodation and Amenity Space

The London Plan (2015) (Policy 3.5) and its supporting document, the London Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance 2016 provide detailed guidance on minimum room sizes and amenity space. These recommended minimum Gross Internal Area space standards are based on the numbers of bedrooms and therefore likely future occupiers. The four 3 bedroom 5 persons units over three floors have GIAs of between 133sqm and 154sqm with a required minimum of 99sqm and the two 3 bedroom 6 persons units provide between 118sqm and 133sqm with a requirement for 108sqm. Each house is therefore considered to offer generous accommodation well in excess of the required minimum, with all habitable rooms receiving good levels of daylight, outlook and natural ventilation. Each unit would be provided with a rear garden with an area of between 43.3sqm and 60sqm. While the minimum requirement is

50sq.m officers considered that this small shortfall for three of the units is mitigated through the provision of front gardens and generous levels of internal space to the degree that it would not warrant grounds for refusal of the application. Given these limits to the rear garden space it is recommended that permitted development rights be removed from the new houses in order to ensure that the site does not become over developed to the detriment of the area and its residents.

Unit	Unit type	GIA in sqm	Req'd GIA	Amenity in Sqm (Not incl small front gardens)	Req'd Amenity
1	3B/6P	133	108	50.4	50
2	3B/5P	154	99	60	50
3	3B/5P	133	99	49.2	50
4	3B/5P	133	99	49.2	50
5	3B/5P	154	99	58.8	50
6	3B/6P	118	108	43.3	50

#### 7.4 Design

London Plan policy 7.4, Sites and Policies Plan policies DM D1 and DM D2: as well as LBM Core Strategy Policy CS14 are all policies designed to ensure that proposals are well designed and in keeping with the character of the local area. The proposals have undergone revision in the wake of discussions with officers including alterations to align eaves lines, window lines and pushing back the frontage of the top floor so as to soften the contrast in roof alignment with the existing terrace. Without being a pastiche of neighbouring housing the design has been developed to reflect the locality through the use of exposed brickwork, commonality of building lines and the gable roof form of neighbouring rear outrigger roofs and commercial roofs. Officers consider that the design provides a modern interpretation of a traditional terrace of houses and would sit well within the wider streetscene and would accord with relevant design and space standards policies.

#### 7.5 Neighbour Amenity

London Plan policy 7.6 and SPP policy DM D2 require that proposals will not have a negative impact on neighbour amenity in terms of loss of light, visual intrusion or noise and disturbance. Objections were received from the neighbouring occupier raising concerns relating to the impact of the proximity of the proposed building on a bedroom window. The Daylight and Sunlight assessment undertaken by the applicant acknowledged that the proposal would mean that one window at 43 Crusoe Road (no 4) would fail the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) test, i.e. daylight to that window would be adversely impacted by the proposed development. Window 3 would experience a loss of daylight but not to the degree that it failed both components of the VSC test. However, as the existing large flank wall of the building that runs along the

boundary will be removed in large part along that line, windows 1,2, 5 & 6 at that address will actually receive an improvement in the daylight achievable. No windows fail the test for Sunlight and houses in Pitcairn Road that adjoin the rear of the site will see an improvement in sunlight and outlook from the removal of a two storey wall directly on their rear boundary. Therefore it is considered that whilst the reduction to one room is regrettable the overall impact is considered to represent an improvement and as such officers consider the proposals to be acceptable and not harmful to the overall amenity of the neighbouring occupiers and would not warrant a refusal of the application.

7.6 Traffic, Parking and Servicing

The issue of additional parking pressure was raised in objections to the proposals however current central government and Mayoral guidance seeks to encourage use of sustainable travel modes and to reduce reliance on private car travel. To this end there are only guidelines on the maximum level of parking that should be provided rather than a minimum.

The applicants transport statement stated that there was capacity in the area Transport planning officers raised no objections to the proposals and noted that additional overnight capacity would be provided when the loading bays are removed and were satisfied that the parking impact would not be severe.

7.7 The proposed level of cycle parking for the houses meets the London Plan minimum standards and is consequently considered acceptable. There is a requirement for the cycle storage to be secure and accessible. Whilst officer preference would be for the storage to be outside the house rather than under the stairs, the internal location would at least be secure, there would be ample space in the rear garden for a store and it would not clutter the small front gardens.

7.8 Contaminated land

The relevant consultees have no objection to the proposals but require the imposition of suitable conditions relating to potential land contamination given the commercial use history of the site.

7.9 Flood risk

The Environment Agency had no objections on flooding grounds but did request a condition be imposed relating to infiltration of surface water discharge.

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).

## 9. **CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 The site is a vacant warehouse building that has been identified in the Sites and Policies Plan 2014 as being suitable for redevelopment for housing. The provision of 6 new family homes is in accordance with policies requiring the provision of additional housing whilst the design and size of the accommodation is considered acceptable and fully in accordance with the required internal space standards. Externally half the gardens exceed adopted standards with the garden for unit 6 being 6.7 sq.m above standard. Modest shortfalls of 0.8sqm to garden space for 2 of the units are not considered sufficient grounds to withhold permission. Notwithstanding the negative impact of the proposals relating to daylight to a neighbouring window, the proposals actually result in more daylight reaching the majority of windows in the neighbouring property. Overall it is considered that these two elements do not detract from the benefits of replacing an old vacant warehouse with an attractive terrace of spacious modern family housing for which there is an identified need in the borough and therefore the proposals are recommended for approval subject to the imposition of suitable conditions.

### **RECOMMENDATION, GRANT PERMISSION SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS.**

1. A.1 Commencement of development for full application
2. A.7 Approved plans; Site location plan, drawings; 294A/LP/0.01 REV E, 294A/LP/1.00 REV F, 294A/LP/1.01 REV F, 294A/LP/1.02 REV F, 294A/LP/1.03 REV E, 294A/LP/2.00 REV E, 294A/LP/2.01 REV C, 294A/LP/2.02 REV A, 294A/LP/3.00 REV E, 294A/LP/3.01 REV E, 294A/LP/3.02 REV E, 294A/LP/8.00 REV A, 294A/LP/8.01 REV A, 294A/LP/8.02 REV A, 294A/LP/8.03 REV A, 294A/LP/8.04 REV A & 294A/LP/8.05 REV A
3. B 3 Materials as specified
4. B4 Surface treatments
5. B5 Boundary treatment.
6. C1 No permitted development extensions
7. C.7 Refuse and recycling implementation
8. C8 No use of flat roof
9. D.9 No external lighting
10. D.11 Construction times.
11. Construction Method Statement No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the demolition and construction period. The Statement shall provide for:
  - The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
  - Loading and unloading of plant and materials
  - Storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
  - The erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate
  - Wheel washing facilities
  - Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction



- A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works

Reason; To protect the amenities of future occupiers and those in the local vicinity in accordance with policies DM D2 & DM EP4 in the Merton Sites and Policies Plan 2014 and CS20 in the Merton Core strategy 2011

12. H.9 Construction vehicles

13. Non standard condition No drainage systems for the infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground are permitted other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to Controlled Waters. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: Infiltrating water has the potential to cause remobilisation of contaminants present in shallow soil/made ground which could ultimately cause pollution of groundwater and therefore the control of pollutants is required to accord with policy DM EP4 of the Adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan 2014

14. M1 Contaminated land

15. M2 Contaminated land- remedial measures

16. Contaminated land- Validation report

17. 'No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until evidence has been submitted to the council confirming that the development has achieved not less than the CO2 reductions (ENE1), internal water usage (WAT1) standards equivalent to Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. REASON To ensure that the development achieves a high standard of sustainability and makes efficient use of resources and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 5.2 of the London Plan 2015 and policy CS15 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011.

18. Non standard condition. No development other than demolition may commence until an agreement under section of the 278 Highways Act agreement has been entered into with the Local Authority to secure the removal of the existing access points, the reinstatement of the pavement and the removal of the existing loading bays.

Reason. To improve parking and servicing for this development and ensure compliance with policy CS 20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011.

---

[Click here](#) for full plans and documents related to this application.

Please note these web pages may be slow to load

This page is intentionally left blank