

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

23rd April 2015

Item No:

UPRN	APPLICATION NO.	DATE VALID
	15/P0364	11/02/2015
Address/Site:	35 Florence Avenue, Morden, SM4 6EX	
(Ward)	Ravensbury	
Proposal	Erection of a 1 bedroom single storey dwelling house – application for outline planning permission with all matters reserved.	
Drawing No's	Site location plan, Indicative drawings FP1, FP2, FP3 & FP/4.	
Contact Officer	Leigh Harrington (020 8545 3836)	

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION subject to planning conditions.

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- Head of agreement: No
- 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 - 19
- Press notice - No
- Site notice - Yes
- External consultations: Metropolitan Police
- Density – 1.8 dwellings per hectare
- Number of jobs created N/A

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is brought before the Planning Applications Committee due to the level of objection to the proposal and the previous planning history of the site.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site (554 sq.m) is a plot of land to the rear of 35 Florence Avenue in Morden. 35 Florence Avenue is a large detached two-storey property with accommodation in the roof space. A driveway to the side of the house allows for vehicular access to the plot of land to the rear which is the subject of this application. The plot of land is surrounded by a number of residential properties in Florence Avenue, John's lane and William's Lane and is formed predominantly from a grass lawn.
- 2.2 The site is not within a conservation area and has a Public Transport Accessibility Level of 1b where 1 is the lowest level of public transport accessibility. The site is not within a Controlled Parking Zone.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The proposal is for outline planning permission for the erection of a single storey bungalow style property on the land to the rear of 35 Florence Avenue with all matters, including the design and access reserved at this stage.
- 3.2 The applicant has however provided illustrative plans that show a bungalow (55sq.m) which would provide a double bedroom, full bathroom and a combined living/kitchen/dining room area along with an area of permeable hardstanding to the front of the building. The dwelling would be independent from the host building with illustrative plans showing a garden to the new dwelling of around 400sq.m and an additional 120sqm hardstanding area with the rear garden of the retained dwelling reduced to 60sq.m.
- 3.3 Illustrative plans show the bungalow located no closer than 3m from the boundaries of back gardens to house in Johns Lane providing an overall separation of 35m from the back of these houses. The plans show the bungalow located no closer than 7m from the boundaries of back gardens to house in Williams Lane Lane providing an overall separation of 20m from the back of these houses. The illustrative plans show a bungalow 22 m from the backs of houses in Florence Avenue.
- 3.4 The bungalow is described on the illustrative plans as having a ridged roof rising to 3.98m with an eaves of 2.44m.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 1984 - MER259/84 Outline planning permission refused for the erection of a bungalow and two domestic garages in rear garden, involving demolition of existing garage at side of dwellinghouse.

- 4.2 2005 - 05/P2857 Application for demolition of existing house and erection of a 5 bedroom detached dwelling house on three floors with top floor of accommodation within the roofspace, facing Florence Avenue and a terrace of three houses, with accommodation on two floors, in rear garden (2 x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bedroom houses). Vehicle access to 4 parking spaces via enlarged crossover onto Florence Avenue. Withdrawn by applicant.
- 4.3 2006 - 06/P1155 Application for demolition of existing house and the erection of a 5 bed detached house fronting Florence Avenue, and a terrace of 4 x 1 bed dwellings to the rear with access onto Florence Avenue. Refused on the following grounds.
The proposed development would:
(a) have adverse implications for biodiversity due to the large amount of back garden land and open space that would be lost to built development;
(b) result in the living conditions and privacy of occupiers of existing neighbouring residential properties being diminished by increased noise and disturbance, including due to use of the new access road to the rear;
(c) fail to respond to or reinforce the locally distinctive patterns of development; and
(d) fail to respect the siting, rhythm, scale, proportions, materials and massing of surrounding buildings;
all contrary to policies NE.10, BE.15, BE.16 and BE.22 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (October 2003). Appeal dismissed.
- 4.4 2007 - 07/0696 Application for a certificate of lawfulness in respect of a proposed single storey building in rear garden for use as stables, tack room, store and garage. The proposals entail the demolition of an existing garage and the formation of a driveway to access the building refused on the following grounds.
On the basis of the information submitted as part of the application the Council consider that the proposed structure and the use for which it is intended is not incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse and would therefore fall outside of the definition of permitted development as set out in Class E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 to the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995. Planning permission is therefore required. .
- 4.5 2007 - 07/P1650 Application for planning permission for the demolition of existing house and erection of a new 5 bedroom house with accommodation on three floors with top floor in roofspace and a parking space to front, and three dwellings to rear (one detached, two semi-detached- one 3 bedroom house, one two bedroom and 1 one bedroom)

with accommodation on two floors with top floor in roofspace. Three parking spaces to be provided to rear of replacement dwelling on Florence Avenue frontage, with access provided by proposed driveway between replacement dwelling and 37 Florence Avenue. Refused on the following grounds:

The proposed development would:

- (a) have adverse implications for biodiversity due to the large amount of back garden land and open space that would be lost to built development;**
 - (b) result in the living conditions and privacy of occupiers of existing neighbouring residential properties being diminished by increased noise and disturbance, including due to use of the new access road to the rear;**
 - (c) fail to respond to or reinforce the locally distinctive patterns of development; and**
 - (d) fail to respect the siting, rhythm, scale, proportions, materials and massing of surrounding buildings;**
- all contrary to policies NE.10, BE.15, BE.16 and BE.22 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (October 2003). Appeal dismissed.**

- 4.6 **09/P1909** Planning application for construction of a three bedroom detached dwelling arranged over two levels on garden land to the rear of 35 Florence Avenue. Refused on the following grounds:
The proposals by reason of their design, siting, height, bulk and massing, would result in an unduly prominent and unneighbourly form of development, which would:
- a) fail to respond to or reinforce the locally distinctive pattern of development within the area resulting in a building that would be unduly visually intrusive to neighbouring occupants,**
 - b) result in an undue loss of privacy to the rear gardens of the 35 and 33 Florence Avenue,**
- and would be contrary to policies BE.15, BE.16 and BE.22 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (2003) and the Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance Notes: New Residential Development (1999); and**

The proposed development would generate additional pressure on educational facilities, public open spaces and children's play spaces in the area. In the absence of a legal agreement securing a financial contribution toward education provision, the upgrade of local public open space and children's play spaces and the costs of monitoring the S106 obligations, the proposal would fail to offset this impact, and would be contrary to policies C.13, L.8 & L.9 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (October 2003) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: Planning Obligations (2006).

- 4.7 10/P2614 Planning application for the erection of a large one and half storey dormer bungalow on this plot of land at the rear of 35 Florence Avenue. Refused on the following grounds:

The proposal by reason of its design, siting, height, bulk and massing, would result in an unduly prominent and unneighbourly form of development, which would:

a) fail to respond to, or reinforce the locally distinctive pattern of development

b) result in the loss of garden land with implications for biodiversity, trees and wildlife habitats

c) result in a loss of amenity for nearby properties and their rear gardens in terms of loss of privacy and visual intrusion, including light pollution;

contrary to policies BE.15, BE.16, BE.22, NE.10, NE.12 and P.3 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (2003) and the Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance Notes: New Residential Development (1999); and

The proposed development would generate additional pressure on educational facilities, and on local public open space and children's play spaces. In the absence of a planning undertaking to provide a financial contribution toward education provision, the upgrade of local public open space and children's play space and the costs of monitoring the S106 obligations the proposal would fail to mitigate the impacts of the proposals and would be contrary to policies C.13, L.8 & L.9 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (October 2003) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: Planning Obligations (2006).

Appeal dismissed.

- 4.8 12/P1665 application for a lawful development certificate in respect of the proposed erection in rear garden of a detached single storey outbuilding, a detached single storey double garage/workshop on rear boundary with associated resurfacing of back garden with permeable paving. Certificate refused on the following grounds:

The proposed larger outbuilding, by reason of being within 2m of the boundary of the curtilage of the dwellinghouse and exceeding 2.5m height, would exceed the permitted development tolerances set out in Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No 2) (England) Order 2008. Planning permission would therefore be required.

And

The proposed new buildings exceed what may be reasonably considered as incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse. The floorspace of the two buildings would be much larger than the house itself, even including the upper floor. Although the activities

designated on the plans of the new buildings fall into categories that, individually, may be acceptable as incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling house, taken together they occupy an unreasonable amount of space and as a matter of fact and degree it is considered that the proposals do not come within the terms of Class E of Part 1 of GPDO.

- 4.9 12/P2505 Application for a lawful development certificate in respect of the proposed erection of an ancillary detached single storey double garage and storage building, plus ancillary detached single storey leisure building, with permeable paving allowing vehicular access to garage. Certificate refused on the following grounds:

The proposed new buildings exceed what may be reasonably considered as incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse. The floorspace of the two buildings would be much larger than the house itself, even including the upper floor. Although the activities designated on the plans of the new buildings fall into categories that, individually, may be acceptable as incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse, taken together they occupy an unreasonable amount of space and, as a matter of fact and degree, it is considered that the proposals do not fall within the terms of Class E, Part 1, Schedule 2 of the GPDO (as amended).

- 4.10 15/P1202 Current Application for a lawful development certificate in respect of the proposed erection of a detached single storey garage with combined workshop/leisure room, ancillary to the main dwellinghouse.

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1 The application was advertised by means of neighbour notification letter and site notice.

- 5.2 There were nine letters of objection to the proposal which raised the following issues;

- The changes to PPS3 reclassifying back gardens as Greenfield sites (officers would note that Planning Policy Statements were superseded by the NPPF in 2012. However, Merton's LDF has a specific policy for assessing proposals to build houses on garden land);
- The plot size is too small and doesn't meet the SPG requirement for an 80m plot;
- The proposal will generate severe light pollution from the building and the access road
- Increased noise and disturbance
- The site would be overlooked from all surrounding neighbours
- Unneighbourly form of garden grabbing development
- The new house would adversely affect housing density.
- Harm the streetscene of Florence Avenue

- A dwelling in the rear garden is out of keeping with the local area.
- Increased vandalism and security risk as the site could be accessed from the road;
- The roadway would be too narrow for emergency vehicles and refuse vehicles and result in a serious impact on street parking and have insufficient “visibility requirements” for pedestrians. The roadway is too small for the site.
- Car exhaust pollution and disturbance from the access road
- The access road has no pavement for pedestrian access which is a Health and Safety hazard and contrary to Supplementary Planning Guidance.
- The building and hard surfacing will effect water run-off and cause problems of flooding
- Impacts the human rights of neighbours
- Harm to valuable backland habitat;
- Site is used by Bats and Stag Beetles
- Loss of a back garden and open site Green Space
- The building should be realigned
- The agents are not members of ARB or RIBA;

5.3 The Council’s Transport Planning section were consulted and raised no objection to the scheme, commenting that “The proposal is unlikely to generate substantial car parking (maximum of 1 car), and the immediately surrounding roads (it is noted that Florence Avenue is not in a CPZ) would be able to absorb this.”

5.4 The Metropolitan Police Safer by Design Officer was consulted and observed that:

- There should be no conflict between vehicular and pedestrian use of the access road.
- Lighting for the dwelling should be to the required British Standard to avoid harm to neighbour amenity
- Boundary fencing should have a trellis top.
- Safer by Design principles should be incorporated as a minimum.

6. **POLICY CONTEXT**

- 6.1 London Plan 2015
- 3.3 (Increasing housing supply)
 - 3.4 (Optimising housing potential)
 - 3.5 (Quality and design of housing developments)
 - 5.3 (Sustainable design and construction)
 - 6.13 (Parking)
 - 7.4 (Local character)
 - 7.6 (Architecture)

London Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance 2012

- 6.2 Merton LDF Core Strategy 2011:
CS 9 (Housing provision)
CS 13 (Open and nature conservation)
CS 14 (Design)
CS 15 (Climate change)
CS 16 (Flood risk management)
CS 20 (Parking, servicing and delivery)
- 6.3 Merton Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014):
DM D1 (Urban design)
DM D2 (Design considerations)
DM D3 (Alterations and Extensions to Buildings)
DM F1 (Support for Flood Risk management)
DM O2 (Nature conservation, trees hedges and landscape features)
DM T2 (Transport impacts of developments)

Supplementary Planning Guidance for New Residential Development
1999

7.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 7.1 As this is an outline application with all other matters reserved the main issues for consideration are the principle and suitability of the site for residential development by means of a one bedroom house, the impact on neighbour amenity and the local streetscene including open spaces.
- 7.2 Housing need.
Policy CS. 9 within the Council's Adopted Core Strategy [July 2011] and policy 3.3 of the London Plan [July 2011] stated that the Council will work with housing providers to provide a minimum of 4,800 additional homes [320 new dwellings annually] between 2011 and 2026. The further alterations to the London Plan 2015 have increased this figure to 411 homes for Merton. This proposal will provide a new one bedroom house and is therefore considered to accord with these policies.
- 7.3 Use of garden land.
Policy CS 13 in the Core Strategy requires proposals for new dwellings in back gardens to be justified against;
- Local context and character of the site.
 - Biodiversity value of the site.
 - Value in terms of green corridors and green islands.
 - Flood risk and climate change impacts.

- 7.4 Whilst previous applications have been refused on the grounds of harm to biodiversity, the Inspector's decision letter in 2010 stated; "There is no reasoned evidence that the appeal site has any material value in terms of protected species or habitat. The loss of part of the site to development would therefore not have a harmful effect in this regard. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have harmful effect on biodiversity in the area around the appeal site and that it thus would not conflict with UDP Saved Policy NE.10."
- 7.5 The site does not form part of either a green corridor or a green island, it is not an area at risk of flooding and the associated area of hardstanding has been indicatively shown to be permeable and this could be formalised by condition at the reserved matters stage. The land is now laid to lawn with no trees still on the site and therefore it is considered that the proposal would be unlikely to have any impact on biodiversity but an Informative highlighting the need to adhere to requirements of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 is recommended. In view of these factors it is considered that there is insufficient evidence to justify a refusal of planning permission on these grounds.
- 7.6 Scale of the development.
Plot size; The plot is a substantial area of land for a residential area such as this with a stated area of 554sqm and far exceeds the minimum requirements for development of this scale. The letters of objection raised the issue of plot size and quoted a minimum plot size of 80sqm as set down in the 1999 New Residential Development SPG. Even though this document is given less weight in light of the more current London Housing SPG 2012, section 9.5 states "An overall plot depth of about 80 metres is desirable for backland development, in order to accommodate a new residential street, with houses or flats to each side, while allowing reasonable rear garden areas and privacy for both the new and existing dwellings." Given that the proposal is for a single bedroom, single storey house it is considered that the proposal would not be contrary to the SPG. Current plot size requirements are derived from a combination of the minimum required Gross Internal Area for the size of the proposal, which in this case is 55sqm, plus a further 50sqm for garden space. Both the existing house and the proposed house will have sufficient garden space and therefore it is considered that the proposal meets the minimum plot size requirement.
- 7.5 Building size; Previous applications have been refused because of the scale, size and massing of the proposed buildings. Whilst this is an outline application and the details of the final design will still need to be approved through a subsequent application, this outline application is for a single storey dwelling. A structure of that scale will by definition be limited in its size and height. However in order to ensure that the development remains

of a suitable size and scale, a condition removing permitted development rights is recommended.

7.6 Impact on 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, privacy, visual intrusion or noise and disturbance. The site is surrounded by gardens and therefore the combination of the siting and height of a one bedroom single storey bungalow in this position means that there would be no impact from a loss of light to any habitable room in neighbouring properties and the overall size and siting of a one bedroom single storey bungalow in this position are such that had this been an outbuilding it would have complied with permitted development criteria for a Class E outbuilding. It is considered that the applicant has demonstrated that a single storey building sited 3m from a 2m high fence would not raise issues in regards to an unacceptable loss of privacy and visual intrusion. The reduced size and scale of a one bedroom single storey bungalow in this position is also considered to reduce any harmful impact on neighbour amenity caused by light pollution and a condition relating to the placement and arrangement of any external lighting is recommended. It is considered that the scope for unacceptable noise and disturbance in these circumstances is not considered to justify grounds for refusal and in determining the last appeal for a larger house the Inspector stated “I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have (a) harmful effect on the living conditions of nearby occupiers in relation to privacy, light emissions and visual intrusion”.

7.7 Sites and Policies Plan policy DM D2 requires proposals to provide layouts that are safe, secure and take account of crime prevention. The Metropolitan Police Safer by Design Officer was consulted on the proposals and raised no objections or opinion that the siting of a one bedroom bungalow in this position presented a security risk for neighbouring occupiers. Subject to a condition relating to the design of the boundary fence and through the subsequent use of Safer by Design principles it is considered that there are no grounds to warrant a refusal of permission on the basis of safety and crime prevention.

7.8 The impact on the street scene

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 are all policies designed to ensure that proposals are well designed and in keeping with the character of the local area.

7.9 Although the Inspector considered the previous application to have a negative impact on the character of the local area that application was for

a far larger building, one that occupied the majority of the width of the plot with accommodation in the roof space. The illustrative plans indicate that the bungalow would be set behind gates to the front of the site and set in from the site boundaries on all sides, Consequently it is considered that the scope for a single storey one bedroom bungalow in this position to have a negative impact on the character of the local area is limited and not sufficient to warrant a refusal of outline planning permission.

7.10 Housing standards and amenity space provision.

The illustrative plans show a one bedroom house with a Gross Internal Area of 55m² which exceeds the 50m² minimum Gross Internal Area requirements of the London Plan 2015. The illustrative subdivision of the existing garden areas would still provide both properties with garden areas well in excess of the required 50m². Consequently it is considered that the applicant has demonstrated that it would be possible to provide additional housing capacity to an acceptable standard that accords with all relevant planning policies in this regard.

7.11 Parking, servicing and deliveries.

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. Concerns have been raised relating to site access but the established driveway is wide enough for a car (or small van in the case of deliveries) to access the site however as this is an outline application full details of access would be subject to a separate application at the reserved matters stage.

8 CONCLUSION

8.1 Officers consider that the proposal has now been scaled down sufficiently for the applicant to successfully demonstrate that a one bedroom single storey bungalow could be accommodated on site without contravening policy concerns in relation to loss of privacy, visual intrusion and harm to the streetscene whilst the Inspector determined that the previous application had no negative impacts on biodiversity. Since the previously refused scheme the Core Strategy has been adopted and it sets criteria for backland development that this proposal is considered to accord with. The Further Alterations to the London Plan this year have increased the requirements for new houses and it is considered that a new bungalow could contribute towards that target with a modest development on a site that would otherwise remain underutilised. The applicant has demonstrated that the bungalow would meet London Plan standards in terms of both internal and external space provision for a single storey one bedroom house whilst the details of layout, scale, appearance, access and landscaping would be dealt with under the reserved matters application.

For these reasons the proposal is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION subject to planning conditions:

1. A2 Commencement of Development The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission or 2 years from the approval of the last of the reserved matters as defined in the condition below, whichever is the later.
2. A3 Submission of reserved matters (outline)
 - a. Detail of the reserved matters set out below ('the reserved matters') shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval within 3 years from the date of this permission:
 - (i) layout; (ii) scale; (iii) appearance; (iv) access and (v) landscaping
 - b. The reserved matters shall be carried out as approved.
 - c. Approval of all reserved matters shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced.
3. C1 No permitted development Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no extension, enlargement or other alteration of the dwellinghouse other than that expressly authorised by this permission shall be carried out without planning permission first obtained from the Local Planning Authority. Reason; The Local Planning Authority considers that further development, over and above the development described by the illustrative plans, could cause detriment to the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties or to the character of the area and for this reason would wish to control any future development to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS14 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and D3 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.
4. B5 Details of walls and fences to be approved No development shall take place until details of all boundary walls or fences are submitted in writing for approval to the Local Planning Authority. No works which are the subject of this condition shall be carried out until the details are approved, and the development shall not be occupied / the use of the development hereby approved shall not commence until the details are approved and works to which this condition relates have been carried out in accordance with the approved details. The walls and fencing shall be permanently retained thereafter. Reason; To ensure a satisfactory and safe

development in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies 7.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS14 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D1 and D2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

5. C6 Details of the provision to be made for the storage of refuse and recycling shall be submitted to and approved No development shall take place until a scheme for the storage of refuse and recycling has been submitted in writing for approval to the Local Planning Authority. No works which are the subject of this condition shall be carried out until the scheme has been approved, and the development shall not be occupied until the scheme has been approved and has been carried out in full. Those facilities and measures shall thereafter be retained for use at all times from the date of first occupation. Reason To ensure the provision of satisfactory facilities for the storage of refuse and recycling material and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 5.17 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS17 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM D2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014
6. D9 No External Lighting No external lighting shall be installed without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. Reason; To safeguard the amenities of the area and the occupiers of neighbouring properties and ensure compliance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies DM D2 and DM EP4 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.
7. D11 Construction times. No demolition or construction work or ancillary activities such as deliveries shall take place before 8am or after 6pm Mondays - Fridays inclusive, before 8am or after 1pm on Saturdays or at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Reason To safeguard the amenities of the area and the occupiers of neighbouring properties and ensure compliance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.15 of the London Plan 2015 and policy DM EP2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.
8. F9 Hardstandings Any hardstanding shall be made of porous materials, or provision made to direct surface water run-off to a permeable or porous area or surface within the application site before the development hereby permitted is first occupied or brought into use. Reason. To reduce surface water run-off and to reduce pressure on the surrounding drainage system in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 5.13 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS16 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy F2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

9. J1 Lifetime homes The new dwelling unit/s shall be constructed to Lifetime Homes Standards, and shall not be occupied until the applicant has provided written evidence to confirm this has been achieved based on the relevant Lifetime Homes Standards criteria. Reason To meet the changing needs of households and comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 3.8 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS8 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM D2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.
10. L2 Code for Sustainable Homes – Pre-Commencement (New build residential). No development shall commence until a copy of a letter from a person that is licensed with the Building Research Establishment (BRE) or other equivalent assessors as a Code for Sustainable Homes assessor that the development is registered with BRE or other equivalent assessors under Code For Sustainable and a Design Stage Assessment Report demonstrating that the development will achieve not less than the standards equivalent to Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. 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.
11. L3 Code for Sustainable Homes – Pre-Occupation (New Build Residential) No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until a Building Research Establishment or other equivalent assessor's Final Code Certificate, confirming that it has achieved not less than the standards equivalent to Code 4 level for Sustainable Homes, has been submitted to, and acknowledged in writing by the Local Planning Authority, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. 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.

Non standard informative. The applicant is advised of the need to adhere to requirements of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 which seeks to protect stag beetle, nesting birds/bats and their nests/roosts. All species of stag beetles and bats in Britain and their roosts are afforded special protection under the Wildlife and Countryside act 1981. If bats are found, Natural England should be contacted for advice (tel: 020 7831 6922).