

Merton Council
Planning Applications Committee
8 December 2022
Supplementary agenda

11 Modification Sheet

1 - 22

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Applications Committee
08th December 2022
Supplementary Agenda
Modifications Sheet.

Item 5 – Broghill House, Queen Alexandras Court, St Mary’s Road, Wimbledon SW19 7DE

Questions and Answers from Technical Briefing (05/12/2022):

Q: Any view about conditionality on replacing like for like trees

A: Yes, no issue with that, we can specify that as a minimum

Q: Clarity on height of the development

A: p31 is a good drawing, which shows the difference in height levels

Q: Room for an alternate exit to manage flow of traffic?

A: Applicant trying to avoid unnecessary openings, in our view, two houses do work with existing access, but can look into the level of discussion about access onto St Mary’s Rd.

Q: The houses are far lower than the existing blocks, so not an issue in terms of bulk and massing, but what is the quality of the actual materials and design, do they reflect the historical setting of the existing?

A: They have proposed a slate roof and traditional exposed brick with a modern twist on the windows. We did have pre-application discussion, the scheme has been amended away from very contemporary dwellings. The existing building is fairly subtle, these two we think are the right approach for the setting

Q: Have refuse and recycling plans been submitted?

A: They haven’t been submitted, where there’s clear space for it to go, we condition for details post consent.

Q: Vital that we put in conditions on ingress and egress

A: We can take this into consideration in the traffic management plan and take views from members at the meeting.

Q: Noise issues at weekend, and safety of elderly and infirm residents in the area?

A: It is intended to restrict that, taking into account representations that we have.

Q: Any indication on becoming an HMO?

A: In any residential scheme they would have to come back to us if they wanted that in the future, but only if they breached the permitted development rights (more than 6).

Q: Can a condition be put in anyway?

A: Unlikely that they would become HMO given size, you would have to put in a condition to remove permitted development rights, can be debated on the night.

Q: The trees are being replaced by a number of trees, can we specify a minimum number?

A: We can be as specific as we want to, what tends to happen is our Tree Officer will look at the proposed species works there, eg may not want a particular species next to a mature tree.

Q: Can there be a Welfare method statement, for the building period, where there are special consideration of neighbouring residents?

A: We can build that into the construction management plan

Questions on email:

Cllr Aidan Mundy's questions, with Case Officer reply/comments:

Para 3.4 re: tree felling. What is being replaced with? If trees, can we condition same or close to or better maturity. Perhaps living wall co2 reduction = these trees maybe a way forward.

No details at this stage as this is secured under the landscaping condition. We can tailor this condition to require specific tree sizes e.g. semi mature with minimum 14 – 16cm girth.

Para 6.2 Is this condition feasible?

It is possible, however our Highways Team will advise regarding loading and unloading arrangements.

Para 6 re: Wimbledon Society comments and air pumps. Is there any evidence noise from heatpumps is an issue here? Do we have a spec for the pumps they want to install? Will they also install solar pv?

I don't think the Air Source Heat pumps given the sites location would be a concern to residents. No spec for the heat pumps as this is not required. This will also only

likely be considered later in the development process. Yes they are proposing 5 x PV panels.

Para 6.10 (a) Can we have details for the night on the alternative site for the amity space and (b) what engagement with residents has been made to make sure its fit for purpose? Appreciate you have applied a condition but perhaps it could be future proofed?

The Head of Service Estates - Facilities has briefed the Residents representative on the Friends Committee meeting (held quarterly) that the gardens will be relocated to the area to the right of the clock tower as you look at it.. They were also briefed that once planning permission had been granted the residents would be consulted and would take part in planning the new site, to make it accessible to all. Raised beds and footpaths would probably be the best option. The Manager of the home has also spoken to al the residents that currently use the garden explaining that there would be new provision and that they could be involved in planning it.

Para 7.5.2 Agree - 100% electric provision on site ready

Para 26 We'll probably flip the informative to a condition. Do we have an ecological study of the area in general as part of the local plan and any other needs e.g. hedgehog trails etc etc.

I don't think there is any ecological study but the landscaping condition will require details on improvements to biodiversity.

Cllr Susie Hicks' questions, with Case Officer reply/comments:

Re the proposed development at Broghill House, having spoken to some of the residents of the Royal Homes, their main areas of concern are:

1. the impact on the amenity of residents of blocks H, J and K, at least one of whom I know to be bedridden with Parkinsons and in block J, and another two in block K who use the room at the back of the building designated as a bedroom as their main living area, and all of whom I think have balconies facing the proposed development
2. the impact on the amenity of all residents, the majority of whom are elderly, frail and of limited mobility, of the shared use of the access road by the owners of new houses and their visitors, and during the construction process.

With these issues in mind, please could you,

3. confirm that there are two schools nearby, Ricards Lodge High School and Bishop Gilpin Primary School, and that their pupils stream down Lake Road several times a day.

Yes these schools are located on Lake Road. I'm assuming some pupils would walk along Lake Road to the town centre.

4. confirm that there are two large listed gate posts at the entrance to the access road from Lake Road, and please could you provide a picture.

The posts to the access gates from Lake Road are not statutory or locally listed. I think only the access gates from St Mary's Road and wall immediately adjoining this access are Grade II Listed. As you can see from the photo the brick piers and surrounding wall of the car access gates from Lake Road have little architectural merit. Nevertheless, these gates will not be impacted by the development.

5. confirm that these necessitate a sharp turn for any vehicle entering the access road from Lake Drive, and a break in the pavement on Lake Road.

A car will need to turn when exiting the site. The development would simply use the existing access that is used by other cars/vehicles using the site.

6. confirm the width of the access road to the proposed boundary of the site.

Approx. 5.7m

7. confirm the width from the inner side of the proposed boundary to West House.

Minimum of approx. 6.2m

8. confirm that if the access was rearranged, cars driven by the occupants of the new houses and their visitors, could access the site via St Mary's Road and on the inside of the boundary, without using the access road.

Not ideal as the access road would then sit hard up against the front elevation of the west house impacting privacy. It would also not be possible to implement the soft landscaping, which includes the planting of trees along this stretch. Nevertheless, the access arrangement as currently proposed is considered acceptable as the access road would only be used by the occupiers of a single house (West house). Please note that Broghill House currently has 2 parking spaces which require use of

the access road (the access to the car parking spaces at Broghill House is located only slightly further east). I've attached the existing site plan for reference.

9. confirm the size of the refuse vehicles that serve the Royal Homes.

They are the normal size refuse vehicles that clear all the surrounding streets.

10. confirm that these collect from behind block K, and park in the access road for this purpose.

I don't know where exactly they park but refuse vehicles currently drive on the existing roads to the areas where the bins are stored, empty the bins and drive off. There will be no requirement to change to this even with the 2 new houses in place.

11. confirm that there are already 18 cars belonging to residents and 4 belonging to staff that use the Royal Homes site, together with delivery vans, visitors, the Royal Mail, emergency vehicles and service vans.

I don't know how many cars are owned by residents. Broghill House however currently has two spaces and the total number of spaces proposed is four so there would only be a net increase of two spaces.

12. confirm that there is a blind bend at the end of block K, next to the bottom gate out of the Royal Homes, and that this is an area used by pedestrians, particularly residents of the Royal Homes.

There is a bend however the access to the west house is located away from this.

13. confirm that under the present plan vehicles travelling to and from West House would exit into the access road next to block K and the blind bend.

Yes they would exit onto the access road. Please note that the access is located approx. 13m from the bend so I wouldn't consider it to be that close. Also cars parking in Broghill House currently use this access road.

Turning to impact on amenity,

14. Please can you provide a visual guide to demonstrate the impact of the height of the new buildings on sunlight to the rooms at the back of blocks K,H and J.

I can't but the applicant has provided a daylight/sunlight report which demonstrates that the most impacted habitable rooms would still received adequate levels of sunlight during the year, including winter.

15. Please can you confirm that the proposed new homes are to the South of the block H-J and therefore the impact will be throughout most of the day.

The new homes would be to the south and there will be some impact during the day, depending on the position of the Sun. However, as stated above the submitted daylight/sunlight test has demonstrated that this impact is acceptable.

16. Please can you clarify " more than 20%" (paragraph 7.3.6) and explain how much the proposed buildings would reduce WSPH for these flats (para 7.3.6).

The development would reduce winter sunlight probable sunlight hours by between 24.7% and 35.3% to the most impacted habitable rooms. However, all rooms still receive more than 5% of WSPH (between 19.4 and 22.6%) and can therefore be considered reasonably sunlit. Please note that only one of the flats where the daylight/sunlight was measured is single aspect.

17. Have I understood correctly that the new development would block up to 95% of probable winter sun from the back windows and balconies of block J and K (para 7.3.6).

No it won't, it will reduce winter sunlight by between 24.7% and 35.3% to the most affected rooms on the ground floor. However, all rooms still receive more than 5% of WSPH (between 19.4 and 22.6%) and can therefore be considered reasonably sunlit.

18. Please can you explain how much taller/closer to blocks H-J the proposed houses would be, compared to what is there at present.

Broghill House is currently approx. 16.9m from blocks H-J. The proposed dwellings would be between 11.4m (West House) and 18.4m (East House) from this block.

Broghill House is currently approx. 5.3m to eaves and 8m to ridge when measured from the access road. The houses step down in height but measuring their height from the access road, the East House would be approx. 5m to eaves and 8.1m to ridge whilst the west house would be approx. 6.3m to eaves and 9.5m to top of ridge.

Parking and traffic

19. Please can you confirm that London Plan Policy T6.1 new houses built within areas that are PTAL 5-6 (as these would be) should be car free.

Yes, London Plan policy is car free for PTAL 5-6.

20. Please could you explain why, when we regularly insist on car free development in such areas, the fact that the proposed houses are going to be large makes a difference to your thinking on this (para 7.5.2)?

In this instance it was considered that it would likely be very difficult to sell six-bedroom dwellings which did not include off-street parking. The existing Broghill House has two off-street parking spaces so there will only be a net increase of two spaces. To compensate for this it will be a requirement that all spaces include active electric charge points which exceeds the requirement set out in the London Plan.

Boundaries

21. As the boundary wall would be 11.4 metres from blocks H and J, could it be as attractive as possible, possibly a living wall?

The boundary wall sits adjacent to the access road, which means it is approx. 5.7m from blocks H and J. A green wall could be located here however it should be noted that tree planting is proposed just inside the boundary wall and when this matures it should soften the appearance of the site when viewed from Blocks H-J

I attach an amended plan below, given to me by a resident of the Royal Homes, which shows what she and several other residents would prefer as a solution to the traffic management problems they foresee if the access road is shared. Would this be viable?

Not ideal as the access road would then sit hard up against the front elevation of the west house impacting privacy. It would also not be possible to implement the soft landscaping, which includes the planting of trees along this stretch.

Nevertheless, the access arrangement as currently proposed is considered acceptable as the access road would only be used by the occupiers of a single house (West house). Please note that Broghill House currently has 2 parking spaces which require use of the access road (the access to the car parking spaces at Broghill House is located only slightly further east). I've attached the existing site plan for reference.

Page 13 – Conditions

Additional Condition:

Condition 26

No development shall take place until details of the proposed finished floor levels of the development, together with existing and proposed site levels, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and no development shall be carried out except in strict accordance with the approved levels and details.

Reason: To safeguard the visual amenities of the area and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy D4 and D8 of the London Plan 2021, policy CS14 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and D3 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

Amended Conditions:

Condition 10. D.11 (Construction Times) (**No work on Saturdays**)

Condition 11. F.1 (Landscaping/Planting Scheme, which shall include new tree planting **to be no less than total to be removed** and biodiversity enhancement measures)

Condition 20. Development shall not commence until a working method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to accommodate:

- (i) Parking of vehicles of site workers and visitors;
- (ii) Loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- (iii) Storage of construction plant and materials;
- (iv) Wheel cleaning facilities
- (v) Control of dust, smell and other effluvia (Air Quality measures);
- (vi) Control of surface water run-off;
- (vii) Noise mitigation measures.

(viii) Welfare Method Statement

No development shall be carried out except in full accordance with the approved method statement.

Reason: To ensure the safety of pedestrians and vehicles and the amenities of the surrounding area and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies T4 and T7 of the London Plan 2021, policy CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM T2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

Item 6 - 30A Ridgway Place, Wimbledon, SW19 4EP

Questions and Answers from Technical Briefing (05/12/2022):

Q: What would happen if we said the basements not acceptable, would fill it in, who's liable for the cost – developer or owner?

A: Liability goes to property/landowner, their lawyers/conveyancers should have picked it up at the time of purchase. Potentially they would have to fill it in, it was done at risk, and they'll have to do whatever is necessary to restore the place to an acceptable state.

Q: Can you tell us the name of the developer who didn't tell us about this?

A: Not to hand, but can check applicants for previous development applications

Q: Can we apply working hours conditions on this, or better to get it over and done within a short timescale?

A: We would treat in a normal way, rather than seek to mitigate.

Q: can you comment on issues around standing water, and Cllr Hicks submission?

A: The case officer is looking into and consulting, will aim to have some answers for the mod sheet.

Q: Can we outlay the narrative of the development, either on the mod sheet or on the night, do you have any paper trail on the building control side, so you can show what has been checked?

A: Yes, can provide.

Questions on email:

Cllr Aidan Mundy has requested further details of how this application came about.

Further to the history at paragraph 4.2.2 of my report, I can confirm that the applicant submitted an application earlier this year (22/P1868) for a rear ground floor extension. It came to light when I started reviewing the planning history that the basement on which the extension was to be built did not itself have planning permission. Tim Bryson and I advised the applicant's agent to withdraw the application; gather evidence that the basement had been constructed in compliance with Merton's policies on basement impacts; and resubmit the retrospective application and the application for the extension together.

For further context, please see below the plan of the basement layout that was permitted in 2018 (18/P0253). You will see that basements were permitted for the middle two houses, but not the outer two including the subject property.



I have summarised below my recent correspondence with members.

Cllr Aidan Mundy's questions, with Case Officer reply/comments:

You mention the same developer is leading this new application. Do you know how that came to pass? Do we have confidence the developer will provide the info you require for conditions to be discharged?

The applicant

The applicant, Mrs Village, is not the developer of the houses, but a local resident who recently bought 30a Ridgway Place as her home. I have no reason to believe that she would not provide sufficient information to discharge the conditions, and it would be in her interests to do so. The architect for this application, Marcus Beale, did design the original house, but I do not know how Ms Village came to instruct his firm to design the extension.

7.1.5 Have you now received confirmation re: drainage built to plan.

7.1.6 What checks or verifications conducted?

Basement construction

Further to paragraphs 7.1.5 and 7.1.6 of the Committee Report, the statement we have from Marcus Beale that the basement was built to plan is based on his involvement with its construction. In answer to my request for further detail, he has said in an email:-

“The project was executed as a Design and Build contract.

MBA (Marcus Beale Associates) visited site thereafter during construction only on 9 May 2017 and 14 June 2017.

The groundworks and basements were constructed from April to September 2017.

The construction was inspected by Assent Building Control on the following dates:-

4 April 2017
18 April 2017
28 April 2017
9 May 2017
7 June 2017
23 August 2017
8 September 2017
27 September 2017
12 October 2017

On each occasion they issued a written inspection report.

Their final certificate at completion was issued 11 October 2018.”

He adds that there is no evidence of leaking in the walls of the basement, and we have seen no evidence to contradict this. He states:-

“There is no evidence of any leakage in the walls of the basements. These are constructed as contiguous piling with a reinforced concrete facing. There is a drained cavity internally, served by internal drainage and a sump pump.

The leaks we are aware of are in the terraces of no 30 and 30A.

These terraces leaked because the damp proofing of the terrace deck and skylights were incorrectly executed.”

Re: recommendations. Do you have a view re: construction schedule?

Construction Schedule

I think you are referring to the Construction Method Statement Report in Condition 2. This is an historical document (the basement having already been constructed) which has been reviewed and approved by the Council’s Flood Risk Officers and Basement Engineers.

Cllr Susie Hicks' questions, with Case Officer reply/comments -

Flooding

1. I note that the architects say that the basement construction was inspected the Assent Building Control between April and October 2017, and by MBA on 9/5/14 and 14/6/17, and that the groundworks and basements were constructed from April to September 2017. As you will appreciate from the letters of objection, the occupants of neighbouring houses say demolition and crushing took place before Christmas 2016, and works started on the site in January 2017. Please can you clarify what was being done on the site between January 2017 and April 2017, and what stage the works had reached when Marcus Beale Associates first inspected in May 2017. Please could we see the inspection reports filed with MBA by Assent Design and any written reports created by MBA in May and June 2017?

To clarify my email to Cllr Mundy on 5.12.22, MBA were not directly involved in construction which was supervised by Assent Building Control. MBA did twice visit the site during that period as detailed below.

MBA response:-

We were not retained to inspect or direct the works. This was a design and build contract, where the contractor took our drawings and built from them, managed by a separate project manager. We understand site setup began early 2017. Assent Building Control's inspected the works including foundations and drainage. They have issued written reports and a completion statement.

MBA site visit 9 May 2017 showed piling and excavation complete on southern half of site.

MBA site visit 14 Jun 2017 showed excavation almost complete north side of site.

2. There is a huge discrepancy between the accounts of the neighbours of repeated water problems, and repeated works to 30A over many years, and of the house having been uninhabitable and uninhabited because of problems with the basement, since completion approximately 4 years, and the statement that there "is no evidence of leaking in the walls of the basement and we have no evidence to contradict this", and the officers' conclusions that

the additional area of basement provides no drainage or flood risk issues, therefore:

MBA response:

We do not recognise this description. The houses were not uninhabitable.

The construction of the houses was left incomplete because the contractor and developer went into receivership.

The receivers:

- a) completed some remaining works, which included some rectifications
 - b) discharged the remaining planning conditions and then
 - c) sold the houses.
- I.e. did their job.

- a. Please could you ask Marcus Beale to confirm the dates and nature of any works at 30A Ridgeway Place, undertaken by themselves or on their behalf, between October 2017 and now, and the reason they were needed

MBA response:

None. We are aware that the receiver carried out some completion/remedial works of a minor nature but we were not involved in this. We were then employed by the applicant to make this application.

- b. Please could you also ask Marcus Beale Associates whether they were employed or retained by the then owner from 2017 to the recent purchase of the property, and if not, whether they are able to comment on whether and what works were carried out to 30A during that time

MBA Response:-

No we were not retained by the then owner between 2017 and the recent purchase.

- c. The neighbours say the most recent attempt to fix problems with the basement was completed in September 2022, do you know anything about this?

MBA response:

There has been no work to fix the leaking terrace at no 30A, awaiting this application.

The terrace at no 30, which similarly leaked, has recently been repaired for the new owner.

As stated in our previous email to the case officer [23 November 2022 at 17:28:17 GMT] this was a leak in the terrace around the walk-on skylights, in the roof, not the walls. We have seen no evidence of defects to the basement walls or any groundwater intrusion. The walls have contiguous piles and a drained cavity.

- d. To the best of your knowledge are there, or have there been, groundwater issues with the basement of 30A since 2017, and if so please can these be detailed

MBA Response

No.

- e. Are you aware of underground streams in this area, and have you checked this

Council's Flood Risk Officer:-

None known.

- f. Having you spoken to the neighbour who complains of an increase in standing water in his garden since the basement was built

No. This neighbour is on the opposite side of the street and the garden cannot conceivably be impacted by the proposal.

- g. There was apparently a flood of sewage from 30A in July 2022, are you aware of this, the cause or what was done to rectify it

No.

MBA:-

The applicant informed us that no. 32's sewage was spilling into her front driveway. This is the adjoining owner no. 32's foul drain which passes through the application site and has nothing to do with the new houses. We believe there was blockage which was then cleared.

Council's Flood Risk Officer:-

We received no report of this, it would have gone to Thames Water as the sewerage undertaker.

- h. Can you confirm that the next property No.30 is having, or has recently had, works carried out to rectify water problems associated with their basement

No.

- i. Can you confirm that according the 2011 Merton PFRA documentation (annex 6 figure 5) shows a strip of "moderate flood hazard" running through the middle of the site of 30A

Council's Flood Risk Officer:-

Yes. Please note that this data is 11 years old. The most recent surface water flood maps shows that the risk is contained within the carriageway itself. Please see our online SFRA maps [Internal](#) and [external](#).

- j. Can you confirm that the basement has not been used or inhabited since it was completed, and if so do you know the reason for this? Is it because, as neighbours assert, there have been repeated problems with water ingress and damp in the basement, and the latest attempt to remedy this was completed in September this year

MBA:-

The basements of all the houses are in use.

The whole of the basement of no 30 is in use.

The majority of the basement of no 30A is in use.

Only the rear room of the basement of no 30A is not yet in use awaiting the outcome of this planning application

- k. Which neighbours have you spoken to, and have you visited the site

I have visited the site and read the representations.

- l. Is there a risk that if water is successfully blocked from the basement at no. 30A it will find its way to the next property (as seems to be the case at the moment) and how would you quantify that risk

Council's Flood Risk Officer:-

The movement of groundwater is based on the geology. Whether it enters any property is based on whether that property is water-tight/waterproofed.

MBA's Str Engineer:-

Provided any drainage solution is considered and suitably designed then there should not be any increase in risk.

- m. If MBA are able to definitively say what works have been carried out to 30A in the 5 years from October 2017 to now, please can they list the works, the reason for them, and the dates

See above

- n. Please can you confirm that one effect of the building of the basement was to cause the collapse of the retaining wall and exposure of the foundations of No.32

I am not qualified to answer this engineering question or comment on its premise.

MBA:-

Str. Eng. I understand this was in relation to general site excavations and was a contractor item but they mitigated the local effect of this at the time by the installation of a new retaining wall and fence with more suitable foundations.

- o. Had the basement been constructed properly, is this something that should have been foreseen or should have happened

MBA's Str. Engr. Construction stage risk but was mitigated on site see note above]

MBA response:-

We have seen no evidence that the basement was not constructed properly.

Such evidence as we have seen suggests it was constructed properly.

The terrace/rooflights at nos 30 and 30A leaked, but this is independent of the groundworks/drainage.

- p. What plans are there for flood attenuation, given the proposals for a flat green roof and a covered passage, where will heavy rainfall go ?

Council's Flood Risk Officer:-

This will tie into the existing drainage on site.

- q. Is there a risk that if flooding problems impact upon neighbouring properties as the neighbours anticipate, the council will incur liability for having approved this basement?

This is a legal question that I am unable to answer.

Loss of Amenity

3. What is the "reasonable separation distance" (7.4.5) between the side elevation of the proposed extension and the side boundary fence

The distance between the buildings is 1.98m [drawing 640.2/03/P1]. The distance to the boundary fence varies because the boundary is not straight.

4. Is it correct that when planning permission was originally granted to this site (15/P3366), the developers waived their permitted development rights, and conditions were attached requiring no extensions, no additional windows and doors and no use of the flat roof

Yes, permitted development rights for this application were restricted by condition.

5. How large is the garden, and what percentage of the garden would be left to permeable greenery after construction.

More than 50% of the garden remains and the proposal is therefore compliant with policy.

6. Are the footprint, mass and height of the proposed extension larger than the original plans for application 15/P0633, which were rejected

I assume you are referring to 15/P0663 which is an historical application for the development of four semi-detached houses on this site. The question is impossible to meaningfully answer: the proposed mass, footprint and height of those four

proposed houses were entirely different to what is proposed here and cannot be said to be “larger”, or not, in any meaningful way.

This application is for a basement and ground floor extension, which I have assessed on its own merits and within the current context.

7. Can you confirm that Ridgeway Place has a 1/10 gradient, and the views from No. 32 at present extend all the way down across London to Croydon/Crystal Palace

I have not measured the gradients on Ridgeway Place, and I suspect they vary. I do not know which areas of London can be seen from the garden of 32 Ridgeway Place.

I can say that there is no right to “a view” and an outlook over London would not amount to a material consideration. The proposal is a modest extension which would be built way from the boundary on ground that sits lower than the ground level of 32 Ridgeway Place and would not unduly enclose its garden or rear windows.

The covered patio of 32 Ridgeway Place was itself enclosed by its owners pursuant to the application for a rear extension to that property (19/P1337). Please see my report for further details and photos.

8. Can you confirm that this extension if built will block that view for the occupants of No. 32, while preserving it for 30A

See answer to question 7.

9. Can you confirm how much taller 30A will be if the extension is built than it is at present

This is a single storey extension to a three-storey house. The building will not be any taller.

10. Has the height of the parapet been reduced as requested, and if so please can you point out where this can be seen on the plans.

It is unclear to me which parapet and which request are being referred to.

11. Can you confirm that the sun rises at the bottom of the hill, and that this extension will therefore block sunlight to the garden, patio and rear living areas of 32 in the mornings, and in the winter months for most if not all of the day (p 55 birdseye view from the East is illustrative of the problem, the building marked 28 is I believe no 32)

The sun rises in the East and Ridgway Place descends from the Northwest to the Southeast.

The impact on daylight and sunlight to the garden and patio of 32 Ridgway Place due to the single storey extension would be negligible. The house and garden of 32 Ridgway Place sit on a higher level and the patio is in any event separated by a wall built by the owners of 32 Ridgway Place. Please see Figs 1 and 2 of my report.

12. Can you confirm that the proposed extension will be taller than the originally proposed building in (15/P0633) which was rejected on the grounds that it was “an overdevelopment of the site and an unacceptable loss of daylight/sunlight to the detriment of no. 32 Ridgeway Place”

Please see response to question 6. This is a single storey extension which has been assessed on its own merits within its current context.

13. Please confirm that the area in front of the house is already given over to hard standing for parking, and that permission was originally granted for only one parking space at the front. How big is the area at the front (width, depth and footprint), now proposed to be used for parking for two cars

There is no proposal to increase the number of parking spaces.

14. Where will the bins go if there are two cars parked at the front

See answer to question 13.

Item 7 – Planning Appeal Decision

Item 8 – Planning Enforcement – Summary of Current Cases

Questions and Answers from technical briefing (05/12/2022):

Q: Are the stats a hangover from the previous report, or new things we can talk about on the night?

A: The appeals are new, not the same as in November.

Q: When we say instructions to legal, are we instructing someone, or are we being sued?

A: We've instructed legal to take action on the sites

This page is intentionally left blank