

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
15 September 2016

	<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>DATE VALID</u>
	16/P1968	12/05/2015
Address/Site:	64-70 Ravensbury Grove & Ravensbury Garages and adj land, Mitcham, Surrey CR4 4DL	
Ward:	Ravensbury	
Proposal:	Demolition of garages on Ravensbury Grove and existing flats at 64-70 Ravensbury Grove and the redevelopment of site to provide 21 residential units (c3 use) - comprising 14 x flats and 7 x dwellinghouses with the 14 flats split between 2 x part three, part four storey buildings. Provision of associated vehicular access, parking, cycle and refuse storage and landscaping of the site.	

Drawing No.'s: CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0001 Rev D (site location plan), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0100 Rev K (prop site plan), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0101 Rev G (prop block plan), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0102 Rev B (prop roof plan), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0110 Rev D (prop open space plan), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0111 Rev G (prop levels plan), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0120 Rev E (prop site sections 1), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0121 Rev D (prop site sections 2), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0160 Rev G (phase 1 car parking plan), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0200 Rev G (Block A plan), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0201 Rev G (Block B plan), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0210 Rev E (block A elevations 1), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0211 Rev E (block A elevations 2), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0212 Rev E (block B elevations 1), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0213 Rev D (block B elevations 2), CAG-REM-PH1-0300 Rev D (Mews House A Plan), CAG-REM-PH1-0301 Rev C (Mews House A Variant Plan), CAG-REM-PH1-0302 Rev C (Mew Houses A Section), CAG-REM-PH1-0305 Rev C (River House A Plan), CAG-REM-PH1-0306 Rev B (River House A Variant Plan), CAG-REM-PH1-0307 Rev C (River House A Section), CAG-REM-PH1-0310 Rev D (Mews House A elevations), CAG-REM-PH1-0311 Rev D (Mews Houses A Variant elevations), CAG-REM-PH1-0312 Rev D (River House A elevations), CAG-REM-PH1-0350 Rev D (1B2P Apartment A), CAG-REM-PH1_0351 Rev C (1B2P Apartment B), CAG-REM-PH1 -0352 Rev D (1B2P Apartment C), CAG-REM-PH1_0355 Rev D (WHC apartment A), CAG-REM-PH1 -0356 Rev D (WCH apartment B), CAG-REM-PH1 -0360 Rev D (2B4P apartment A), CAG-REM-PH1 -0365 Rev D (2B3P WCH apartment A), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_9000 Rev C (landscape general arrangement plan), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_9001 Rev C (illustrative landscape plan), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_9002 (tree strategy plan).

And plans as follows:

- Design and Access Statement undertaken by HTA Design LLP with reference no: CAG-REM_PH1_A_RP_101 Rev C dated 11.05.2016.
- Planning Statement undertaken by Savills/HTA and dated May 2016.
- Ecological Appraisal for Ravensbury Estate – Ravensbury Grove undertaken by SLR ref: 404.04976.00002 Version No: fv1 dated May 2016.
- Flood Risk Assessment – Phase 1 undertaken by Tully De'Ath Consultants reference number 11264 dated May 2016.
- Lighting Assessment dated May 2016.

- Transport Statement undertaken by WYG, reference A089000-1 Rev 3 dated 6 May 2016.
- Framework Residential Travel Plan undertaken by WYG, ref: A089000-1 Rev 3 dated 6 May 2016.
- Sustainability and Energy Statement – Version 1 dated 28/04/2016.
- Heritage Desk-Based Assessment by Cotswold Archaeology, reference 770140 dated May 2016.
- Construction Management Plan undertaken by MACE and dated May 2016.
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment undertaken by Tamala Trees Consulting Arborists reference 02462Rv5 dated July 2016.
- Overheating and Daylight and Sunlight and Overshadowing Assessment undertaken by HTA and dated May 2016.
- Preliminary Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Desk Study prepared by Peter Brett ref: 32120 Rev 1 and dated May 2016.

Contact Officer: Shaun Hamilton (020 8545 3300)

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to s106 legal agreement and conditions.

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- S106: Yes – permission would be subject to s106 legal agreement relating to affordable housing, stopping up of highway and creation of a right-of way.
- Is a screening opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental Statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Statement been submitted: No
- Press notice(s): Yes
 - Major
 - Adjacent to a Conservation Area
 - Departure from Policy
- Site notice(s): Yes
 - Major
 - Departure
 - Standard
- Design Review Panel consulted: Yes – proposal given a green.
 - See consultation responses section of this report.
- Number of neighbours consulted: 546
- External consultations: 15
- Controlled Parking Zone: No
- Flood zone: Yes
- Conservation Area: No – directly adjacent to Wandle Valley CA.
- Listed building: No
- Protected Trees: 0
- Public Transport Access Level: 2

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is being brought to the Planning Applications Committee for determination due being a major development , a departure from policy (in regards to open space) and due to the number and nature of objections received.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site is located at the southern end of Ravensbury Grove within the southernmost portion of Ravensbury Estate. The site is an irregular shape and is bound by a backchannel of the River Wandle to the south, west and east, with neighbouring residential properties of Ravensbury Estate to the north. The site has an area of 0.306ha.
- 2.2 There is an existing two-storey brick building located within the western portion of the site which accommodates 4 no 1 bedroom residential units. To the front of these flats is a green space / accessway providing pedestrian access from the end of Ravensbury Grove to the footbridge over the backchannel and linking to the Wandle Trail and Ravensbury Park. The remainder of the site is occupied by approximately 50 derelict garages for which both vehicular and pedestrian access has been restricted.
- 2.3 Directly to the north of the application site are residential dwellings of the Ravensbury Estate accessed via Ravensbury Grove of Hengelo Gardens. Those closest comprise terraced properties with generous rear gardens. To the south, west and east of the site is Ravensbury Park which forms part of the Wandle Valley Conservation Area.
- 2.4 Part of the site is designated Open Space and also falls within an archaeological priority area.
- 2.4 The application site forms a small portion of the wider Ravensbury Estate. By way of context of the siting of this application area, the wider Ravensbury Estate comprises approx. 4.5ha and is adjacent to the River Wandle, Ravensbury Park and is separated from Morden Hall Park by Morden Road which wraps around the western and northern borders of the Estate. To the north/ north east of the estate is an industrial area with buildings ranging from between two and five stories in height. The Estate has 192 dwellings which is made up of a mixture of semi-detached and terraced houses, flats and maisonettes. The Estate has generous communal green spaces and amenity spaces / plants with mature trees present throughout. Dwellings within the Estate are predominantly two storey, with some flats along Ravensbury Grove rising to 4 stories with a pitched roof.
- 2.5 The site has a PTAL rating of 2 which is considered low.
- 2.6 Much of the wider Ravensbury Estate falls within Flood Zone 2 and 3. However the application site generally has a higher ground level in comparison and as a result much of the specific site in question falls outside of the flood zones. However, being partially within these zones and in conjunction with the proximity to those flood zones mentioned above and the nearby River Wandle, flooding is a key aspect.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 This application seeks redevelopment of the site which involves the demolition of the existing flats at 64-70 Ravensbury Grove and the garages and the erection of two part 3 part 4 storey blocks of flats (containing a combined 14 residential units) and seven dwellinghouses. Overall the scheme will deliver 21 residential units (net increase of 17).
- 3.2 The proposed residential units would be a mix of houses and flats of various sizes as summarised below:

	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4 Bed	Total
Flats	9	5	0	0	14
Houses	0	0	3	4	7
Total	9	5	3	4	21

- 3.3 To the end of Ravensbury Grove a public square is proposed, which would be flanked on either side by the two part 3 part 4 storey blocks of flats. One of the blocks would be broadly in a similar position to the existing building of 64-70 Ravensbury Grove, but set further back so as to align with the adjoining terrace of Ravensbury Grove. The second block of flats would occupy a portion of the existing green space at the pedestrian link between the end of Ravensbury Grove and the footbridge over the Wandle backchannel.
- 3.4 Each of the proposed flats would have private outdoor amenity space in the form of patios (ground floor) or balconies/terraces on the upper levels. Block A would also have a communal garden to the rear, which would be limited to the sole use of residents of that Block.
- 3.5 Wheelchair accessible units are proposed for 3 of the ground floor flats.
- 3.6 The proposed houses would be located on the eastern portion of the site and be centred around a mews courtyard which incorporates a community green space. The houses would be 2 and 3 stories high with pitched roofs. Those houses along the southern portion would be 3 stories with houses dropping down to 2 stories as they get closer to the rear gardens of existing houses of Hengelo Gardens. Each of the houses would have private garden space.
- 3.7 Access to the site would be maintained via Ravensbury Grove, with a pedestrian link to the footbridge over the backchannel to the Park maintained through the public square and around the southern end of proposed Block B.
- 3.8 The proposal includes the provision of 21 car parking spaces and a total of 33 cycle parking spaces. Refuse storage and collection points are also provided within the scheme.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

08/P2084 - Outline planning permission for the construction of 9 three storey houses (7 x 3 bedroom and 2 x four bedroom) on the site of disused garages (access layout and scale to be considered) - Withdrawn Decision 03-10-2008

5. CONSULTATION

5.1 Public consultation

Public consultation was undertaken by way of post, site notices and press notices. In total 53 representations were received from members of the public / residents with 2 in support and 51 in objection. The points made in the representations received are summarised as follows:

Those received in support (2):

- High time something was done with the garages site.
- New buildings and fresh landscaping will improve a part of the estate that is extremely run down.

- The new properties will bring new opportunities to the area and encourage young professionals to move here.
- New properties look fantastic and are in keeping with the tallest buildings along Ravensbury Grove
- Improve the overall feel over the area, modernising an area that has become very run down.

Those received which objected to the proposed development (51):

- Impact on Ravensbury Park / the Wandle Valley Conservation Area
 - o Proposal will be detrimental to the park and be unsightly and wasteful.
 - o Object to flats and houses being built so close to the Conservation Area.
 - o Light pollution to the park
 - o Will have a massive impact on the park and the walkers that use it.
 - o Would ruin the beautiful tranquil riverside walk
 - o Such an impact on a CA park wouldn't be allowed if it was in Wimbledon.
- Impact on wildlife
 - o Impact on the wildlife – esp bats
 - o Important wildlife/ biodiversity corridor
 - o Ecological assessment was carried out in May which was miserable, so would have likely missed a lot.
 - o Assessment reports no amphibians – many are present in Wandle water.
- Views to the park and out of the park/CA
 - o Views to the park from existing houses will be obstructed.
 - o Views out of the park will be obstructed with looming blocks of flats and houses ruining the green outlook.
 - o Blocking of views to Ravensbury Park from Ravensbury Grove and houses along Hengelo Gardens.
 - o View of the park is fundamental to the character of Ravensbury Grove and the surrounding area.
 - o The height of the flats and riverside houses will dominate the treeline when seen from within Ravensbury.
- Loss of light
 - o Loss of light to the rear gardens of houses on Hengelo Gardens.
 - o Blocks of flats will result in a loss of light to houses along Ravensbury Grove – even with reducing part of these down to 3 stories.
- Loss of privacy
 - o Overlooking to existing neighbouring properties.
 - o Flats overlooking one another.
 - o During winter when the trees will have no leaves there would be overlooking potential to rear gardens and rooms of houses along Wandle Road.
- Increase in noise, light, waste and general pollution and congestion as a result of the proposal.
- Negative impact on the character of the area
 - o Out of keeping with neighbouring two storey terraced houses.
 - o Wouldn't allow this on a main road, let alone adjacent to an unspoilt river.
 - o This wouldn't be allowed if it was in Wimbledon, so don't allow it here.

- Overbearing
 - o Four storey flats out of scale.
 - o Land of the garages site is higher than the rest, so will be even more visible/overbearing.
 - o The size will make the site feel very congested.
 - o Out of scale with the estate and the context of being adjacent to the park.
- Unacceptable density
 - o Will have impacts for the usability of Ravensbury Grove.
- Design concerns/suggestions
 - o Blocks of flats should have pitched roofs so as to be in keeping with the rest of the estate.
 - o Flat roofs require more maintenance.
 - o Fibre cement board cladding is unattractive.
 - o Window frames, doors and balcony balustrades are not in keeping with the rest of the estate.
 - o Predominant colour of brickwork in the Estate is red – new properties should be in keeping with this.
 - o Valley gutters are very hard to keep clean – especially with the prop units being located adjacent to the park.
 - o Houses should be no higher than those neighbouring.
 - o Height of blocks A and B should be reduced.
- Inadequate infrastructure
 - o Parking, access and transport links
- Access to flats/ houses
 - o As many homes as possible should comply with 'lifetime homes' criteria so as to deliver multi-generational housing – currently appears to be minimal or non-existent.
 - o Flats without disabled access should be rejected.
 - o Applicant outlines that it is not feasible to have elevators in the flats. As a large housing provider this shouldn't be an issue. There are also further grants etc available.
 - o People with disabilities should have maximum access to wheelchair flats.
- Energy efficiency
 - o Homes should be fitted with triple glazing – maximising CO² and energy cost savings.
 - o Existing flats should be retained so as to be sustainable development.
- Affordable housing – should be 100% of units
- Loss of open/green space near the park entrance
 - o Will result in a 'corridor feel'.
 - o When Ravensbury Gardens Estate as a garden village park of the park was used for the build - retention of the remaining green space throughout the garden estate is very important.
 - o Connects the estate to the park.
 - o Should be seeking to increase the amount of green space, not reducing it.
- Impact on trees
 - o The cherry tree isn't of 'low quality'
 - o Removal of trees will upset the wildlife – especially bats.

- Environmental impact does not fully take into account the impact of driving the foundations for a four story clock on the roots of the London Planes near the site – very old.
- Why have the trees along the edge of the site/the park been cut back/down before planning is even granted?
- Construction impacts
 - Noise and disturbance through construction period.
- Anti-social behaviour increasing in the area due to isolating of the park entrance and removing the view to it down from Ravensbury Grove.
- Impact on vehicular access
 - Increased density will have impacts for Ravensbury Grove – single lane, access for emergency vehicles etc.
- Impact on parking
 - Provision of 1 parking space per dwelling is nowhere near enough.
 - Number of trips generated and parking provision seems unrealistically small given some of the units are 3 and 4 bedroom.
 - A development of this size would require more like 30-40 spaces.
 - There will be spill over of parking to Ravensbury Grove.
 - Parking is already bed with the VW garage always parking in the estate.
 - Parking needs to be sorted first, before applications are made
 - Car ownership/usage is at 1.3 per household in the south west and growing.
 - More houses means more parking issues
- Cycling
 - Parts of the Wandle Trail are pretty grotty and should be upgraded.
- Impact on Ravensbury Estate residents
 - Will result in the loss of the ‘village’ feel to the estate
 - Ruining of community.
- Historic
 - Given nearby Anglo-Saxon burial ground this is very important.
 - Part of a wall of the Ravensbury Printworks is still present on the site.
- Flood risk
 - The rest of the estate is located in a High Flood Risk Zone.
 - Placing more structures/hardstanding in this area will increase flood risk.
 - Inability to get insurance.
 - The garages site is higher than surrounding residential areas – exacerbating runoff effects and impacts for neighbours.
 - Previous application at the garages site (less than a decade ago) was thrown out (withdrawn) on the basis of flooding impacts.
- Comments regarding overall regeneration of Ravensbury Estate.
 - Misleading and ignoring residents.
 - Riding roughshod over what people want.
 - Landlords are only thinking about putting money in their pockets
 - Will go ahead regardless of comments made.
 - The estate has potential to be an example for surrounding areas.
 - Much of the assertions made about the repairability or utility of existing homes does not stand up to scrutiny.
 - Just want to put in as many houses as they can get away with.

- Might as well sell off the park while you're at it- basically as good as this shocking proposal.
- Will set a bad precedent for the rest of the regeneration of Ravensbury.
- Consultation
 - Not taking into consideration any of the comments/concerns made by the residents
- Contrary to planning policy:
 - Contravenes NPPF, Merton's Local Plan and their Nature Conservation Management Plan for Ravensbury Park and the Wandle Valley Conservation Area Character Assessment – all of which indicate that development needs to work with a community and not against it and vitally not be detrimental but enhance the habitat and ensure it improves the way people live their lives.
 - Does not follow the ethos of the NPPF
 - Wandle Conservation Policy (policy WV.P3) outlines that any development should be expected to 'preserve or enhance its setting and not detracts views into or out of the area' – the development will not do this.
- Management of the estate
 - Landlords are incapable of basic maintenance works.

5.2 External organisations / groups

Ravensbury Residents Association

- Character and views along Ravensbury Grove
 - Generous setbacks, green spaces and mature trees
 - Buildings in balance.
 - Reduction in building height as it nears Ravensbury Park.
- Relationship with Wandle Valley.
 - Would expect parts of the estate to be incorporated into the Wandle Valley Conservation Area.
 - Large open areas and scope for enhanced planting.
 - One of the most narrow points of the CA.
- Open space aspect
 - Open space within the application site and being located adjacent to the Park (therefore within the 400m buffer zone).
 - Application land is not surplus to requirements – car parking/garaging is greatly required.
 - Design infringes on Park and contrary to policies.
 - Block B is proposed on open space.
 - Current path is much more direct than that proposed – therefore would be worsening public access to the park.
 - Development would pave over green space – important as a soakaway.
- Nature conservation, trees, hedges and landscape features
 - Height, massing and proximity will detract from the green corridor.
 - Paving over front gardens would be detrimental to the character of the area.
 - Circle has already undertaken this for many properties – no drainage, no soakaways.
 - Extensive hedging of the estate should be retained.
- Safety and security
 - Southern end of Ravensbury Grove has good levels of natural

- surveillance.
- Gated development
 - o Concern that the proposed road down the side of Block B may become a gated community.
- Removal of gate from garages area to the adjacent footpath.
- Sustainability
 - o Too sensitive for wildlife.
 - o Should be for change for the better.
 - o Detrimental to our green economy in terms of effects on the Park.
- Fragmentation of green space within the site.
- Pressure to develop this site to this extent should be resisted.
- Block B would encroach on the surrounding trees and interfere with the sense of proportion within the estate.
 - o Compromising view and the extensions of the Park environment into Ravensbury.
- Block A stands forward of the neighbouring terrace.
- Any buildings over two stories in height will block out a large amount of the tree line and impact outlook.
- Garage site is 1m higher than surrounding land and will therefore be comparatively more visible.
 - o Overlooking potential to the first floor rear windows of Hengelo Gardens houses.
 - Would require screening.
- Development should enhance the setting and not detract from views into or out of the Conservation Area – as per policy.
- Compromising of the Park entrance.
- Incorrect to say that the plans have been drawn up with input from residents / buy-in from the community.
- Developing Ravensbury Local Plan
 - o Second stage of consultation undertaken in March 216 and should therefore me a material planning consideration.
 - o Building height for the garages site seems to be left blank in the EP.
- Applicant's own structural engineers have outlined that the Orlit Housing in question (for wider regeneration) is not actually defective.
 - o Have been neglected by the landlords in terms of basic repairs.
- Should be independent verification of the availability of development sites within the area.
- Do not understand why the balconies are not recessed within the buildings so as to reduce the bulk and impact.

Friends of Ravensbury Park

- Many aspects of the proposal that are liked, object to various aspects.
- Inadequacies of the Arboricultural Report:
 - o Text and prop site plan do not correspond – W1 & W2 are confused.
 - o Existing trees in the park are omitted – particularly adjacent to the prop communal garden of Block A
 - o Large tree next to the existing gate to the park is not shown.
 - o Outline of existing overhanging tree canopy which abuts the communal garden boundary of proposed block A is not accurately shown.
 - o The same tree canopy has been reduced in area on the application proposed site plan and does not therefore correspond with the shown in the Arb Assessment, which is in itself inaccurate.
- Misrepresentation of this scale causes great concern.
- Before the application is considered the applicant should make the results available of the bat survey (understand that his is to be undertaken in June

- 2016).
- Pleased to see the proposed lighting indicates efficient cut off, in order to mitigate the effect. Will still not prevent residents for installing their own security lighting etc.
 - o Request that restrictions and monitoring to ensure compliance are imposed on residents.
 - Railings on a dwarf brickwork as boundary treatment is welcomed
 - o Existing wall bricks could be re-used
 - o Residents may want to fix screens to these which may result in a messy effect – may just want to go for solid from the outset
 - Concern about the proximity of buildings to the park.
 - o 4 storey blocks in one location is only 3m from the park boundary and will have significant visual impact on the park.
 - o Request that both apartment blocks are reduced to 3 stories.
 - Query the choice of crab apple trees – will likely cause nuisance to residents.

Wandle Valley Forum

- Concerns about the proposal as follows:
- Scale of development will overlook and negatively impact on Ravensbury Park. Diminishing the experience of walking along the Wandle Trail. In conflict with Policies CS13, CS14 and DM D2.
 - o Consider that a three storey development is the maximum in this location.
- Risk of re-opening proposals for a new foot crossing over the Wandle.
- Need for extensive archaeological studies prior to any development being undertaken.
- Need for a full and accurate arboricultural assessment.
- Lack of published evidence in regards to potential impacts on bats.
- Need for conditions to curb additional lighting being installed by residents – impact on wildlife corridor and sensitive nightscape.
- Need for conditions to ensure improved visual relationship between Wandle Corridor and the estate – not obscuring railings along the boundary etc.

Transport for London

- Site is not located on a Transport for London Road Network (TLRN).
- 21 car parking spaces including 3 disabled is acceptable and accords with the London Plan.
- Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCP) will be provided in accordance with the London plan and should be secured by conditions.
- Cycle Parking provision accords with the London Plan and should be secured via condition – should be located in an accessible, convenient, secure and sheltered area.
- Development would be CIL liable – rate for this borough is £35.
- Subject to the above conditions being met the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact to the TLRN.

Officer response:

- Noted – appropriate conditions have been included.

Historic England

- Application site lies within an area of archaeological interest.
- Wandle Valley/ Mitcham Archaeological Priority Area.
- Appraisal indicates the need for field evaluation to determine appropriate mitigation.
- Condition acceptable – two stage process:
 - o Evaluation to clarify the nature and extent of surviving remains;

- Followed by, if necessary, a full investigation.
- Condition wording provided.
- Informative recommended.

Officer response:

- The above condition and informative put forward by Historic England has been included.

Designing Out Crime Officer

- Consideration should be given to the re-positioning of the River Front Houses front doors – currently proposed to be accesses via the car ports. This positioning reduces the chance of natural surveillance. Doors should be positioned so as to provide a clear vision from the street frontage.
- Footpaths should be as straight as possible and at least 3m wide, well lit and devoid of potential hiding places.
- Proposed footpath to the Wandle Trails appears to have chamfered corners to air natural surveillance - landscaping should be carefully selected and maintained to allow for clear vision channels.

Officer response:

- Further information was received from the applicant in regards to this. Whilst on the side elevation of the river front houses, the front door placement is as close to the front as possible whilst still being under cover. This is also considered to offer passive surveillance to the rear gardens whilst also maintaining views to the front and Mews Courtyard.

Environment Agency

- Initial objection in relation to potential increased flooding impacts for the area. After further information was supplied by the applicant the EA outlined that they now have no further objections to the scheme, subject to the imposition of recommended conditions.

Officer response: Noted – the recommended conditions have been included.

5.4 Internal responses

Transport Planning

- PTAL of 2 and not in a CPZ – although there are potential plans for the introduction of a CPZ in the area.
- Cycle parking – generally acceptable, some concerns about vertical storage in Block B – condition recommended.
- Car parking provision is acceptable, including number of disabled spaces. Electric vehicle charging points needs to be agreement through parking management plan.
- Parking management plan for the permanent parking needs to be secured via condition.
- Would expect final travel plan to refer to car club provision. Secure via condition.
- Construction management plan needs to be secured via condition.
- Construction phase parking arrangements – to be secured through a separate planning application.
- Stopping up order – needs to be agreed as part of the s106 legal agreement for the existing public highway land at the entrance to the development to be ‘stopped up’ and ownership transferred to the applicant under the relevant legislation.
- Needs to have a creation of a permitted right of way (24/7) from Ravensbury

Grove tot eh River Wandle Trail through the car parking and pedestrian square to the footbridge over the River Wandle to be secured through a s106 agreement/

Officer response:

- Noted – appropriate conditions have been included.

Future Merton – biodiversity/ecology

- Methodology, findings and recommendations of the submitted ecological appraisal by SLR (May 2016\)) and the June 2016 bat survey are accepted.
- Subject to conditions addressing the following matters the proposal will result in net biodiversity gains
 - o Extension lighting to be in accordance with the details in the submitted Lighting Assessment.
 - o A construction method statement which includes details of surface water management and the off-site drainage works in accordance with the guidance in paragraph 7.1.2 of SLR's May 2016 Ecological Appraisal.
 - o details of the green roofs are to be submitted, which should include the features described in paragraph 7.2 of SLR's May 2016 Ecological Appraisal.
 - o planting to be in accordance with the details in paragraphs 6.0.1 – 6.0.7 of the submitted May 2016 Design and Access Statement.
- Informative suggested in relation to demolition of buildings and trees felling avoiding the bird nesting and bat roosting seasons as per relevant legislation.

Officer response:

- Noted – appropriate conditions have been included.

Future Merton – Open Space

- Development is on open space, for which there is a strong policy presumption against.
- Any replacement open space should be land that the council would designate as (protected) open space at the next review of the Policies Map – these are considered to be:
 - o The communal garden at the rear of Block A.
 - o The soft landscaped areas in the Mews Courtyard.
 - o The pedestrian square and the stop of land for the woodland understorey planting.
- Proposed landscaping is considered to result in site-wide qualitative improvements.
- Proposals don't meet both the 'quantity and quality' tests, it constitutes a departure from adopted planning policy DMO1. However, from an open space planning policy perspective and without prejudice to all the other relevant planning policy in this instance, it would be acceptable due to:
 - o the relatively poor quality of the designated open space on this site,
 - o the proximity, quantity and quality of the adjacent protected open space,
 - o the relatively small quantity of open space that would be lost,
 - o the built footprint of the proposed buildings would be similar to that of the existing buildings,
 - o the dwellings would all have private amenity space
 - o the quality of the replacement open space (that could be designated with the next Policies Map review) and
 - o the site-wide landscape improvements that the proposals will bring,

Officer response:

- Noted – appropriate conditions have been included.

Future Merton – Play Space

- Requirement for play spaces for the expected child populations.
- Nearest play space in Ravensbury Park is approx. 290m actually walking distance from the site.
- All houses have private gardens, Block A has a communal area with a functional play space, Mews courtyards area also is considered a functional play space.
- Suitable conditions securing delivery and retention of landscaping, this aspect the proposal would be acceptable.

Officer response:

- Noted – appropriate conditions have been included.

Tree Officer

- No objection to the removal of specified trees, with the proposals indicating an intention to plant 17 new trees around the site.
- Some more trees could be retained.
- Inconsistencies in the arb report and appendices.
- Bike stores, paving and boundary treatment should be addressed in the tree report.
- Brick walls along the river front houses is a bit harsh.
- After further information relating to the above was supplied, further comments outlined that whilst there were still points to be resolved if minded for approval conditions should be attached in relation to tree protection and site supervisions, and the design, materials and method of construction of the cycle store in relation to nearby trees.

Officer response:

- Noted – appropriate conditions have been included.

Environmental Health Officer

- Conditions recommended relating to:
 - o External light placement to avoid light spillage.
 - o Supplementary intrusive investigation for contaminated land.
 - o Any approved remediation scheme must be carried out in accordance with its terms prior to the commencement of development.
 - o If contamination is found it must be reported to the LPA.
- The demolition/construction method statement and submitted with the application shall be implemented and complied with during the development.

Officer response:

- Noted – appropriate conditions have been included.

Flood risk engineer

- No objection the proposal and find the FRA acceptable.
- Conditions recommended in relation to:
 - o Development undertaken in accordance with the FRA.
 - o Development not to be occupied until a floodplain compensation scheme is implemented insuring that the prop does not increase flood risk elsewhere.
 - o Final floor levels in relation to flood levels.
 - o Flood warning and evacuation plan.
 - o Surface water and foul water drainage.

Officer response:

- Noted – appropriate conditions have been included.

Sustainability / Climate Change Officer

- Development has demonstrated that the proposed energy approach is policy compliant.
- Condition recommended relating to:
 - o CO2 emissions and water usage rates equivalent to Conde for Sustainable Homes Level 4.

Officer response:

- Noted – appropriate conditions have been included.

Design Review Panel – notes relating to Ravensbury Garages from meeting on Wednesday 25th May 2016

Item 2: Pre-Application, 15/P4014/NEW, **Ravensbury Garages**, Ravensbury Grove, Morden

The Panel felt that this was a well-considered and laid out scheme which was creating a distinctive sense of place with good architecture. The Panel liked the framed view at the end of Ravensbury Grove, which would let in sunlight. There was some concern expressed that the western block of flats should not accentuate a pinch-point in the green corridor of the park.

The Panel welcomed the references to local materials. However they guarded against using 'fake' cheaper materials for the top floors and weatherboarding. They recommended better quality materials such as copper (referencing a nearby copper mill) for the top floors and timber (referencing the White House nearby) for the weatherboarding.

The Panel questioned why the mews houses were only 2-storey instead of three. It was felt three storeys would fit in better with a stepped gradation from 2 to 4 storeys as set out in the rest of the proposal. It would also be a more efficient use of land especially as this part was not in the flood plain.

The Panel felt that a little more work was required on clarity of what brick examples were being referenced and where they were being used on the new buildings. There was also a case for some simplification of the brickwork in places, questioning the need for some soldier courses. The side elevations to the flats appeared to have small recesses that seemed a bit fussy and possibly unnecessary.

It was suggested there should be more consistency in window opening details and a coherent internal logic to detailing. The balcony for the top floor on the eastern (and possibly also the western) block of flats would be better located to the south to benefit from the views overlooking the river.

The car parking arrangement was generally supported but more thought was needed on how people might park randomly and how this could be effectively controlled and managed.

Overall the Panel thought this was a very good proposal.

VERDICT: **GREEN**

Officer response:

- Noted. On further discussion with Design Officers it was considered that the Mews Houses were most appropriate at 2 stories in height due to the proximity of gardens of houses of Hengelo Gardens and the two storey nature of these neighbouring properties.

6. POLICY CONTEXT

6.1 NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework (2012):

- 6. Delivering a wide choice of quality homes.
- 7. Requiring good design.

6.2 London Plan (2015)

Relevant policies include:

- 2.6 Outer London: Vision and strategy
- 2.8 Outer London: Transport
- 3.3 Increasing housing supply
- 3.4 Optimising housing potential
- 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
- 3.8 Housing choice
- 3.9 Mixed and balanced communities
- 3.11 Affordable housing targets
- 3.13 Affordable housing thresholds
- 5.1 Climate change mitigation
- 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- 5.7 Renewable energy
- 5.10 Urban greening
- 5.13 Sustainable drainage
- 5.17 Waste capacity
- 6.3 Assessing the effects of development on transport capacity
- 6.5 Funding Crossrail and other strategically important transport infrastructure
- 6.9 Cycling
- 6.11 Smoothing traffic flow and easing congestion
- 6.12 Road network capacity
- 6.13 Parking
- 7.1 Lifetime neighbourhoods
- 7.2 An Inclusive environment
- 7.3 Designing out crime
- 7.4 Local character
- 7.5 Public realm
- 7.6 Architecture
- 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology
- 7.14 Improving air quality
- 7.15 Reducing and managing noise, improving and enhancing the acoustic environment and promoting appropriate soundscapes
- 8.2 Planning obligations

6.3 Merton Local Development Framework Core Strategy – 2011 (Core Strategy)

Relevant policies include:

- CS 8 Housing choice
- CS 9 Housing provision
- CS 13 Open space and leisure
- CS 14 Design
- CS 15 Climate change
- CS 17 Waste management
- CS 18 Transport

CS 19 Public transport
CS 20 Parking servicing and delivery

6.4 Merton Sites and Policies Plan – 2014 (SPP)

Relevant policies include:

DM H2 Housing mix
DM H3 Support for affordable housing
DM D1 Urban Design
DM D2 Design considerations
DM O1 Open space
DM O2 Trees, hedges and landscape features
DM EP2 Reducing and mitigating noise
DM T1 Support for sustainable travel and active travel
DM T2 Transport impacts of development
DM T3 Car parking and servicing standards
DM T4 Transport infrastructure

6.5 Supplementary planning considerations

London Housing SPG – 2012
Merton Design SPG – 2004

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 Key planning considerations:

- Principle of development
- Affordable housing
- Open space / green space
- Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the area
- Biodiversity
- Play space
- Flooding
- Heritage / Archaeology
- Impact upon neighbouring amenity
- Standard of accommodation
- Transport and parking
- Refuse storage and collection
- Cycle storage
- Sustainability
- Developer contributions

Principle of development

7.2 Policy 3.3 of the London Plan 2015 states that development plan policies should seek to identify new sources of land for residential development including intensification of housing provision through development at higher densities and 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.

7.3 Core Strategy policies CS8 & CS9 seek to encourage proposals for well-designed and conveniently located new housing that will create socially mixed and sustainable neighbourhoods through physical regeneration and effective use of space. This should meet the needs of all sectors of the community and include the provision of family sized and smaller housing units. The proposal would result in a net increase of 17 residential units that would be a range of sizes, from 1 bed apartments to 4 bed dwellings. The site is currently used for residential purposes, open space and derelict

garages It is considered that the proposed accommodation will increase the variety of residential accommodation available locally.. Therefore, the proposed intensification of residential use at the site is considered acceptable subject to compliance with the relevant London Plan policies, Merton Local Development Framework Core Strategy, Merton Sites and Policies Plan and supplementary planning documents.

Affordable Housing

- 7.4 Core Strategy policies CS.8 also outlines provisions for affordable housing in line with the relevant provisions of policies 3.11 and 3.13 of the London Plan (2015). Being an Affordable Housing provider, the applicant is seeking that a large portion of the homes would be affordable housing. The application documents outline that the redevelopment proposals will deliver 86% affordable housing, with 18 affordable homes all in the affordable / social rented units. Core Strategy policy CS.8 outlines a tenure split of 60% social rented and 40% intermediate. The proposed tenure being affordable / social rented is acceptable.
- 7.5 The proposal is considered a stand-alone application and is therefore assessed on its own merits. However, affordable housing provision to the above mentioned level is considered dependent on whether or not the wider regeneration of Ravensbury Estate goes ahead. Therefore, to ensure policy compliance in regards to affordable housing provision a S106 legal agreement has been put in place to ensure minimum policy compliance with a provision that this is subject to viability should the wider regeneration of Ravensbury Estate not go ahead. It is noted that the existing tenure of the four existing units (that would be demolished are 1 x private and 3 x affordable rented. Therefore the minimum policy requirement i.e. 40% should not include these three existing affordable units, and should be 40% of the other 18 units that the scheme would deliver. Therefore, when taking into account the existing affordable housing units on site, the minimum requirement under this policy is 10.2 of the proposed 21 units. The heads of terms has been drafted to reflect this.

Open Space

- 7.6 In line with the NPPF, policy DM 01 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan (2014) outlines that the existing designated open space should not be built on unless an assessment has shown the opening space to be surplus to requirements; or the loss would be replaced by equivalent, or better open space (both qualitative and quantitative aspects); or where development is for alternative sports or recreational provision for which the needs outweigh the loss.
- 7.7 The proposed development would result in a net loss of designated open space when compared to the existing situation. However, as per the comments received from Merton's Open Space policy advisor it is considered that due to:
- The relatively poor quality of the designated play space on this site,
 - The proximity, quantity and quality of the adjacent protected open space;
 - The relatively small quantity of open space that would be lost,
 - The built footprint of the proposed buildings would be similar to that of the existing buildings,
 - The dwellings would all have private amenity space,
 - The quality of replacement open space (that could be designated with the next policies map review; and
 - The site-wide landscape improvements that the proposals will bring.
- A departure from adopted Policy DM O1 would be acceptable in this instance.

Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the area

- 7.8 London Plan policies 7.4 and 7.6, Core Strategy policy CS14 and SPP Policy DMD2 require well designed proposals that will respect the appearance, materials, scale, bulk, proportions and character of the original building and their surroundings. Policy 7.6 sets out a number of key objectives for the design of new buildings including that they should be of the highest architectural quality, they should be of a proportion, composition, scale and orientation that enhances, activates and appropriately defines the public realm, and buildings should have details that complement, but not necessarily replicate the local architectural character. Policy CS14 of the adopted Core Strategy states that all development needs to be designed to respect, reinforce and enhance local character and contribute to Merton's sense of place and identity. This will be achieved in various ways including by promoting high quality design and providing functional spaces and buildings. The site is also located adjacent to the Wandle Valley Conservation area and as such, the Wandle Valley Conservation Area Character Assessment is applicable.
- 7.9 The Ravensbury Estate is characterised by predominantly terraced and semi-detached two storey housing with hipped roofs. There is however a large block of flats, Ravensbury Court which rises to 4 stories with a hipped roof with one block of apartments alongside Ravensbury Grove being 4 stories with a pitched roof. The estate has large set-backs and green spaces that create a feeling of 'openness'.
- 7.10 The Wandle Valley Conservation Area bounds the Ravensbury Estate to the south and east (Ravensbury Park) and to the west and north over Morden Road (Morden Hall Park). The Conservation Area narrows substantially in this location and therefore the Estate and the applicable development site occupies a key location in the context of this Conservation Area. Policy WV.P3 of the Character Assessment outlines that proposal adjacent to the Conservation Area should preserve or enhance its setting and not detract from view into or out of the area. Several objections received focused on aspects relating to the impact that the development would have for views into the CA both from dwellings and the estate as a whole and also on views from within the CA looking towards Ravensbury Estate. It is noted that views out of the Park will be lessened when considering the increased bulk of the buildings when compared to the existing garages on site. However, it is considered that when taken into account the improvements to the site, the style and design of River Front Houses and Mews Houses, and proposed landscaping that this would be of a level which would, on balance, not warrant a refusal in this regard. Views into the park, whilst will limited those from private residences will be maintained down Ravensbury Grove (public area).
- 7.11 In terms of bulk and massing, many of the objections received outline that the proposed Blocks (both A & B) are too large and high in the context of the estate. As outlined above, there are instances of 4 storey buildings within the estate. The proposed blocks of flats would be stepped from 3 storey, when closest to the neighbouring terraces of Ravensbury Grove raising to 4 storey closer to the Park. It is noted that the orientation of the building, particularly Block A, which although slightly forward of the neighbouring terrace, is set further back. It is acknowledged that the placement of Block B over what is currently open space will alter the view to Ravensbury Park. However, when taken in combination with the placement of Block A it is considered that views from further up Ravensbury Grove will be enhanced, with these visual lines being framed on either side by the blocks.
- 7.12 The revision of the blocks during the pre-application stages to 3 storey closest to the adjacent terraces is considered to be appropriate whereby, as a result of the flat

roofs, the blocks would have a similar height to the pitched roofs of the terraces. The combination of the change in materials from brick to a green grey cladding and the set-back of the upper level are considered to reduce the visibility of this upper level, particularly when viewed from Ravensbury Grove.

- 7.13 The bulk of the scheme has been developed so as to deliver Mews houses nearest the rear gardens of dwellings along Hengelo Gardens, with these then wrapping around to three storey River Front Houses adjacent to the 4 storey aspect of Block B. This graduated height and bulk is considered to be acceptable and results in a cohesive design and interlinking of buildings throughout the development.
- 7.14 In conclusion, the design, scale, layout and appearance of the proposed development is considered acceptable when taken in the local context.

Biodiversity / ecology

- 7.15 Policy CS.13 of Merton's Core Strategy (2011) seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity within the borough. Further policy CS.13 requires refusal of development that has a significant adverse effect on the population or conservation status of protected or priority species and priority habitats. This is particularly relevant when considering bat roosts / foraging areas are known to be present in neighbouring Ravensbury Park.
- 7.16 The applicant has supplied an Ecological Appraisal and undertaken a Bat survey as recently as June 2016. These documents have been reviewed by Merton's Biodiversity Advisor and it has been determined that with appropriate conditions the proposed development will result in net biodiversity gains. The conditions recommended relate to:
- External lighting to be in accordance with the submitted lighting assessment (minimising light spillage into the surrounding park).
 - Construction method statement to outline details of surface water management and off-site drainage works in accordance with the Ecological Appraisal.
 - Provision of bat boxes, bird nesting boxes and hedgehog box in accordance with the Ecological Appraisal.
 - Details to green roofs to be submitted including the details outlined in the Ecological Appraisal.
 - Planting in accordance with the Design and Access Statement.
- 7.17 With the above assessment, review and imposition of conditions in mind it is considered that the proposed development is in accordance with policy CS.13 of the Core Strategy (2011).
- 7.18 Policy CS.13 of the Core Strategy also relates to trees. This is particularly relevant in the context of the site being located adjacent to the Wandle Valley Conservation Area – Ravensbury Park, and the Wandle River itself. Merton's Trees and Landscape Officer has reviewed the application documentation and after initial requests for further clarification has outlined that, subject to appropriate conditions to ensure adequate protection and to address outstanding issues, the proposed development is considered acceptable in this regard.

Play Space

- 7.19 Policy 3.6 of the London plan and Policy CS.13 of the Core Strategy require housing proposals to provide play space for the expected child population. Merton's policy advisor in regards to play space has reviewed the application and has outlined that

with suitably worded conditions that secure the delivery and retention of the landscaping, and in conjunction with the functional space provided in the communal garden and Mews Courtyard, this aspect of the proposed development would be acceptable. This is considered to be addressed through the requirement of submission of a landscaping plan as per condition.

Flooding

- 7.20 Policies DM F1 and DM F2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan and policy CS.16 of the Core Strategy seeks to ensure that development will not have an adverse impact on flooding and that there would be no adverse impacts on essential community infrastructure. Being located next to a backchannel of the River Wandle and with much of the surrounding Ravensbury Estate being located in a Flood Risk Zone, this was an aspect brought up by a multitude of nearby residents.
- 7.21 Merton's Flood Risk Engineer has reviewed the application and in regards to surface water runoff impacts, has raised no objection to the proposal – subject to appropriate conditions being imposed on the development. These conditions have been included.
- 7.22 The Environment Agency (EA) was consulted concerning flooding impacts in relation to the River Wandle and the surrounding flood risk zones. Further information was supplied by the applicant after initial concerns/objections were raised by the EA in regards to flooding impacts. After reviewing this further information supplied, the EA has provided confirmation that the proposal would be acceptable in regards to flooding impacts, subject to the inclusion of recommended conditions. These conditions have been included.

Archaeology

- 7.23 Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2015) and policy DM D4 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan (2014) seek to conserve and where appropriate enhance Merton's heritage assets and distinctive character. The application included a heritage desk-based assessment. This along with the wider application was reviewed by English Heritage who determined that the proposed development would be acceptable, as long as suitable conditions were included on any permission. These recommended conditions have been imposed on the permission.

Impact upon neighbouring amenity

- 7.24 SPP policy DM D2 states that proposals must be designed to ensure that they would not have an undue negative impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, quality of living conditions, privacy, visual intrusion and noise.
- 7.25 Number 62 Ravensbury Grove is an end-of terrace dwelling that is located directly to the north of proposed Block A. This neighbouring property has a garage between the dwelling and the boundary with the application site. The proposed Block A would be set approx. 1m forward of the front elevation of this neighbouring property with the proposed flank wall being set back 1m from the boundary and extending no further than the primary rear elevation of this neighbouring property. Block A would be 3 storey high with a flat roof in this location – having a maximum height similar to the apex of this neighbouring terrace. As such, when taking into account the bulk and setbacks it is not considered that Block A would result in an unacceptable amenity impact for neighbouring number 62 Ravensbury Grove.

- 7.26 Number 11 Ravensbury Grove is located to the north of proposed Block B and is also an end of terrace dwellinghouse. Block B would be set back 7.5m (approx.) from the boundary with this neighbouring property – the width of the vehicular access road and a parking space. With this set back in mind and the 3 storey height in this location it is not considered that the proposal would result in an unacceptable impact in terms of loss of light, overshadowing or outlook for this neighbouring property. Proposed Block B does have bedroom windows at first and second floor levels in the north elevation. These would look out towards number 11 Ravensbury Grove, but have been positioned so as to orientate towards the side/flank elevation of this neighbouring property. In combination with the proposed tree planting it is considered that these proposed windows would not result in an unacceptable amenity impact in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy which would warrant a refusal in this instance.
- 7.27 The proposed end Mews House would have a flank wall that would be set back approximately 3m from the boundary with the rear gardens of numbers 4 and 5 Hengelo Gardens. Being limited to two stories in height with a pitched roof it is not considered that these neighbouring properties would experience an unacceptable amenity impact in terms of loss of light, overshadowing or outlook. All windows of this Mew House are orientated to the front and rear of the proposed dwelling and are not therefore considered to result in any unacceptable overlooking to neighbouring properties.
- 7.28 Concern was received in regards to the application site being higher than neighbouring properties, particularly though of Hengelo Gardens. As such, it was put forward that from the drive/parking area there would be views from standing height directly into the rear first floor windows of these dwellings. The rear facing windows would be located approximately 14m from the boundary with the application site. Although it is noted that these windows may be viewable from this site, due to this distance it is not considered that any resulting loss of privacy would, on balance, justify a refusal in this regard.

Standard of accommodation

- 7.29 Policy 3.5 of the London Plan 2015 states that housing developments should be of the highest quality internally and externally and should ensure that new development reflects the minimum internal space standards (specified as Gross Internal Areas - GIA) as set out in Table 3.3 of the London Plan (Table 3.3). Table 3.3 (as amended in the Housing Standards Minor Alterations to the London Plan – March 2016) provides a comprehensive detail of minimum space standards for new development; which the proposal would be expected to comply with.

Table 1: Section of table in Table 3.3 of the London Plan

Number of bedrooms	Number of bed spaces	Minimum GIA (m2)			Built-in storage (m ²)
		1 storey dwellings	2 storey dwellings	3 storey dwellings	
1b	1p	39 (37)			1.0
	2p	50	58		1.5
2b	3p	61	70		2.0
	4p	70	79		
3b	4p	74	84	90	2.5
	5p	86	93	99	
	6p	95	102	108	
4b	5p	90	97	103	3.0
	6p	99	106	112	
	7p	108	115	121	
	8p	117	124	130	

7.30 The GIA of each of the proposed unit types are summarised as follows:

Residential units	Unit	Required GIA	GIA	Number of units at this size
Block A	1 bed 2 person – WHC flat		59.9m ²	1
	1 bed 2 person flat	50m ²	53.4m ²	6
Block B	1 bed 2 person – WHC flat		61.0m ²	1
	2 bed 3 person – WHC flat		72.8m ²	1
	1 bed 2 person flat	50m ²	51.4m ²	1
	2 bed 4 person flat	70m ²	72.8m ²	4
Mews House	3 bed 5 person (two stories)	93m ²	96.7m ²	3
Riverfront houses	4 bed 6 person (three stories)	112m ²	115	

7.31 As shown above, all units meet the minimum floor area requirements as set out in the London Plan 2015.

7.32 All habitable rooms are serviced by windows which are considered to offer suitable outlook and natural light; in addition, all units are dual or triple aspect.

7.33 In accordance with London Plan Housing SPG standards, all floor to ceiling heights are a minimum of 2.5 for at least 75% of the GIA. Each of the proposed units has adequate internal storage capacity.

7.34 In accordance with the London Housing SPG, the Council's Sites and Policies Plan states that there should be 5sq.m of external space provided for 1 bedroom flats with an extra square metre provided for each additional bed space. Each of the proposed flats of Blocks A and B exceed this requirement. Merton's Sites and Policies Plan (2014) policy DM D2 requires for all new houses a minimum garden area of 50sqm. This has been provided in the form of rear gardens for both the Mews and River Front Houses, with each of the River Front Houses having the benefit of an 8.9m² balcony from the first floor living space.

7.35 It is considered that all units would offer a high standard of living for any future occupants.

Transport and parking

- 7.35 Core Strategy policy CS20 requires that development would not adversely affect pedestrian or cycle movements, safety, the convenience of local residents, on street parking or traffic management.
- 7.36 The proposed layout would provide car parking at a rate of 1 space per unit and cycle parking provision in alignment with London Plan requirements. Council's Transport Planning Advisor has reviewed the application and has raised no objections subject to the inclusion of appropriate conditions. These conditions have been included on the application.

Refuse storage and collection

- 7.37 Appropriate refuse storage is proposed for each of the blocks of flats. Each of the proposed houses have private refuse storage area with a communal 'refuse and recycling area' provided as a collection point. A condition requiring implementation has been included for completeness.

Cycle storage

- 7.38 Cycle storage is required for new development in accordance with London Plan policy 6.9 and table 6.3 and Core Strategy policy CS 18. Cycle storage should be secure, sheltered and adequately lit; for a development of the nature proposed, 33 cycle storage spaces would be required.
- 7.39 Council's Transport Planning Advisor had some concerns about the use of vertical hanging cycle parking and recommended that a condition requiring final cycle parking details to be submitted. This condition has been included.

Sustainability

- 7.40 On 25 March, 2015 the Government issued a statement setting out steps it is taking to streamline the planning system. Relevant to the proposals, the subject of this application, are changes in respect of sustainable design and construction, energy efficiency and forthcoming changes to the Building Regulations. The Deregulation Act was given the Royal Assent on 26 March, 2015. Amongst its provisions is the withdrawal of the Code for Sustainable Homes.
- 7.41 Until amendments to the Building Regulations come into effect the Government expects local planning authorities not to set conditions with requirements above Code level 4 equivalent compliance. Where there is an existing plan policy which references the Code for sustainable Homes, the Government has also stated that authorities may continue to apply a requirement for a water efficiency standard equivalent to the new national technical standard.
- 7.42 In light of the Government's statement and changes to the national planning framework it is recommended that conditions are not attached requiring full compliance with Code Level 4 but are attached so as to ensure that the dwelling is designed and constructed to achieve CO2 reduction standards and water consumption standards equivalent to Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4.
- 7.43 As per the recommendation of Councils Sustainability/ Climate Change Officer, a condition to the above effect has been included to ensure compliance.

Developer contributions

- 7.44 The proposed development would be subject to payment of the Merton Community Infrastructure Levy and the Mayor of London's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

8. CONCLUSION

- 8.1 It is considered that the proposal is of a suitable layout, height, scale and design which would not cause unacceptable harm the amenities of neighbouring residents. It would not harm the character and appearance of the area, including the context of the site being adjacent to Ravensbury Park and the Wandle Valley Conservation Area. The development would provide good quality living accommodation for future occupants. The proposal would not have a detrimental impact on highway safety or parking pressure, given the imposition of appropriate conditions. The proposal would result in a net loss of open space within the site which would be contrary to adopted planning policy – however, this is considered acceptable on balance due to existing site characteristics and the quality of the proposed open space. It has been demonstrated that the proposal will not have an unacceptable impact on ecological aspects of the area and is therefore acceptable in this regard. The proposal would accord with the relevant National, Strategic and Local Planning policies and guidance and approval could reasonably be granted in this case. It is not considered that there are any other material considerations, which would warrant a refusal of the application.

The application is therefore recommended for approval subject to a S106 legal agreement and appropriate conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to planning conditions and the completion of a S106 agreement covering the following heads of terms:

1. Delivery of 40% of the residential units on the site as affordable housing (of which will be a minimum of 60% affordable rent) excluding those existing affordable houses demolished as part of development; or
2. In the event that the planning permission for the wider regeneration is not granted prior to occupation of the Scheme, the delivery of affordable housing based on the outcome of a financial viability assessment.
3. Stopping up order – for the existing public highway land at the entrance to the development and ownership transferred to the applicant.
4. Permitted right of way (24/7) –creation of a public right of way from Ravensbury Grove to the River Wandle Trail through the car park and pedestrian square to the footbridge over the River Wandle.
5. The developer agreeing to meet the Council's costs of drafting the Section 106 Obligations [£ to be agreed].
6. The developer agreeing to meet the Council's costs of monitoring the Section 106 Obligations [£ to be agreed].

And the following conditions:

1. A1: The development to which this permission relates shall be commenced not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 (as amended) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.

2. A7: The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with

the following approved plans: CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0001 Rev D (site location plan), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0100 Rev K (prop site plan), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0101 Rev G (prop block plan), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0102 Rev B (prop roof plan), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0110 Rev D (prop open space plan), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0111 Rev G (prop levels plan), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0120 Rev E (prop site sections 1), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0121 Rev D (prop site sections 2), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0160 Rev G (phase 1 car parking plan), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0200 Rev G (Block A plan), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0201 Rev G (Block B plan), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0210 Rev E (block A elevations 1), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0211 Rev E (block A elevations 2), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0212 Rev E (block B elevations 1), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_0213 Rev D (block B elevations 2), CAG-REM-PH1-0300 Rev D (Mews House A Plan), CAG-REM-PH1-0301 Rev C (Mews House A Variant Plan), CAG-REM-PH1-0302 Rev C (Mew Houses A Section), CAG-REM-PH1-0305 Rev C (River House A Plan), CAG-REM-PH1-0306 Rev B (River House A Variant Plan), CAG-REM-PH1-0307 Rev C (River House A Section), CAG-REM-PH1-0310 Rev D (Mews House A elevations), CAG-REM-PH1-0311 Rev D (Mews Houses A Variant elevations), CAG-REM-PH1-0312 Rev D (River House A elevations), CAG-REM-PH1-0350 Rev D (1B2P Apartment A), CAG-REM-PH1_0351 Rev C (1B2P Apartment B), CAG-REM-PH1_0352 Rev D (1B2P Apartment C), CAG-REM-PH1_0355 Rev D (WHC apartment A), CAG-REM-PH1_0356 Rev D (WCH apartment B), CAG-REM-PH1_0360 Rev D (2B4P apartment A), CAG-REM-PH1_0365 Rev D (2B3P WCH apartment A), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_9000 Rev C (landscape general arrangement plan), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_9001 Rev C (illustrative landscape plan), CAG-REM-PH1_DR_9002 (tree strategy plan).

And the following submitted documents:

- Design and Access Statement undertaken by HTA Design LLP with reference no: CAG-REM_PH1_A_RP_101 Rev C dated 11.05.2016.
- Planning Statement undertaken by Savills and dated May 2016.
- Ecological Appraisal for Ravensbury Estate – Ravensbury Grove undertaken by SLR ref: 404.04976.00002 Version No: fv1 dated May 2016.
- Flood Risk Assessment – Rev A – Phase 1 undertaken by Tully De’Ath Consultants reference number 11264 dated June 2016.
- Lighting Assessment dated May 2016.
- Transport Statement undertaken by WYG, reference A089000-1 Rev 3 dated 6 May 2016.
- Framework Residential Travel Plan undertaken by WYG, ref: A089000-1 Rev 3 dated 6 May 2016.
- Sustainability and Energy Statement – Version 1 dated 28/04/2016.
- Heritage Desk-Based Assessment by Cotswold Archaeology, reference 770140 dated May 2016.
- Construction Management Plan undertaken by MACE and dated May 2016.
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment undertaken by Tamla Trees Consulting Arborists reference 02462Rv5 dated July 2016.
- Overheating and Daylight and Sunlight and Overshadowing Assessment undertaken by HTA and dated May 2016.
- Preliminary Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Desk Study prepared by

Peter Brett ref: 32120 Rev 1 and dated May 2016.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning

3. B1: No development above ground shall take place until details of particulars and samples of the materials to be used on all external faces of the development hereby permitted, including window frames and doors (notwithstanding any materials specified in the application form and/or the approved drawings), have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. No works which are the subject of this condition shall be carried out until the details are approved, and the development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development and 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 Polices Plan 2014.

4. D11 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 2011 and policy DM EP2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

5. B4 No development, other than demolition and site preparation shall take place until details of the surfacing of all those parts of the site not covered by buildings or soft landscaping, including any parking, service areas, roads and footpaths have been submitted in writing for approval by the Local Planning Authority. No works that are the subject of this condition shall be carried out until the details are approved, and the development shall not be occupied until the details have been approved and works to which this condition relates have been carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory standard of 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.

6. Non-standard condition: [Demolition dust and noise] Prior to the commencement of development [including demolition] measures shall be in place to prevent nuisance from dust and noise to surrounding occupiers with these measures in accordance with a method statement that has previously been submitted to and approved in writing to the Local Planning Authority with the approved measures retained until the completion of all site operations.

Reason: To protect the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties and

to accord with Sites and Policies policy DM D2.

7. H6 No development above ground shall commence until details of secure cycle parking facilities for the occupants of, and visitors to, the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. In addition to the cycle stores the details shall include those relating to the proposed site levels, materials and method of construction of the store located adjacent to existing trees in the communal garden of Block A –having regard to the recommendations of the BS 5837:2012 – Trees in relation to design, demolitions and construction – recommendations. The approved facilities shall be fully implemented and made available for use prior to the first occupation of the development and thereafter retained for use at all times.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory facilities for cycle parking are provided and to safeguard the existing retained trees to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies 6.13 and 7.21 of the London Plan 2015, policies CS18 and CS13 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM T1 and DM O2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

8. H8: Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted, a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall follow the current 'Travel Plan Development Control Guidance' issued by TfL and shall include:
 - (i) Targets for sustainable travel arrangements;
 - (ii) Effective measures for the on-going monitoring of the Plan;
 - (iii) A commitment to delivering the Plan objectives for a period of at least 5 years from the first occupation of the development;
 - (iv) Effective mechanisms to achieve the objectives of the Plan by both present and future occupiers of the development.The development shall be implemented only on accordance with the approved Travel Plan.

Reason: To promote sustainable travel measures and comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 6.3 of the London Plan 2015, policies CS18, CS19 and CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM T2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

7. H9: The development shall not commence until details of the provision to accommodate all site workers', visitors' and construction vehicles and loading /unloading arrangements during the construction process have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details must be implemented and complied with for the duration of the construction process.

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 6.3 and 6.14 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM T2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

8. H11: The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until a Parking Management Strategy has been submitted in writing for approval to the Local Planning Authority. No works that is subject of this condition shall be carried out until this strategy has been approved, and the development shall not be occupied until this strategy has been approved and the measures as approved have been implemented. Those measures shall be maintained for the duration of the use unless the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority is obtained to any variation.

Reason: To ensure the provision of a satisfactory level of parking and comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 6.13 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM T3 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

9. Amended H10: 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;
 - (vi) Control of surface water run-off/management and off-site drainage works (in accordance with SLR's May 2016 Ecological Appraisal – paragraph 7.1.2).
- 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 6.3 and 6.14 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM T2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

10. Non-Standard Condition: The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (Ref: 11264 dated June 2016 and produced by Tully De'Ath for Circle Housing). The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future users, and ensure flood risk does not increase offsite in accordance with Merton's policies CS16, DM F1 and DMF2 and the London Plan policies 5.12, 5.13.

11. Non-Standard Condition: The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced (other than site clearance and demolition) until such time as a detailed scheme to compensate flood storage has be submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The detailed scheme shall

include cross sections, plans and final location and volume of earth movements in support of the calculations. The implemented scheme shall include flood openings (voids) and these voids must be maintained and remain operational for the lifetime of the development. The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained, in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority.

Reason: To reduce the risk of river flooding to the proposed development and future users, and ensure flood risk does not increase offsite in accordance with Merton's policies CS16, DM F1 and the London Plan policy 5.12.

12. Non-Standard Condition: The development hereby permitted by this planning permission shall ensure that finished floor levels for all residential units shall be set no lower than 300mm above the 1 in 1000 year flood level (in metres above Ordnance Datum) and include flood resilient materials for the ground floor construction. The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained, in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future users in accordance with Merton's policies CS16, DM F1 and the London Plan policy 5.12.

13. Non-Standard Condition: The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until such time as a Flood Warning and Evacuation plan and procedure is implemented and agreed in writing to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. The Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the submitted document included within section 13 of the Flood Risk Assessment and the procedures contained within the plan shall be reviewed annually for the lifetime of the development. Consultation of the plan shall take place with the Local Planning Authority and Emergency Services.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future users in accordance with Merton's CS16 and policy DM F1 and the London Plan policy 5.12.

14. Non-Standard Condition: No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a detailed scheme for the provision of surface and foul water drainage has been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and in consultation with Thames Water. The final drainage scheme shall be designed in accordance with the details submitted in the Flood Risk Assessment. The drainage scheme will dispose of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) to both the River Wandle and the surface water sewer at the agreed restricted rate (4.5l/s and 1l/s respectively)

in accordance with drainage hierarchy contained within the London Plan Policy (5.12, 5.13 and SPG) and the advice contained within the National SuDS Standards. Where a sustainable drainage scheme is to be provided, the submitted details shall:

- i. Provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay (attenuation provision of no less than 67.5m³ of storage) and control the rate of surface water discharged from the site. Appropriate measures must be taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;
- ii. Include a timetable for its implementation;
- iii. Provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime;
- iv. A CCTV of the existing sewer and drainage network to establish its condition and any remedial works;
- v. Include a sequencing of works and construction method statement for any sewer diversions and new connections
- vi. All sewer diversions and any new connections are undertaken to the satisfaction of Thames Water.

Reason: To reduce the risk of surface and foul water flooding to the proposed development and future users, and ensure surface water and foul flood risk does not increase offsite in accordance with Merton's policies CS16, DMF2 and the London Plan policy 5.13.

- 15.F5: No development [including demolition] pursuant to this consent shall commence until an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan, drafted in accordance with the recommendations and guidance set out in BS 5837:2012 has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the approved details have been installed. The details and measures as approved shall be retained and maintained, until the completion of all site operations.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing retained trees in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS13 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy O2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

- 16.F8: The details of the Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan shall include the retention of an arboricultural expert to monitor and report to the Local Planning Authority not less than monthly the status of all tree works and tree protection measures throughout the course of the demolition and site works. The works shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing retained trees in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.21 of the

London Plan 2015, policy CS13 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy O2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

17. Amended standard D10: Any external lighting shall be positioned and angled to minimise light spillage or glare beyond the site boundary and in accordance with the details in the submitted Lighting Assessment.

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.

18. Non-standard: A supplementary intrusive investigation should be undertaken for contaminated land, if necessary, a detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment must be prepared, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

Reason: In order to protect the health of future occupiers of the site and adjoining areas in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 5.21 of the London Plan 2015 and policy DM EP4 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

19. Non-standard: Any approved remediation scheme must be carried out in accordance with its terms prior to the commencement of development, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Following the completion of any measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to protect the health of future occupiers of the site and adjoining areas in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 5.21 of the London Plan 2015 and policy DM EP4 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

20. Non-standard: In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11' and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to protect the health of future occupiers of the site and adjoining areas in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 5.21 of the London Plan 2015 and policy DM EP4 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

21. Non-standard: Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a demolition method statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All demolition works shall be in accordance with this approved demolition method statement unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of future occupiers and those in the local vicinity.

22. Non-standard: Prior to the commencement of substructure works a construction method statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All construction works shall be in accordance with this approved construction method statement unless agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of future occupiers and those in the local vicinity.

23. No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until evidence has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, confirming that the development has achieved not less than the CO2 emissions reductions of a minimum of 35% below 2013 Building Regulations Part L, and internal water usage rates of no greater than 105l/p/day (equivalent to Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4) - Evidence requirements are detailed in the "Schedule of Evidence Required - Post Construction Stage" under Category 1: Energy and Carbon Dioxide Emissions (ENE1: dwelling emissions rate) and Category 2: Water (WAT1: Indoor water use) of the Code for Sustainable Homes Technical Guide (2010).

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 2011 and policy CS15 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011.

24. Non-standard: Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, the provision of bat boxes, bird nesting boxes and a hedgehog box as recommended in paragraph 7.2 of SLR's May 2016 Ecological Appraisal will be undertaken.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on biodiversity within the area in accordance with policy CS13 of the Core Strategy (2011) and policy DM O2 of the Sites and Policies Plan (2014).

25. Non-standard: Prior to the occupation of the relevant part of the development a green roof shall be installed details of which shall have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The green roof should include the features described in paragraph 7.2 of SLR's May 2016 Ecological Appraisal, and shall be maintained in accordance with the approved plans for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on biodiversity within the area in accordance with policy CS13 of the Core Strategy (2011) and policy DM O2 of the Sites and Policies Plan (2014).

26.F1: No development shall take place (other than demolition and site preparation) until full details of a landscaping and planting scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved within the first planting season following first occupation of the development hereby approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include on a plan, full details of the size, species, spacing, quantities and location of proposed plants, together with any hard surfacing, means of enclosure, and indications of all existing trees, hedges and any other features to be retained, and measures for their protection during the course of development. The landscaping and planting scheme shall include details of boundary treatment of the site along the boundary with the River Wandle outlining planting regimes and fences/boundaries to properties.

Reason: To enhance the appearance of the development in the interest of the amenities of the area, to ensure the provision sustainable drainage surfaces and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies 5.1, 7.5 and 7.21 of the London Plan 2015, policies CS13 and CS16 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2, F2 and O2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

27.F13: Prior to the occupation of the development a landscape management plan including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscaped areas, other than privately owned, domestic gardens, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscape management plan shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the appearance of the development is maintained in the interest of the amenities of the area, to ensure the maintenance of sustainable drainage surfaces and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies 5.1, 7.5 and 7.21 of the London Plan 2015, policies CS13 and CS16 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2, F2 and O2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

28. No demolition or other development shall take place until a stage 1 written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the

local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition or other development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, and the programme and methodology of site evaluation and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works.

If heritage assets of archaeological interest are identified by stage 1 then for those parts of the site which have archaeological interest a stage 2 WSI shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the stage 2 WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed stage 2 WSI which shall include:

- A. The statement of significance and research objectives, the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works
- B. The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the stage 2 WSI.

Reason: To ensure that the development hereby approved would not have a detrimental impact on heritage or archaeological items in accordance with policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2015) and policy DM D4 of the Sites and Policies Plan (2014).

29. Standard condition (Removal of permitted development - extensions) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no extension, enlargement or other alteration of the dwelling house other than that expressly authorised by this permission shall be carried out without planning permission first obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason for condition: The Local Planning Authority considers that further development could cause detriment to the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and for this reason would wish to control any future development to comply with Sites and Policies policy DM D2 and policy CS14 of the Adopted Merton Core Planning Strategy 2015.

30. Non-standard condition: Prior to first occupation of the proposed new dwellings refuse and recycling facilities shall be in place that are in accordance with details that have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, with the refuse and recycling facilities retained in accordance with the approved details permanently thereafter.

Reason for condition: To ensure the provision of satisfactory facilities for the storage of refuse and recycling material and to comply with policies CS13 and CS14 of the Adopted Core Strategy (2011).

Informatives:

1. The applicant is advised that in accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework, The London Borough of Merton takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. The London Borough of Merton works with applicants or agents in a positive and proactive manner by suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome; and updating applicants or agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application. . In this instance the Planning Committee considered the application where the applicant or agent had the opportunity to speak to the committee and promote the application.
2. The applicant is advised to contact the Council's Highways team on 020 8545 3151 before undertaking any works within the Public Highway in order to obtain the necessary approvals and/or licences.
3. An environmental permit for flood risk activities may be required for works proposed in, under, over or within 8m of the top of the bank of the River Wandle, designated a main river. More guidance can be found in: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities-environmental-permits>
4. The proposed development site is adjacent to the River Wandle, a heavily modified watercourse. In line with the Thames River Basin Management Plan we strongly recommend that the proposed development should be used as an opportunity to restore the watercourse to a natural channel. As well as meeting requirements of the RBMP, this would be a clear, tangible and significant environmental gain in terms of the character of the area and nature conservation. This would also increase connectivity between existing restoration sites and the rest of the catchment.
5. Where possible, the demolition of buildings and tree felling should avoid the bird nesting seasons. If it is not possible to clear the site outside the nesting season, then the site should be inspected by an appropriately qualified ecologist immediately prior to site stripping and should any nests be found then appropriate mitigation should be implemented to protect the nest until the young have fledged.
6. Written schemes of investigation will need to be prepared and implemented by a suitable qualified professionally accredited archaeological practice in accordance with Historic England's Guidelines for Archaeological Projects in Greater London. This condition is exempt from deemed discharge under scheme 6 of The Town and Country Planning Act (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015).

Please [click here](#) for full plans and documents related to this application.
Note these web pages may be slow to load

This page is intentionally left blank