

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
16 MARCH 2017

<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>DATE VALID</u>
16/P2810	07/07/2016
Address/Site	1–5 Carnegie Place, Wimbledon, London, SW191SP
Ward	Village
Proposal:	Demolition of 6 x houses and erection of 6 part two, part three storey townhouses with accommodation at basement level (existing pedestrian access linking Parkside to Heath Mead to be maintained)
Drawing Nos	Site location plan 201 Rev D, 202, 203 & 204B.
Contact Officer:	Stuart Adams (0208 545 3147)

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT Planning Permission subject to S106 agreement and conditions.

CHECKLIST INFORMATION.

Heads of agreement: - Affordable housing & permissive path
Is a screening opinion required: No
Is an Environmental Statement required: No
Has an Environmental Impact Assessment been submitted – No
Press notice – Yes
Site notice – Yes
Design Review Panel consulted – No
Number of neighbours consulted – 64
External consultations – No.
PTAL score – 1b
CPZ – Adjacent to VNE
CA - adjacent Wimbledon North Conservation Area

1. **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The application has been brought before the Planning Applications Committee for consideration due to the number of objections received.
- .

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site comprises a block of five terraced houses located in Carnegie Place, Wimbledon. The existing two storey houses sit at a right angle to the highway from Parkside and car parking spaces are provided in front, within attached garages or at the head of the cul-de-sac. There is an existing pedestrian path that links from Parkside through Carnegie Place to Heath Mead to the east.
- 2.2 To the north of the application site is a large detached building known as Heathland Court. Heathland Court fronts onto Parkside to the west of the application site and the building's current use is an old people's home. The flank elevation faces the application site and contains a number of windows. Its curtilage has a soft landscaped edge with some trees.
- 2.3 To the east of the application site is Heath Mead which comprises two storey semi-detached flats.
- 2.4 To the south of the application site are detached and terraced houses in Alfreton Close. 1, 3 & 5 Alfreton Close are detached houses which sit at a right angle to the southern boundary of the application site. 7 & 9 form part of the small terrace and these houses rear gardens sit directly to the south the application site.
- 2.5 On the opposite side of Parkside to the application site is Wimbledon Common, which is designated as Metropolitan Open Land and is a Site of Special Scientific Interest. The application site is located within the Wimbledon Common Archaeological Priority Zone but is not within a Conservation Area.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The proposal is for the demolition of the 5 existing two storey houses and single storey garages at the front, that currently make up the cul-de-sac known as Carnegie Close, and their replacement with 6 new townhouses. The existing houses are arranged in a staggered formation, orientated east to west, at a 90 degree angle to the road with rear elevations and rear gardens facing towards Parkside. The proposed houses would be arranged to face the road in Carnegie Place on a north- south axis with rear gardens backing onto Alfreton Close. They would take the form of 3x 3 storey flat roofed elements connected by 2 storey elements.
- 3.2 The floor space (GIA) and amenity space standards of individual residential units are as follows compared to the adopted London Plan guidelines and Merton planning policy DM D2 Design considerations in all developments).

Proposal	Type(b)bed (p) person	Proposed GIA	London Plan	Amenity Space (sq m)	Merton Amenity Space Requirement
Plot 1	4b8p	295.8	130	337.3	50
Plot 2	4b8p	287.3	130	81.6	50
Plot 3	3b6p	179.1	108	53.6	50
Plot 4	4b8p	264.9	130	88.2	50
Plot 5	4b8p	269.4	130	89.8	50
Plot 6	4b7p	286.7	121	134.9	50

4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 05/P2462 - Erection of 1.8m high brick wall along frontage to Parkside and 0.6m high wall surmounted by 1.2m high railings along boundary at entrance to Carnegie Place to match railings at heathlands and enclose the communal garden at the rear of 1 - 5 Carnegie Place – Grant - 05/01/2006

5. **CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 The application has been advertised by major press notice procedure and letters of notification to the occupiers of neighbouring properties.
- 5.1.1 In response to the consultation, 15 letters of objection (including one from the Wimbledon Society) were received. The letters of objection raise the following points:
- The existing pedestrian access would not be maintained. The proposed path appears very narrow. The pedestrian access must be provided throughout the construction period. Further details of the proposed footpath are required to ensure its availability for full public use in the future and also consider formal adoption. The dog-leg detailing at the eastern end should be improved.
 - Over development. Footprint is excessive, excessive height and bulk of development would dominate the neighbourhood and result in loss of green space
 - Encroachment onto Heath Mead land. The proposed footpath and boundary wall to the east encroaches onto Heath Mead land.
 - Unsympathetic design. The proposed houses are out of character with neighbouring buildings which are constructed of brick, stone and tiles on pitched roofs.
 - Hours of construction
 - By converting the road on Carnegie Place to driveways, the proposal potentially blocks access for fire services needing to gain

access to Heath Mead. The closing of emergency vehicular access to the Heath Mead estate from Parkside will isolate Heath Mead considerably. The fire services have indicated in the past that they would use Carnegie Place if necessary to access Heath Mead.

- Larger houses require more car parking, leading to parking on street. It would spoil the street scene and lead to a car-dominated environment. Request that development is permit free.
- Noise and disruption during construction
- Loss of light
- Visually intrusive and dominating
- Loss of privacy
- Impact on wildlife
- Loss of value to surrounding homes
- Design and materials out of keeping
- No site notice displayed
- Trees should be retained and new ones planted
- It is important that all buildings facing the common are kept low in height and well set back so that the views from the common and Parkside are dominated by greenery rather than buildings. The proposed buildings are brought too close to the road frontage, significantly closer than the adjoining Alfreton Close houses which are some 15m back. The new block should accordingly be set back to the present building line.
- Additional conditions covering basement and hydrology required.

5.1.2 In response to re-consultation (Amended plans relating to alterations to path (retained, but increased in width to 2m), access road and soft landscaping), 13 letters of objection have been received. The letters of objection raise the following points:

- The proposed development encroaches onto the property of Heath Mead Residents Management Ltd by 1m.
- Converting the road on Carnegie Place to driveways potentially blocks access for services needing to gain access to the end block of Heath Mead. In the past, the Fire Brigade have indicated they would use Carnegie Place as a means of accessing Heath Mead.
- The proposed development curtails the right of way of the residents of Heath Mead from the estate to Parkside
- Overdevelopment of the site
- Reduction in green space
- The scale and design of the development is out of keeping with the existing buildings
- Request conditions if approved, hours of work including deliveries, no obstruction of access.
- The footpath is well used and if becomes unusable because it is too

narrow or unsafe, many elderly neighbours will face an extra half mile walk to the bus stop.

- The underground basement will cause noise during construction and will completely change the look of the area.
- The proposal shows no sensitivity to the look of Heath Mead with its 60's maisonettes and open gardens with no fencing or walls.
- Impact on more cars within the vicinity
- Maple tree will remain which is good.
- The pedestrian access is to be positioned where there are existing trees and bushes. Assurance that there will be not restriction or inconvenience whilst the tree work is done and the pathway pit in place
- The Disability Discrimination Act 1995 states a wheelchair user and a ambulant person side by side with say a pram passing by would need 3m.
- The Council require more information and details of the pathway, with its lighting, drainage, surfacing and details of the upkeep.
- The development would be contrary to planning policy DMO1E that says development in proximity to and likely to be conspicuous from the MOL...will only be acceptable if the visual amenities of the MOL will not be harmed. The proposed buildings are too close to the road frontage of the common and Parkside.
- No public site notice displayed
- Overshadowing of Heath Mead

The site plan eastern boundary has been subsequently adjusted slightly following a request for the applicant to check the site plan in relation to extent of site ownership and the elevations have been amended to more clearly show materials as set out in the application forms and Design and Access Statement.

5.2 Transport Planning

- 5.2.1 The PTAL is 1b (poor) however the PTAL bus available within the PTAL calculation area. The development is not located in a controlled Parking Zone nor is there one likely to be in place by the time the development is occupied.
- 5.2.2 The development has proposed one off street parking space per unit plus garage space. This is thought to be a suitable level of off street parking provision to stop the likelihood of overspill parking.
- 5.2.3 Trip generation by the extra residential unit will not generate any perceivable impact on the performance or safety of the surrounding highway network.
- 5.2.4 Cycle parking has been shown on the proposed ground floor plans, cycle

- parking is shown in the rear gardens, in this instance this is suitable, it is thought that the garages could also provide a cycle parking facility.
- 5.2.5 The bin stores have been shown on the proposed ground floor/ basement plans. Bins have been provided within a suitable proximity of the entrances to the development for the use by future residents, the bin stores are also located within a reasonable proximity from the public highway and can be easily accessed by refuse operatives. A suitable turning facility has been provided for refuse vehicles to enter Carnegie Place in a forward gear.
- 5.2.6 A number of residential objections have been made in relation to the east west permeability currently available through the site and the possibility of emergency vehicle access to the western properties in Heath Mead. This route is not a formalised right of way.
- 5.2.7 Existing pedestrian and cycle permeability has been retained in a near identical route at the north of the site. The re-provision of facilities by the proposed development represents an improvement over that of existing (foot way widths widened and resurfaced).
- 5.2.8 Emergency access to the western properties in Heath Mead is available from Heath Mead at present. It is noted that the cars currently park in the cul-de-sac section (of Heath Mead), If residents feel that these vehicles potentially obstruct emergency vehicle access the council have the ability and function to provide parking restrictions to protect the passage of emergency vehicles at this point. This can be requested and implemented outside the planning process.
- 5.2.9 The existing informal secondary emergency access/pedestrian-cycle passage has been incorporated within the proposed application. There is a need to restrict the planting of vegetation around the eastern section where the path dissects the application boundary. By keeping this area free of vegetation a secondary access facility for emergency vehicles is kept clear for those previously mentioned properties in Heath Mead.
- 5.2.10 The proposed development will not generate a significant negative impact on the performance and safety of the surrounding highway network as such a recommendation for approval is supported.
- 5.3 Highways – No objection subject to conditions
- 5.4 Historic England – No objection subject to condition
- 5.5 Tree Officer – No objection subject to conditions

5.6 Flood Officer - No objection subject to conditions

5.7 Structural Engineer – No objection subject to conditions

6. **POLICY CONTEXT**

6.1 Adopted Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014)

DM H2 Housing Mix

DM H3 Support for affordable housing

DM D1 Urban Design and Public Realm

DM D2 Design considerations in all developments

DM EP2 Reducing and mitigating noise

DM T1 Support for sustainable transport and active travel

DM T2 Transport impacts of development

DM T3 Car parking and servicing standards

DM O1 Open Space

DM O2 Nature Conservation, trees, hedges and landscape features

6.2 Adopted Core Planning Strategy (July 2011)

CS8 – Housing Choice

CS9 – Housing Provision

CS14 - Design

CS15 – Climate Change

CS18 – Active Transport

CS19 – Public Transport

CS20 - Parking, Servicing and Delivery

6.3 London Plan 2015 (as amended)

3.3 (Increasing Housing Supply),

3.4 (Optimising Housing Potential),

3.5 (Quality and Design of Housing Developments),

3.8 (Housing Choice),

5.1 (Climate Change Mitigation),

5.3 (Sustainable Design and Construction).

7.3 (Designing Out Crime)

7.4 (Local Character)

7.6 (Architecture)

6.4 Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) New Residential Development (December 1999)

7. **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

7.1 The principal planning considerations related to this application are the principle of demolition and redevelopment, the design of the new houses and its impact upon the Carnegie Place street scene and the character of the area, including the nearby Metropolitan Open Land. standard of accommodation provided, impact upon neighbouring amenity and sustainable transport, parking and /highways considerations, including permeability and connections to adjoining development.

7.2 Amendments

7.2.1 The proposed new access path, linking into the existing path from Parkside to Health Mead, has been increased in width to 2m and includes an amended layout. The new access road serving the development would maintain a 4.8m wide access and new soft landscaping has been introduced along the northern boundary of the site and within the frontages of the properties.

7.3 Land Ownership and Right of Way

7.3.1 Objections received have indicated that the proposed development encroaches on land outside the ownership of the applicant and that there is a right of way from Health Mead to Parkside. Landownership and right of way matters are non-planning considerations. These are private matters between land owners.

7.3.2 Nevertheless, the applicant has been asked to verify the position of the eastern ownership boundary and its relationship to the application site boundary on the submitted site plan. No built development is proposed directly adjacent to the eastern boundary other than the new footpath. As a consequence, the site plan boundary has been slightly adjusted. Although the applicant believes that there is no existing legal right of way through the site, no objection has been raised to the Council's requirement for a legal agreement to allow a permissive right of way from Heath Mead to Parkside via the proposed 2m wide path. This would ensure that a public route from Heath Mead to Parkside is maintained at all times.

7.4 Principle of Development

7.4.1 The London Plan and both the Council's adopted LDF and Sites and Policies Plan seeks to increase housing provision where it can be shown that an acceptable standard of accommodation will be provided and provide a mix of dwelling types. The London Plan published in July 2011 sets Merton a minimum 10 year target of 3,200 dwellings within the

borough between 2011 – 2021. The proposed development of the site would create a net increase of one house. The principle of development is therefore considered acceptable, making a modest contribution towards meeting housing choice and housing targets.

- 7.4.2 The existing houses are not within a Conservation Area and lack any real architectural merit and therefore there is no objection to the principle of development and the demolition of the existing houses.

7.5 Design

- 7.5.1 Planning policy DM D2 (Design considerations in all development) seeks to achieve high quality design by relating positively and appropriately to the siting, rhythm, scale, density, proportions, height, materials and massing of surrounding buildings and existing street patterns, historic context, urban layout and landscaping features of the surrounding areas.
- 7.5.2 The existing houses in Carnegie Place are orientated at a right angle to the highway. The proposed scheme seeks to readdress the relationship with the highway by having the houses front onto the highway, this is consistent with traditional street scenes and the general pattern of development in the area.
- 7.5.3 Rather than forming a solid wall of development, the terrace has been broken up into 3 main flat roofed 3-storey elements interspersed with 2-storey flat roofed lower elements. To further break down the massing, the upper floors of the 3-storey elements are significantly recessed away from both front and rear elevations. The application site and surrounding area is characterised by buildings set within open grounds. The proposed development would respond to the sense of openness with the design approach of the buildings, broken down into different heights, set comfortably away from the highway and site boundaries and offering good provision of soft landscaped areas with open driveways and front gardens. The side garden of Plot 1 would maintain a 10.8m separation between the new flank wall and the boundary with Parkside. All of the trees closest to the western Parkside boundary would be retained and those which sit behind them that are proposed to be removed are all C category and unclassified trees which would be replaced with new trees of a good size at planting. This approach would ensure that the proposed development would respect the general pattern of development and would preserve views from and to Wimbledon Common
- 7.5.4 The proposal is considered to present a high quality modern design approach. Neighbours have raised concerns that the proposed development is out of keeping in terms of height, massing, design approach and materials. However, officers' view is that there is no single

overriding architectural design approach in the area and buildings vary in height, form and design. It is also noted that the proposed development sits adjacent to a five storey building (Heathland Court) on the opposite side of Carnegie Place. The proposal seeks to provide small terrace of part two, part three storey modern houses. The height of the development is domestic in scale, responding to the varying building heights within the vicinity. Its modern design approach and choice of a mixture of grey and white render with a grey stacked stone base and grey window surrounds is considered to be acceptable and would contribute to the eclectic mix of building types in the area. The proposed development is also considered to be a considerable improvement on the existing situation. The proposed development is therefore not considered to be out of keeping, but a good example of modern architecture that responds to the existing pattern of development with an appropriate balance between built form and soft landscaping.

Footpath

- 7.4.5 The originally submitted plans have been amended to widen and adjust the alignment of the proposed 2m wide footpath which forms part of the proposed redevelopment. The footpath would maintain the existing pedestrian link through Carnegie Place which connects Heath Mead to Parkside and is wider than the existing path. Neighbours have raised concerns about the need to maintain access between Parkside and Heath Mead at all times and about the upkeep and quality of the footpath. Officers consider it necessary to require a clause within a legal agreement prior to grant of planning permission requiring the route to become a permissive path which is kept available to the public at all times. This is in the interest of promoting walking as a means of transport and maintaining a permeable layout in accordance with Sites and Policies Plan policies DM D1 and DM T1. The Council can control the finish of the footpath by planning condition, requiring further details to be submitted and approved by the Council. Neighbours have requested that the footpath is maintained during construction - a planning condition requiring details of phasing of works in relation to the provision of a route through the site to ensure that any closure would be kept to a minimum, commensurate with the need for public safety and a sensible phasing of construction.

Fire Access

- 7.4.6 Neighbours have raised concerns with fire access to properties in Heath Mead. It should be noted that the only direct highway/vehicle access to Heath Mead is via Castle Way and then Seymour Road. Carnegie Place as existing is a vehicular cul-de-sac - the current situation does not provide direct vehicle access to Heath Mead. Emergency vehicles would have to drive over the footpath/soft landscaped area to gain direct access

to properties in Heath Mead. The layout of the proposed development would not interfere with the existing highway access from Castle Way and Seymour Road and should emergency vehicles have to gain access to Heath Mead from Carnegie Place, the proposed development would still allow access across the footpath and soft landscaped areas (similar to existing).

7.5 Neighbour Impact

- 7.5.1 The Council's SPG for New Residential Development states that in order to achieve satisfactory privacy between the windows of habitable rooms and all kitchens, the minimum distance required for this purpose is 20m for two-storey dwellings. Where either or both dwellings facing each other is three or more storeys, then the possibility of overlooking is increased, and accordingly the distance separation should be greater.
- 7.5.2 The SPG further states that in order to achieve satisfactory daylight, sunlight and outlook where proposed new housing is orientated to face directly towards an existing residential area, a spacing of at least 10 metres (for 2 storey dwellings) or 12.5 metres (for 3 storey dwellings) will be required between the new dwellings and the site boundary.

Heathland Court

- 7.5.3 Located on the opposite side of Carnegie Place, this building currently operates as a nursing home. The building fronts onto Parkside, however the building has a number of flank windows facing towards the application site.
- 7.5.4 The proposal seeks to orientate the proposed building towards the flank elevation of this neighbouring building, however the proposal would be separated from this neighbouring property by the public highway and existing and proposed trees would provide some natural screening. The closest properties to Heathland Court are plots 5 and 6. The level of separation from the first floor of plots 5 & 6 would be 19.5m and 16m respectively. The level of separation proposed is a typical relationship of street scene where buildings face each other across a public highway. The public highway would form a physical barrier between buildings and the level of soft landscaping in this instance would help diffuse overlooking between neighbouring properties.
- 7.5.5 At the second floor of plots 5 and 6, the sole windows facing Heathland Court would be bathroom windows fitted with obscured glazing. This can be controlled via a planning condition.

Alfreton Close

- 7.5.6 The existing houses on the site and their close proximity to properties in Alfretton Close are considered to be a material planning consideration. The existing situation needs to be taken into account when assessing the proposed redevelopment against standards set out in the Council's SPG for New Residential Development.

5 Alfretton Close

- 7.5.7 This neighbouring property is orientated at a right angle to the application site. The existing houses on the application site sit at a right angle to Alfretton Close with staggered building footprint that results in the end house projecting close to the site boundary and beyond the frontage of this neighbouring property. The existing houses are therefore clearly visible from the frontage of this neighbouring property. The proposal seeks to change the orientation of the buildings and move them further away from Alfretton Close. The proposed development is therefore considered to be an improvement compared to the existing situation. It is however considered necessary that the external terrace to plot 1 is fitted with a 1.7m high obscured side screen to prevent overlooking and the perception of overlooking of the neighbour's rear garden area.

7 Alfretton Close

- 7.5.4 The existing houses on the site are situated at a right angle to no 7. The two storey flank wall of 5 Carnegie Place projects part way across the rear garden of no 7 at a distance of only 1.2m from the boundary. The existing situation is therefore considered to be a material planning consideration due to the close proximity of the existing houses. It should be noted that the proposed houses would be located to the north of this neighbouring properties in Alfretton Close. Therefore the proposal would have limited impact upon the natural light levels received to the properties in Alfretton Close due to this orientation and relationship.
- 7.5.5 The proposal seeks to alter the orientation of the houses and move the houses further away from the boundary compared to the existing situation. Whilst the proposed houses would be more substantial in size when compared to existing, they would be pushed further away from the site boundary and the design approach with a staggered footprint, form and varying height would help to reduce the massing.
- 7.5.6 The two storey element of the proposed house at plot 5 would be 9.2m from no 7's rear garden boundary. Although the Council's SPG states that there should be a minimum separation of 10m for the preservation of daylight, sunlight and outlook, the proposed development sits to the north and the flank wall of the existing house is 1.2m from the rear garden boundary. The shortfall in separation distance is minimal and is considered to be acceptable in the context of the existing situation. In terms of privacy, the first floor rear facing windows in the two storey

element are high level windows to a dressing room and bathroom and would not impact on privacy.

- 7.5.7 The three storey element of the proposed house would be 13.3m at first floor and 14.513m at second floor away from the site boundary and 28m and 29.3m from the rear elevation of 7 Alferton Close respectively. These separation distances would comply with the Council's SPG guidance in terms of privacy, daylight, sunlight and outlook.

9 Alferton Close

- 7.5.8 Plot 6 within the development is the closest building to this neighbouring property. The two and three storey elements of the house at plot 6 would be distanced 13.286m and 14.5m respectively from the site boundary and 27.6m and 28.6m respectively from the rear elevation of this neighbouring property. The level of separation would meet the Council's minimum space standards which would ensure that there is no undue loss of privacy, visual intrusion or loss of light.

11 – 13 Heath Mead

- 7.5.9 The proposed houses would be orientated at a right angle to these properties. The end plot, plot 6 would have its two storey side element inset 1.7m from the boundary and would not project beyond the front or rear elevation of this neighbouring building. The remaining part of the proposed house would be distanced at least 5.125m from the site boundary and approximately 16m from the flank wall of this neighbour. The level of separation would ensure that there would be no undue loss of amenity to this neighbouring property.

7.6 Basement

- 7.6.1 The proposed basements would have no perceptible impact upon the visual amenities of the area with light wells being located at the rear of the houses with low-rise balustrades. There are no trees within close proximity of the proposed basements that would be affected by the deeper excavation of the land.
- 7.6.2 Neighbours have expressed concerns in relation to the impact of the proposed basement level on land stability, adjacent properties and water table. The applicant has commissioned an independent structural engineer (AND Designs Ltd) to produce a Basement Impact Assessment and a Consultant Civil Engineers (Martin J Harvey) to produce a Drainage Strategy Report. The reports explain the construction and detailing of the proposed basement. The Council's Structural Engineer and Flood Officer have confirmed that they have no objection subject to conditions. (It is also worth noting that separate building regulations approval would be required for the construction of the basement.)

7.8 Standard of Accommodation

- 7.8.1 The proposed houses would provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation for future occupiers. The proposed houses would exceed Merton's and London Plan space standards. The layout of the houses shows that each room is capable of accommodating furniture and fittings in a satisfactory manner. The houses would all have direct access to private rear amenity space well in excess of the Council's minimum standard of 50 square metres.

7.9 Trees

- 7.9.1 As required by planning policy DM O2 (Nature conservation, trees, hedges and landscape features) of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan, development proposal will be expected to retain trees of amenity value. The existing trees on the site are fundamental features which respond to the leafy character of the immediate vicinity and most notably an extension to Wimbledon Common. The applicant has submitted an arboricultural report which the Council's Tree Officer has confirmed is acceptable. The Council's Tree Officer has confirmed that she has no objection to the proposed limited tree removals subject to conditions relating to tree protection, site supervision and landscaping which includes new trees of a good size at planting.

7.10 Traffic, Parking and Highways conditions

- 7.10.1 The site has a PTAL rating of 1b which is low, reflecting poor access to public transport. Each house has a single garage with a driveway in front which can accommodate a further parking space. The level of parking provision is considered acceptable. Only 1 additional house is proposed compared to the existing situation and any additional trip generation will therefore be low.

7.11 Affordable Housing

- 7.11.1 Planning policy CS8 (Housing Choice) of Merton's Core Planning Strategy states that the Council will seek provision of an affordable housing equivalent to that provided on-site as a financial contribution on sites where there is a net increase of between 1-9 units. Following changes to national planning policy and a Court of Appeal judgement in May 2016, the Council is not seeking contributions from developments of 10 units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floorspace of no more than 1000 square metres (gross internal area). In this instance, the floor area of the proposal would be above 1000 square metres, therefore the policy remains applicable in this instance. The existing site contains 5

single family dwelling houses and there would therefore be a net increase of 1 unit for the purposes of the affordable housing contribution. In line with the Council's calculation formula, the required affordable housing contribution in this instance would be £133,170.

8. Local Financial Considerations

- 8.1 The proposed development is liable to pay the Merton and Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), the funds for which will be applied by the Mayor towards the Crossrail project. Merton's Community Infrastructure Levy was implemented on 1st April 2014. This will enable the Council to raise, and pool, contributions from developers to help pay for things such as transport, decentralised energy, healthcare, schools, leisure and public open spaces - local infrastructure that is necessary to support new development. Merton's CIL has replaced Section 106 agreements as the principal means by which pooled developer contributions towards providing the necessary infrastructure should be collected.

9. SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

- 9.1 The proposal is for minor residential development and an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required in this instance.
- 9.2 The application does not constitute Schedule 1 or Schedule 2 development. Accordingly, there are no requirements in terms on EIA submission.

10. CONCLUSION

- 10.1 The proposed redevelopment would replace existing houses with little architectural merit. The new housing layout and massing has been carefully considered in terms of its relationships to surrounding properties and the general area, and would respect the existing pattern of development. The proposal would provide good quality residential units with no undue impact upon neighbouring amenity, nearby Metropolitan Open Land, trees or highway conditions. The permeability of the site would be maintained by the retention of a public route through the site between Parkside and Heath Mead.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION

SUBJECT TO A S106 Agreement covering the following heads of terms:-

1. Permissive 2m wide route connecting Parkside to Heath Mead maintained at all times
2. Financial contribution towards Affordable housing (£133.170).
3. The developer agreeing to meet the Councils costs of preparing, drafting and monitoring the Section 106 Obligations.

And the following conditions:

1. A.1 Commencement of Development
2. A7 Approved Plans
3. B.1 Materials to be approved
4. B.4 Details of Surface Treatment
5. Details of boundary treatment
6. Details of Refuse
7. Refuse implementation
8. Details of Cycle Parking
9. Cycle implementation
10. Landscaping details
11. Landscaping implementation
12. Details of screening to balconies
- 13 No use of flat roof
14. Sustainable homes
15. D11 Construction Times
16. Construction Vehicle Traffic Management Plan
17. Phasing Plan
18. F5 Tree Protection

19. Design of foundations
20. F8 Site Supervision
21. Demolition Method Statement
22. Construction Method Statement
23. Temporary works drawings
24. Structural drawings of the basement retaining walls and piles
25. 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 drainage scheme will dispose of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) 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 and control the rate of surface water discharged from the site to no more than 3l/s. 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;
 - 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.
26. Phasing works plans
27. Removal of Permitted development Rights (Extensions)

- 28 Removal of Permitted development Rights (windows in upper levels)
- 29 Removal of Permitted development Rights (front boundary treatment)
- 30 Obscured glazing to bathrooms
- 31 No demolition or 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 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.
32. H9 Construction Vehicles
33. H10 Construction Vehicles, Washdown Facilities etc
34. H12 Delivery and Servicing Plan to be submitted
35. Construction logistics Plan to be submitted

Planning Informative

1. INF9 Works on the Public Highway

2. INF12 Works affecting the Public Highway
 3. Written schemes of investigation will need to be prepared and implemented by a suitably 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 schedule 6 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.
-

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

Please note these web pages may be slow to load

This page is intentionally left blank