

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
25th May 2017

<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>DATE VALID</u>
16/P4672	05/12//2016
Address/Site	7 Lambourne Avenue, Wimbledon Park, London, SW19 7DW
Ward	Wimbledon Park
Proposal:	Demolition of existing detached house and erection of 2 x two storey detached houses with accommodation at basement and roof level .
Drawing Nos	907/2h/01, 03 Rev C, 04 Rev C, 05 Rev D, 06 Rev D, 07 Rev C, 08 Rev G, 10 Rev C, 12 Rev D, 14 Rev D
Contact Officer:	Stuart Adams (0208 545 3147)

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions and S106 agreement

CHECKLIST INFORMATION.

Heads of agreement: - Permit Free Development
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 – 10
External consultations – No.
PTAL Score – 1b
CPZ – P2(s)

1. **INTRODUCTION**

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

2. **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 The application site comprises a two storey detached house located in Lambourne Avenue, which is a cul de sac accessed from Arthur Road, Wimbledon Park. The house is the last in a line of 4 properties on the eastern side of the road before reaching the houses at the bottom of the cul de sac. The house has a side boundary with the turning head area, giving it a corner location. It is set back from the pavement in an elevated position compared to pavement level. It sits on a plot which is appreciably larger and wider than the other 3 houses on the east side of the road.
- 2.2 Lambourne Avenue is characterised by detached houses in a maturely landscaped setting, to which the vegetation within the deep front curtilages makes a contribution. Another key feature of the road is the topography, sloping downwards from Arthur Road, from south to north, to the bottom of the cul-de –sac. The most northerly properties on the far side of the turning head sit below street level which provides views beyond and a sense of openness.
- 2.3 The next door house, no 5 Lambourne Avenue, adjacent to the southern boundary of the application site, is a new replacement house, completed in 2015.
- 2.4 The property is located within the Wimbledon North Conservation Area (Sub-Area 3: Arthur and Leopold Road). It is also within a Controlled Parking Zone.

3. **CURRENT PROPOSAL**

- 3.1.1 The proposal is for the demolition of the existing two storey detached house and erection of 2 x two storey detached houses including accommodation at basement and roof levels. The proposed houses would have a traditional design using stock brick, stone detailing, timber sash windows and slate roofs.
- 3.1.2 House A would be located closest to the bend in the road. House A would be separated from House B by a 2.1m gap. The gap would accommodate a light well serving the basements of the proposed houses. House A adopts a subordinate design approach to House B, being narrower in the width of the front elevation, set lower in the ground, with lower ridge and eaves levels, a part catslide roof form and a staggered front building line, set back between 1.4m and 2.4m behind the frontage of House B. The house would have a part open driveway for two cars and a pedestrian footpath leading up to the house, with a low brick wall containing the rest of the front curtilage.

- 3.1.3 House B would be separated from 5 Lambourne Avenue by a 1.1m gap. The eaves and ridge level of House B would be 0.92m and 0.89m below the eaves and ridge of 5 Lambourne Avenue. The house would have a part open driveway for two cars and a pedestrian footpath leading up to the house.
- 3.1.4 The floor space (GIA) and amenity space of the 2 houses compared to the adopted London Plan and Merton planning policy DM D2 Design considerations in all developments).

Proposal	Type(b)bed (p) person	Proposed GIA	London Plan standards	Amenity Space (sq m)	Merton standards
House A	6b12p	365	129	280	50
House B	6b12p	398	129	205	50

3.1.5 Amendments

Following discussions with the applicant, the original submission has been amended as follows:

House A

Maximum depth of house reduced from 15.2m to 14.9m (0.3m reduction).
 North West Flank wall reduced from 13.4m to 12.7m (0.7m reduction).
 Ridge height lowered from 53.76 AOD to 53.61 AOD (0.15m reduction)
 Eaves height lowered on part of roof from 51.12 AOD to 49.76 AOD (1.36m reduction).

House B

Ridge height lowered from 54.46 AOD to 54.31 AOD (0.15m reduction), Eaves height lowered from 51.39 AOD to 51.34 AOD (0.05 reduction)

4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1. 15/P2830 - Demolition of the existing house and erection of 2x two storey 5/6 bedroom semi-detached houses with accommodation at basement and roof levels – Refused by Planning Applications Committee on 21st April 2016 for the following reasons:

The proposed houses by reason of their design, height, massing and siting would be an overly dominant and overbearing form of development that fails to relate positively to the Lambourne Avenue street scene and would fail to either conserve or enhance the Wimbledon North Conservation Area which is a designated heritage asset, contrary to

policies DM D2 (Design considerations in all developments) and DM D4 (Managing heritage assets) of Merton's Adopted Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014), and CS14 - Design of Merton's adopted Core Planning Strategy (July 2011).

A subsequent planning appeal was dismissed by the Planning Inspector, ref APP/T5720/W/16/3152709, who stated as follows:

“Whilst the eaves of the proposal would be at a similar level above ground as the neighbouring properties, so that the stepping arrangement in the street would be maintained in this respect, this would not be the case with regard to the roof ridge which would only be marginally below that of No. 5. The principal frontage would be far wider than its neighbours as would the exposed side elevation. Although the proposal’s design would reflect the formal arrangement of No. 5, it would be far grander in terms of its scale and proportions than its neighbours”.

“Taken together, the matters outlined above would result in an overly dominate and prominent building that would be out of scale and out of keeping with its immediate context. I therefore conclude that, due to its size, siting and design the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of this part of the Wimbledon North Conservation Area and would have an unacceptable effect on the street scene”.

“For these reasons the proposal fails to accord with Policy DM D2 of the Council’s Sites and Policies Plan (2014) (SPP) which, amongst other matters, seeks to ensure that new development relates positively and appropriately to the siting, rhythm, scale, density, proportions, height and massing of surrounding buildings. There is also conflict with SPP Policy DM D4 which states that proposals affecting a heritage asset or its setting should conserve and enhance the significance of the asset. The proposal is also contrary to the broad aims of Policy CS14 of the London Borough of Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011)”.

- 4.2 WIM6953 - Erection of house and garage – Grant - 27/08/1963
- 4.3 WIM4240 - Formation of a new street and also to provide an additional building plot making a layout of 20 building plots – Grant - 19/03/1959.

5. **CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 The application has been advertised by standard site notice procedure and letters of notification to the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

5.2 In response to consultation, 10 letters of objection received to the original plans. The letters raise the following concerns:

Design

- The building is still massively increases the impact on the corner plot by comparison with the original house and neighbouring houses.
- New houses would dominate even from the top of the road.
- Wrong to allow the single dwelling character of Lambourne Avenue to be so radically changed.
- Gap between no 5 and no 7 is significant feature of Lambourne Avenue and must be preserved.
- Ridge height of house A does not respect the drop in the ground levels of the road. The road level has a fall of 0.89m in between houses no 5 and no 7 but the ridge level has fallen only by 0.74m. The house should be lowered to 54.31m to match the fall in the road.
- Although now two separate houses, instead of one mass containing two houses, they are still very large for the corner and have only marginally been reduced.
- The cars will be parked directly in front of the houses and directly in front of the pavement detracting from character and appearance of the street scene.
- The developers have squeezed a lot of windows into the building and front and rear elevations look odd. The rear dormer windows appear larger than their neighbour and out of scale.
- Ridge height is 1m higher than existing and only marginally lower than in the previous application that was rejected. Should be no higher than existing (as required for redevelopment of no 5)
- Detracts from the spacious open nature of the street scene

Basement

- Although the heights have been marginally lowered, concern that there will need to dig deeper into the ground for the basement. This is of concern for all surrounding homes and may have an impact on the integrity of the road surface and high level of risk associated with the proposed build.
- Basement impact on the stability of the land given its sloping nature.

Neighbour Amenity

- Loss of light to basement games room and kitchen at no 5

- Loss of views towards Wimbledon Park from no 5 due to 2m rearward projection beyond upper levels
- Visually oppressive and overbearing
- Disruption during construction

Highways

- Two additional houses will impact on the already low proportion of parking bays/numbers in this road. Loss of 2 CPZ parking places.
- The new house would extend significantly closer to the edge of the plot in comparison to the current house, with a negative impact on the street scene and the views towards Wimbledon Park.

Plans

- Outlined of the existing house should be shown on the plans.

5.3 In response to re-consultation, 10 letters of objection have been received. reiterating original objections and raising the following additional points:

- The bulk and mass of the houses has only been marginally reduced. House A on the corner is still very prominent and dominant . Although there have been minor changes, these houses still fail to preserve the character and appearance of Wimbledon North Conservation Area and the street scene.

5.3 Tree Officer – No objection subject to conditions

5.4 Future Merton – Transport Planning

- Each dwelling would have 2 of-street parking spaces, which is in accordance with London Plan maximum Parking Standards.
- The CPZ operates Monday – Friday 11.00am - 3.00pm. Outside these times parking is uncontrolled including the busier weekend periods
- Separate crossing applications would be required in accordance with Merton’s crossover guidance.
- The construction of the new crossovers would result in the loss of 2 existing on-street parking spaces . However, these could be relocated on the opposite side of the street.
- Whilst there would be an increase in the numbers of vehicle using Lambourne Avenue arising from the net increase of 1 dwelling this would not be significant and could therefore not be considered grounds for refusal.
- Two existing properties are already at various stages of construction/modification. It is therefore recommended that a

construction and logistic plan required by condition to help mitigate potential impacts during construction.

Overall there is no objection from a transport planning perspective.

5.5 Future Merton – Flood Officer – No objection subject to conditions

5.6 Councils Structural Engineer – No objection subject to conditions

6. **POLICY CONTEXT**

6.1 Merton 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

6.2 Adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014)

DM H2 Housing Mix

DM H3 Support for affordable housing

DM.D2 Design Considerations in All Developments

DM.D4 Managing Heritage Assets

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

6.3 London Plan (July 2015) and Minor Alterations to the London Plan (March 2016)

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)

7. **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

7.1 The principal planning considerations related to this application are the principle of development, the design of the new houses and the impact

upon the Lambourne Avenue street scene and the Wimbledon North Conservation Area, the standard of accommodation provided, impact upon neighbouring amenity, trees and parking/highways considerations. The previous appeal decision and the findings of the appeal inspector are a strong material planning consideration.

7.2 Principle of Development

7.2.1 Planning policy DM D4 (Managing heritage assets) requires that development that affects a heritage asset or its setting will be required to conserve and where appropriate enhance Merton's heritage assets and distinctive character. The policy further states that loss of a building that makes a positive contribution to a conservation area or heritage site, should also be treated as substantial harm to a heritage asset. The existing dwellinghouse has little architectural merit and is not considered to make a positive contribution to the Wimbledon North Conservation Area. Therefore, in principle, the demolition of the existing house is considered acceptable, subject to the provision of a suitable replacement development.

7.2.2 The redevelopment of the site would create 2x 5 bedroom houses, which would result in a net increase of 1 unit on the site. The London Plan and the Council's adopted planning policies seek to increase housing provision where it can be shown that an acceptable standard of accommodation will be provided. The London Plan 2015 sets Merton a minimum target provision and the development would make a modest contribution to meeting that target.

7.2.3 In terms of providing two dwellings on this site, there is no principle objection subject to all other normal planning considerations. It is noted that neighbours have raised concerns regarding a covenant restricting development to one dwelling, however this is a civil matter and is not a planning consideration.

7.3 Design, Impact on the Street Scene and on the North Wimbledon Conservation Area and Relationship to Previous Appeal Decision

7.3.1 The current application has been submitted with the intention of overcoming the previous grounds on which the appeal in relation to the demolition of the existing house and replacement with a pair of semi-detached houses was dismissed (Appeal Ref; APP/T5720/W/16/3152709) following Planning Application Committee's refusal of LBM Ref 15/P2830.

7.3.2 The appeal decision letter notes that due to the marked downward slope of the cul de sac and the turning head at its end, next to the appeal site, *'the existing house occupies a particularly prominent, exposed and*

elevated position in the street scene’.

7.3.3 The Inspector notes that the front building line of the proposal would line through with that of its neighbours and also states that ‘an adequate gap would be maintained between the proposal and No. 5.’

7.3.4 The Inspector further notes that they are satisfied that the loss of on-street parking spaces and provision of additional off-street parking would not result in harm to highway safety or parking stress in the street, and also that the proposal would not result in unacceptable loss of light to the next door property.

7.3.5 The reason for dismissal of the appeal therefore relates solely to the impact on the Wimbledon North Conservation Area and the streetscene. The Inspector’s comments are as follows:

‘6. Whilst the eaves of the proposal would be at a similar level above ground as the neighbouring properties, so that the stepping arrangement in the street would be maintained in this respect, this would not be the case with regard to the roof ridge which would only be marginally below that of No. 5. The principal frontage would be far wider than its neighbours as would the exposed side elevation. Although the proposal’s design would reflect the formal arrangement of No. 5, it would be far grander in terms of its scale and proportions than its neighbours.

7. Taken together, the matters outlined above would result in an overly dominant and prominent building that would be out of scale and out of keeping with its immediate context. I therefore conclude that, due to its size, siting and design the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of this part of the Wimbledon North Conservation Area and would have an unacceptable effect on the street scene.

8. For these reasons the proposal fails to accord with Policy DM D2 of the Council’s Sites and Policies Plan (2014) (SPP) which, amongst other matters, seeks to ensure that new development relates positively and appropriately to the siting, rhythm, scale, density, proportions, height and massing of surrounding buildings. There is also conflict with SPP Policy DM D4 which states that proposals affecting a heritage asset or its setting should conserve and enhance the significance of the asset. The proposal is also contrary to the broad aims of Policy CS14 of the London Borough of Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011).

7.3.6 Comparison to Previous Application 15/P2830

7.3.7 The proposed development seeks to overcome the Planning Inspector’s previous grounds for dismissal by reducing the overall mass and

prominence of the new dwellings within the street scene by the following measures:

- replacement of the previously proposed semi-detached houses with two detached houses, separated by a 2m gap in the middle. This significantly reduces the overall bulk, particularly given the hipped roof form, breaks up the width of continuous front elevation and provides a gap between the two houses
- reduction in ridge and eaves height. The previous proposal had a main ridge height set down 0.35m below that of no 5, which the appeal Planning Inspector considered to be insufficient to reflect the characteristic stepping arrangement in the street. In the current application, House B has a ridge height set down 0.89m below that of no 5 and the ridge of House A is set 0.7m below that of House B. Although the Inspector did not have a concern about eaves height, they have also been set lower for both houses than the appeal proposal
- reduction in overall footprint
- staggering of the front building line, so that the corner house, House A, is set behind House B, and its front elevation is set back again adjacent to the corner
- subordinate design for House A on the corner by setting it lower within the site, staggering the flank elevation and setting the eaves down so that its width reduces in proximity to the side boundary.

7.3.8 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.

7.3.9 Lambourne Avenue is characterised by detached houses with relatively deep setbacks from the road. The large detached houses at the northern end of this cul-de-sac are predominantly at a lower level than the road. As noted in the Character Assessment for the Sub-Area, this arrangement of highway and buildings

'combine to form a long wide gap when viewed from within Arthur Road. This allows an extensive view across wooded gardens to Wimbledon Park and beyond.'

The proposed houses do not sit any further forward on the plot than the existing house to be demolished or the adjoining house at no.5, therefore this long, wide gap which is a key characteristic of Lambourne Avenue in relation to the Conservation Area is considered to be maintained.

7.3.10 The houses on the eastern side of Lambourne Avenue follow the road contours with roofs and eaves heights stepping down to follow the

topography. This stepping down is maintained in the proposed development with a change of 0.7m between the ridge of house A and B and a 0.89m between House B and 5 Lambourne Avenue. The change in eaves levels between House A and B would be at least 0.6m and 0.9m between House B and 5 Lambourne Avenue.

7.3.11 In recognition of the fact that no 7 sits in an elevated position above the turning head and points made by the planning inspector, the applicant has reduced the dominance of the north east flank elevation of house A by lowering the building below natural ground level, having a stepped frontage and set down eaves. It is considered that House A would now have a much less imposing impact upon the street scene.

7.3.12 In terms of maintaining suitable gaps around buildings, a 4.272m gap exists between the upper floor elements of no.s 3 and 5, made up of the single storey garage belonging to no.3 and a 1m gap between the flank wall of the new house at no 5 and the boundary with no.3. A similar 4.266m gap is maintained between 5 and 7, made up of the single storey garage of no 5 and the 1m gap between the new house flank wall and the boundary with no. 5. The proposed development has also been amended to retain at least a 5m gap from the northern boundary, increasing to 6.7m. Whilst the two storey element of the proposed houses would be situated closer to number 5 Lambourne Avenue, resulting in a reduced gap between these neighbours, it would be similar to existing spacings and a large gap on the other side of the buildings would be retained in order to maintain a sufficiently green and open aspect at the corner. The Inspector considered the size of gap between 5 and the new development to be acceptable and this is maintained.

7.3.13 The combination of measures set out at 7.3.7 are considered to be sufficient to overcome the previous grounds for dismissal on appeal. The stepping down within the streetscene has been increased, the overall massing and dominance of the front elevation has been greatly reduced by the combination of splitting into two detached houses, staggering the building line and reducing ridge and eaves line. The existing house is of no architectural merit and the proposed design sits comfortably with neighbouring properties. It is considered to relate positively to the rhythm, proportion, height and massing of surrounding buildings in accordance with Policy DM D2 and conserve and enhance the character of the Conservation Area in accordance with policy DM D4.

7.4 Basement

7.4.1 The proposed basement would have a limited impact upon the visual amenities of the area with light wells being located at the rear and side of the houses. The light wells would be fitted with low-rise balustrades and

given their siting would have a limited impact upon the visual amenities of the street scene. There are no trees within close proximity of the proposed basement that would be affected by the deeper excavation of the land. Neighbours have expressed concerns in relation to the proposed basement and its impact upon land stability, impact upon adjacent properties and water table. The applicant has commissioned an independent structural engineer (RJC Structural Design) to produce a Basement Impact Assessment which explains the construction and detailing of the proposed basement. The Council's Structural and flood engineers have confirmed the acceptability of the proposed basement details subject to conditions. Separate building regulations approval would be required for the construction of the basement and the provisions of party wall legislation would apply.

7.5 Standard of Accommodation

7.5.1 The proposed houses would provide a good standard of accommodation for future occupiers. The proposed houses would easily exceed Merton 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. Whilst it is noted that the bedrooms in the basements would have limited outlook and light, they do not form the main bedroom accommodation and are likely to be guest or additional ancillary accommodation. All the other habitable rooms have good levels of outlook, light and circulation areas. The houses would have direct access to a private rear amenity space well in excess of the Council's minimum standard of 50 square metres.

7.6 Neighbouring Amenity

5 Lambourne Avenue

7.6.1 The proposed house would be inset 1.1m from the boundary with this neighbour. The proposed houses would not project beyond the front elevation of no.5 and would be no further forward than the existing house. At the rear, the nearest element of no.5 is a single storey side addition which accommodates a garage and utility room, separating the main house at no.5 from the side boundary. The proposed rear building line of the houses would be slightly behind the ground floor rearward projection of the main part of the neighbouring house (1.1m beyond the upper floors), which is situated beyond the single storey side garage. There would be a separation distance of 4.2m between the flank wall of the proposal and this neighbour's main flank wall (main part of house). Given the siting and good level of separation between neighbours it is considered that there would be no undue loss of amenity. This is a

reduced depth compared to the appeal proposal, which the Inspector considered to be acceptable in relation to impact on the neighbour.

- 7.6.2 In order to ensure that there is no overlooking from the side windows and flat roof section of the proposed houses, obscured glazing and no use of the flat roofs can be secured via suitable planning conditions.

9 Lambourne Avenue

- 7.6.3 This neighbour site is orientated at a right angle to the application site and sits directly at the end of the garden of the application site. The proposed houses would be distanced approximately 25.6m from this neighbouring property. Upper floor windows looking towards the rear garden area would be over 18m away. Given the orientation of the neighbouring property and level of separation it is considered that there would be no undue loss of amenity. A new semi-mature tree will be planted adjacent to the boundary with no.9 and additional planting can be required adjacent to the boundary to soften views of the rear elevations.

7.7 Parking and Traffic

- 7.7.1 The site is in a controlled parking zone (P2(s)) with controls operating between Monday to Friday between 11am-3pm. The proposals show a double width hardstanding for each property, providing each house with 2 off street spaces. This level of parking provision is in line with the London Plan car parking standards.

- 7.7.2 The driveway/crossover for the northernmost property is positioned close to the corner of the road however traffic movements will be low in this cul de sac location and the positioning is therefore considered to be acceptable.

- 7.7.3 The proposal would result in the loss of 2 on street parking bays and will add to visitor demand. Although the provision of 4 off street parking bays will offset some of this impact, it is recommended that the development is permit free. Although this is unusual for a property in a PTAL 1b area it is recommended that this is required to mitigate against the reduced on street parking availability.

7.8 Trees

- 7.8.1 The applicant has submitted an arboricultural report which the Councils Tree Officer has confirmed is acceptable. The Councils Tree Officer has confirmed that she has no objection to the application subject to conditions relating to tree protection, site supervision and detail of landscaping.

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 development will be required to meet the equivalent of Code 4 for Sustainable Homes in terms of energy and water saving efficiency.

10. **CONCLUSION**

- 10.1 The proposed development will provide 2 new family dwellings which are considered to relate well to the context of the Lambourne Avenue street scene and would conserve the character of this part of the Wimbledon North Conservation Area. The standard of residential accommodation proposed is considered to meet the needs of future occupiers, with an appropriate level of amenity space and room sizes with good levels of outlook and light. There would be no undue impact upon neighbouring amenity, trees, traffic or highway conditions. The proposal is in accordance with Adopted Sites and Policies Plan, Core Planning Strategy and London Plan policies. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions and S106 agreement.

RECOMMENDATION

Subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement covering the following heads of terms:-

1. Designation of the development as permit-free and that on-street parking permits would not be issued for future residents of the proposed development.

2. 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. B1 Materials to be approved
4. B4 Details of Surface Treatment (porous or permeable)
5. B5 Details of boundary treatment
6. C01 No Permitted Development (Extensions)
7. No Permitted development (boundary treatment at front)
8. C02 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no window, dormer, rooflight or door other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed in the upper levels of the flank elevations without planning permission first obtained from the Local Planning Authority.
9. C03 Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied, the upper floor windows in the South-West elevation shall be glazed with obscure glass and fixed shut and shall permanently maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities and privacy of the occupiers of adjoining properties 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 Policies Plan 2014.
10. C07 Refuse and Recycling (Implementation)
11. C06 Refuse and Recycling (details)
12. C08 No Use of Flat Roof
13. D11 Construction Times

14. F01 Landscaping/Planting Scheme
15. F02 Landscaping (Implementation)
16. F05 The details and measures for the protection of the existing retained trees as specified in the approved document 'Arboricultural Method Statement Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Report' reference: 'NvP3360-R1' and dated '16 November 2016' including the drawing titled: 'Tree Protection Plan' numbered 'NvP3360-R1' shall be fully complied with. The methods for the protection of the existing trees shall follow the sequence of events as detailed in the document.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing 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 policies DM D2 and 02 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014

17. F08 Site Supervision (Trees)
18. H07 Cycle Parking to be implemented
19. L2 No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until evidence has been submitted to the council confirming that the development has achieved not less than the CO2 reductions (ENE1), internal water usage (WAT1) standards equivalent to Code for Sustainable Homes level 4. Evidence requirements are detailed in the "Schedule of evidence Required for Post Construction Stage from Ene1 & Wat1 of the Code for Sustainable Homes Technical Guide. Evidence to demonstrate a 25% reduction compared to 2010 part L regulations and internal water usage rates of 105l/p/day must be submitted to, and acknowledged in writing by the Local Planning Authority, unless otherwise agreed in writing.

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.

20. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a detailed scheme for the provision of surface and foul water drainage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The drainage scheme will dispose of surface

water by means of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS), the scheme shall:

- i. Provide information about the design storm period and intensity, attenuation and control the rate of surface water discharged from the site to no more than 4l/s in total (2l/s sec max discharge from each dwelling);
- ii. Include a timetable for its implementation;
- iii. Provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development, including arrangements for adoption to ensure the schemes' operation throughout its lifetime.

No works which are the subject of this condition shall be carried out until the scheme has been approved, and the development shall not be occupied until the scheme is carried out in full. Those facilities and measures shall be retained for use at all times thereafter.

Reason: To reduce the risk of surface and foul water flooding and to ensure the scheme is in accordance with the drainage hierarchy of London Plan policies 5.12 & 5.13 and the National SuDS standards and in accordance with policies CS16 of the Core Strategy and DMF2 of the Sites and Policies Plan.

21. Demolition Method Statement
22. Construction Method Statement (produced by contractor)
23. Construction Drawings
24. Development carried out in accordance with the CMS

INFORMATIVES:

1. *It is the responsibility of the developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, watercourses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off-site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of ground water. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required (contact no. 0845 850 2777).*

2. *You are advised to contact the Council's Highways team on 020 8545 3700 before undertaking any works within the Public Highway to obtain the necessary approvals and/or licences. Please be advised that there is a further charge for this work. If your application falls within a Controlled Parking Zone this has further costs involved and can delay the application by 6 to 12 months.*
-

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

Please note these web pages may be slow to load