

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
19th October 2017

<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>DATE VALID</u>
17/P1682	21/04/2017
Address/Site	Birchwood, 7 Ellerton Road, West Wimbledon, SW20 0ER
Ward	Village
Proposal:	Demolition of existing dwellinghouse and erection of 2 detached dwelling houses plus alterations to existing vehicular crossover
Drawing Nos	4C, 5C, 6C, 7C, 8D, 9C, 10B, 11A, 12B, 13, 14, 15, and 16
Contact Officer:	Stuart Adams (0208 545 3147)

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

CHECKLIST INFORMATION.

Heads of agreement: - None
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 – 8
External consultations – GLAAS.
PTAL Score – 1b
CPZ – N/A

1. **INTRODUCTION**

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

officer recommendation to grant permission subject to conditions.

2. **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 This application relates to a large property on the southern side of Ellerton Road, roughly 50m to the east of the junction with Barham Road. Ellerton Road is a private road characterised by large detached properties set within spacious plots.
- 2.2 The existing property has a footprint of 250sqm and the application site is just under 1700sqm. The architectural style is mixed within the locality which reflects that each plot was developed independently rather than on a whole estate basis. The site has a slight gradient such that that the western part of the site is lower than the eastern edge.
- 2.3 Wimbledon Common is roughly 400m to the north and is both a SSSI and a SAC. The site is within the Drax Avenue Conservation Area and an Archaeological Priority Zone and has a PTAL of 1a.

3. **CURRENT PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 The proposal is for demolition of existing dwellinghouse and erection of 2 detached dwelling houses plus alterations to existing vehicular crossover

House A

- 3.2 House A would be a two storey, 6 bedroom Arts and Crafts house. The house would have a handman clay tile roof, cast iron gutters, soft red handmade brick elevations and oak framed bay and casement windows. The house would have two car parking spaces, one within the integral garage and one within the front drive area.

House B

- 3.3 House B would be a two storey, 6 bedroom Arts and Charts house. The house would have a natural light grey slate roof, cast iron gutters, fine roughcast render elevations, honey coloured natural stone bay & cornice with lead roof and honey coloured natural stone plinth. The house would have up to three car parking spaces, one within the integral garage and up to two within the front drive area.
- 3.4 The floor space (GIA) and amenity space standards of individual residential units are as follows compared to London Plan 2015 requirements and Merton planning policy DM D2 Design considerations in all developments).

<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Type(b)bed (p) person</u>	<u>Proposed GIA</u>	<u>London Plan</u>	<u>Amenity Space (sq m)</u>	<u>London Plan/ Merton requirement</u>
House A	<u>6b12p</u>	<u>475</u>	<u>134</u>	<u>465</u>	<u>50</u>
House B	<u>6b12p</u>	<u>480</u>	<u>134</u>	<u>433</u>	<u>50</u>

4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 16/P1621 - Demolition of existing dwellinghouse and erection of 2 detached dwelling houses – Refused permission on 28/07/2016 for the following reasons:

The application has failed to provide any reasoned or sufficient justification for the demolition of the existing dwelling which is considered to make a positive contribution to the Drax Avenue Conservation Area. Furthermore the proposal would by virtue of its design and materials result in a growing homogeneity of built form within the Drax Avenue Conservation Area which would not be in keeping with its character and appearance. As a result the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the Conservation Areas character and appearance such that it would result in substantial harm to a designated heritage asset. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies DMD1, DMD2 and DMD4 of the Sites and Policies Plan (2014), Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy, Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan and paragraphs 132 and 133 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The refusal was also dismissed at appeal (Ref – APP/T5720/W/16/3161105). The planning inspector raised concerns that the design of the houses would appear for all intents and purpose a mirror image of each other. Therefore the proposal would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the DACA.

- 4.2 88/P1214 - Erection of a conservatory extension at rear – Grant - 27/09/1988.

5. **CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 The application has been advertised by Conservation Area procedure and letters of notification to the occupiers of neighbouring properties.
- 5.2 In response to consultation, 7 letters of objection received. The letters raise the following points:

Design

- Not in keeping with street scene. Characterised by detached dwellings standing in their own plots, where overall scale and bulk of development on each plot is much the same
- The current building is charming and adds to the pleasant nature of the conservation area of the Drax Estate, two new dwellings would detract from these aspects.
- The dwellings are still basically mirror images of each other (reason that appeal was dismissed). They are very similar size, width and shape, the proposed dwellings materials are slight and cosmetic.
- The current application does not go far enough to rectify the inadequacies of the previous application.
- The proposal fails to take opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area as required by NPPF.
- Does not preserve or enhance conservation area

Trees

- Loss of trees

Highways

- Construction traffic, request that a construction method statement is produced by the applicant prior to any works
- Impact on the already limited public transportation accessibility in the Ellerton Road area.
- Ellerton Road is a private highway maintainable at the residents expense. Construction traffic is likely to cause abnormal wear and damage to the road. It would be wholly unreasonable for the residents to suffer financial detriment for this. Request that the Council secure an undertaking from the developer to pay for initial condition surveys and for any such damage and wear so caused following a final condition survey.

Flooding

- A hydrology report should be provided before the application is considered.
- The water table is in grave risk of being diverted by the construction of two dwellings, even those without basements.

Neighbour amenity

- Disruption during construction
- Subsidence to neighbouring properties.

- Visual intrusion
- Overlooking from balcony and windows to the south-west combined with a reduction in the tree crown spread.
- Overbearing in design and leads to inevitable problems of overlooking and loss of privacy. The current application is too close to the boundary and threatens to damage boundary features such as well-established trees and fencing.

Other considerations

- Overdevelopment of site
- Set precedent
- Planning Guideline for the DACA has been removed from the Council website resulting in scrutiny of development applications being lax both in preparation and approvals.
- Merton is already meeting housing targets
- Impact upon drainage systems

- 5.3 Following amendments to the scheme (design alterations to House A), one letter of objection has been received stating that the deletion of the proposed roof lights from the front roof slope of House A is a minor change and does not overcome original objection.

Officer comment – note that the changes made to House A involve considerably more changes than just deletion of a front roof light. See section 7.2.3 of committee report for full details of amendments.

- 5.2 Tree Officer – No objections subject to conditions
- 5.3 Flood Officer – No objections subject to conditions
- 5.4 Greater London Archaeological advisory Service - The applicant site falls outside the Archaeological Priority Zone so no comment
- 5.5 Climate Officer - In this instance I am satisfied that a pre-commencement condition can be applied in order to demonstrate compliance with the 19% improvement target as no significant barriers to meeting the targets have been identified in relation to this application.

6. **POLICY CONTEXT**

- 6.1 Merton Core Planning Strategy (July 2011)

CS8 Housing choice
 CS9 Housing provision
 CS11 Infrastructure

- CS13 Open space, nature conservation, leisure and culture
- CS14 Design
- CS15 Climate Change
- CS 16 Flood Risk management
- CS17 Waste Management
- CS18 Active Transport
- CS19 Public Transport
- CS20 Parking, Servicing and Delivery

6.2 Adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014)

- DMH2 Housing mix
- DMD1 Urban design and the public realm
- DMD2 Design considerations in all developments
- DMD4 Managing heritage assets
- DMT1 Support for sustainable transport and active travel
- DMT2 Transport impacts of development
- DMT3 Car parking and servicing standards
- DM F1 Support for flood risk management
- DM F2 Sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) and, wastewater and water infrastructure
- DM EP2 Reducing and mitigating noise
- DM EP3 Allowable solutions
- DM EP4 Pollutants

6.3 London Plan (July 2011)

- 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
- 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- 5.7 Renewable energy
- 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
- 6.9 Cycling
- 6.13 Parking
- 7.1 Lifetime neighbourhoods
- 7.2 An inclusive environment
- 7.3 Designing out crime
- 7.4 Local character
- 7.6 Architecture
- 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology

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 Ellerton Road street scene and the Drax Avenue Conservation Area (DACA), the standard of accommodation provided, impact upon neighbouring amenity, flooding, trees, ecology and parking/highways considerations.

7.2 Amendments

7.2.1 A strong material planning consideration in this instance is the previous planning refusal and associated dismissed appeal. In dismissing the planning appeal the planning inspector considered that the principle of redevelopment of the site could be acceptable subject to high quality replacement houses that appear different in design. The concern with the appeal scheme was the proposed houses would be a mirror image of each other. This approach had been taken elsewhere in the DACA and the planning inspector considered that this approach should not be repeated.

7.2.2 In order to overcome the concerns raised by the planning inspector, the original plans were amended. It was considered that the design of houses didn't go far enough to ensure that they were remarkably different. Whilst of different materials and detailing, the houses had a similar footprint and form which included a single front bay and subordinate two storey side addition with ground floor garage.

7.2.3 Offices were happy with the design approach taken for House B, however the form of House A was considered too similar to House B and improvements could be made to the design and detailing of House A. The changes made to House A include high quality materials and better detailing, introduction of an integrated garage with accommodation above (rather than a two storey side addition) and two front bays (rather than one). The proposed changes are now considered to achieve a high quality design approach that ensures that each house has its own quality and appear remarkably different from each other (and other houses in the DACA) to ensure that the DACA is conserved as required by planning policy DM D4 (Managing heritage assets)

Comparison to Appeal Scheme

7.2.3 In comparison to the appeal scheme, the design rationale and materials for each house is remarkably different helping rectify the potential homogeneity approach being seen in the DACA. The changes include lowered ridge and eaves heights and a notable reduction in the eaves

levels between each house (0.8m). The front building line of House B has also been pushed further back into the site, creating a staggered front building line. This approach creates visual interest and helps contribute towards ensuring that the houses are different. Overall, the heights, form, materials and detailing of each house now ensures that they are remarkably different in appearance and character.

7.3 Principle of Development

7.3.1 The principle of development of the site has already been established under the previous planning application on the site, 16/P1621. Planning application 16/P1621 was refused planning permission (see reasons in section 4.1 of the committee report) and was subsequently dismissed at appeal, however in the appeal decision; the planning inspector acknowledges that the principle of a redevelopment of the site could be achieved. He stated that:

“The existing dwelling therefore has a degree of charm about it and notwithstanding clear evidence of changes that have been made to it over time; the front elevation appears to be largely original. This, when coupled with its prominent street frontage location means it makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Drax Avenue Conservation Area. This is not to necessarily say however that the existing dwelling is sacrosanct and harm would be caused by its loss, providing of course that any treatment of the land afterwards, in terms of buildings or otherwise, would in itself serve to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Drax Avenue Conservation Area.

7.3.2 The above appeal decision is a material planning consideration. The appeal decision is appended to the committee report for reference.

7.3.3 The requirement for additional homes is a key priority of the London Plan and the recently published Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP) seeks to significantly increase the ten year minimum housing target across London from 322,100 to 423,887 (in the period from 2015 to 2025), and this equates to an associated increase in the annual monitoring target across London to 42,389. The minimum ten year target for Merton has also increased by more than 30% to 4,107, with a minimum annual monitoring target of 411 homes per year. The delivery of 1 new residential unit at this site will contribute to meeting housing targets and the mix of unit sizes will assist in the delivery of a mixed and balanced community in a sustainable location. New housing is considered to be in accordance with the objectives of the NPPF, London Plan targets, and LBM policy.

7.4 Design

- 7.4.1 The DACA was laid out from the 1920's with the Arts and Crafts movement heavily influencing development during this early period. The host property was built around 1930 however right up until the late 1950's and early 1960's there were empty plots, given this period of time the DACA is characterised by detached properties of varying design, styles and materials situated within large plots. However more recently the increasing need for housing has resulted in subdivision and infill development which has decreased plot sizes and introduced a more contemporary and similar range of building styles.
- 7.4.2 As set out above, the principle of redevelopment has already been accepted subject to suitable replacements. In dismissing the appeal, the planning inspector raised concerns that the design of the houses would appear for all intents and purpose a mirror image of each other. Whilst he acknowledged that this approach has been taken elsewhere in the DACA, further use of it would, to his mind, further dilute one of the defining characteristics of it. Specifically, and amongst other things, a group of buildings of obvious quality in their own right, and clearly of differing design and appearance.
- 7.4.3 The planning inspector raised no concerns with the bulk, height or massing of the proposal. The proposed houses would follow on from the principles established under planning application 16/P1621. The height, bulk and massing is therefore considered to be acceptable. The pair of detached houses would have a staggered front building line, with a suitable separation between each pair, highway and all site boundaries to ensure that the proposals retain a degree of openness and the semi-rural character that responds to the context to the site and its surroundings.
- 7.4.4 In order to ensure that the site retains an open and semi-rural character, a positive element of the area, permitted development rights can be removed in regards to extensions and boundary treatment. This planning condition would allow the Council to control future development.
- 7.4.5 The proposed dwellings, following amendments, are now considered to overcome the planning inspectors concerns. The two building are considered to be quality buildings in their own right. Both houses would have an Arts and Craft style, however as clearly shown on the CGI images, the proposed houses are remarkably different in appearance due to form, materials and detailing to ensure that the proposed houses conserve the DACA.

7.5 Neighbour Amenity

- 7.5.1 Objections have been received in regards to overlooking from the proposed rear terraces, however it must be noted that a large first floor balcony already exists with no obscured screening. The proposed balconies are smaller in size and would include 1.8m high side screens to prevent views towards neighbouring gardens. A planning condition retaining the side screens would ensure that there is no undue loss of amenity.

3 Ellerton Road

- 7.5.2 The flank wall of House A would be inset away from the site boundary with this neighbouring property. There would be a separation distance of 4.9m between the proposed flank wall and the flank wall of the neighbour. In addition existing vegetation would also help screen the proposed development. House A would have a staggered rear building line, stepping away from this neighbouring property. The level of separation and staggered building form would help maintain suitable light levels and reduce the visual impact of the proposal when viewed from the neighbouring property and rear garden area.

11 Ellerton Road

- 7.5.3 The flank wall of House A would be inset away from the site boundary with this neighbouring property. There would be a separation distance of 2.7m between the proposed flank wall and the flank wall of the neighbour. In addition existing vegetation would also help screen the proposed development. House A would have a staggered rear building line, stepping away from this neighbouring property. The level of separation and staggered building form would help maintain suitable light levels and reduce the visual impact of the proposal when viewed from the neighbouring property and rear garden area.

7.7 Standard of Accommodation

- 7.7.1 The proposed houses would provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation for future occupiers with each house exceeding the London Plan Gross Internal Area minimum standards. Each room would be capable of accommodating furniture and fittings in a satisfactory manner. Each habitable room has good outlook, levels of light, storage spaces and circulation areas. Each house would have direct access to 465 square metre and 433 square metre of private amenity space at the rear of the houses which exceeds the Council's minimum requirement of 50 square metres.

7.8 Traffic, Parking and Highways

- 7.8.1 The proposal provides for two off street vehicle parking spaces for each property, one in the garage and one more on the driveway. This would accord with the maximum residential parking standards as set out in the London Plan. This level of provision is therefore considered to be acceptable. Moreover the Council's Transport Planner raises no objection to the proposal, although a construction traffic management plan is sought which is considered reasonable given the nature of the road network and can be dealt with by a condition.
- 7.8.2 For dwellings of this size, two cycle storage spaces would be required for each property. No details have been submitted and it is therefore necessary to require a condition requiring further details to be submitted. Similarly refuse storage has not been detailed and a condition seeking further details can be attached to any permission.
- 7.8.3 Neighbours have expressed concern that construction traffic is likely to cause abnormal wear and damage to the road. They consider that it would be wholly unreasonable for the resident to suffer financial detriment for this. Residents request that the Council secure an undertaking from the development to pay for initial condition surveys and for any such damage and wear so caused following a final condition survey. However Ellerton Road and surrounding streets are private roads. Therefore the Council would have no jurisdiction to impose such conditions on the planning permission as this would relate to private matters outside the scope of planning. The applicant is however reminded to seek the relevant permissions (if required) from interested parties before works commence.

7.9 Trees

- 7.9.1 The applicant has provided an arboricultural report with the application that assesses the impact on trees on the site. There would be a total of 40 trees being retained unaffected by the proposal and four trees and one shrub that would be removed to facilitate the proposed development. The trees and shrub to be removed are all category C trees (small, low quality trees), therefore there no objection to the removal of these trees. The Council's tree officer has confirmed that she has no objection subject to conditions.

7.10 Flooding

- 7.10.1 Objections have been received from neighbours regarding the proposed development affecting ground water and the condition and capacity of the existing sewerage system in Ellerton road. Neighbours have also requested that a hydrology report is submitted with the application.

7.10.2 It must be noted that the proposed development does not include the construction of a basement. Therefore the proposed build would not require the type of deeper excavations usually associated with a scheme that includes a basement. It is therefore not considered necessary that the applicant includes a hydrology report as requested by neighbours. In light of objections from neighbour about ground water, the applicant has provided a Site Investigation Report with the application. The report states that:

“Groundwater is present at a relatively shallow depth, generally around 800mm to 900mm below the ground level at the site, which is fairly typical of the Claygate Beds in general”.

“There are no water courses on or in the vicinity of the site and there is no evidence to suggest the possible presence of any subterranean water course; the geology of the site precludes the presence of any natural underground river or stream”.

“The proposed method of construction for the two new properties, using the Housedeck system with a suspended slab supported on piles, will not incorporate down standing elements in the ground that could block or impede groundwater movement and, therefore, will not result in any change in the groundwater regime”

7.10.3 The proposed method of construction would use a ‘Housedeck’ system with a suspended slab supported on piles, will not incorporate downstanding element in the ground that could block or impede groundwater movement and, therefore, will not result in any change in the groundwater regime. The Councils Flood Officer is in agreement with the report findings and conclusions. He has confirmed that he has no objections to the proposal subject to conditions.

7.10.4 Concerns raised by neighbours in regard to the condition and capacity of the existing sewerage system in Ellerton Road would be a matter for Thames Water. They are the waste water sewerage company for this location. Details relating to impact upon the sewerage system are therefore none planning matters; however a planning informative can be added to the planning permission requiring the applicant to contact Thames water.

8 Ecology

8.1 The application is supported by an ecological appraisal prepared by Elmbridge Ecology dated 11 April 2016. This notes that an extended phase 1 habitat survey was undertaken as was a bat survey. In relation to

- badgers, hedgehogs, birds, reptiles/amphibians and invertebrates there was no sign of these on site and given the species poor grassland and non native planting it is unlikely that these species would be supported on site. The house was in a good state of repair, with only a few minor openings being considered suitable for bats. However these were inspected using an endoscope and no evidence was found.
- 8.2 Both statutory and non statutory biodiversity sites were considered to be too far away with intervening development or roads which would substantially limit any potential impact of the development on these sites.
- 8.3 The report concludes that the site has negligible potential to support bats or other species and no signs of badgers were found. The Ecology report has been assessed by the Councils policy team who note that the methodology, findings and recommendations of the ecology statement are acceptable, subject to an informative regarding works during the bird nesting and bat roosting seasons. Given this the proposal would have no significant impact on the ecology or biodiversity of the site.
9. Sustainability
- 9.1 The applicant has confirmed that he is willing to accept a pre-commencement planning condition requiring confirmation that the development will achieve a CO2 reduction of not less than a 19% improvement on Part L Regulations 2013, and wholesome water consumption rates of no greater than 105 litres per person per day. In this instance the Councils Climate Officer has confirmed that there are no foreseen barriers preventing the applicant meeting the above targets.
10. Local Financial Considerations
- 10.1 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.
11. **SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS**

11.1.1 The proposal is for minor residential development and an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required in this instance.

11.1.2 The application does not constitute Schedule 1 or Schedule 2 development. Accordingly, there are no requirements in terms on EIA submission.

12. **CONCLUSION**

12.1.1 The design of the development is considered to be of high quality in terms of appearance and character, offering two new dwellings that are materially different in design, respecting the street scene and conserving the Drax Avenue Conservation Area. The proposed buildings would provide high quality residential accommodation with no undue impact upon neighbouring amenity, flooding, trees or highway considerations. 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.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION

Subject to 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
5. F09 Hardstandings
6. B5 Levels
7. B5 Details of boundary treatment
8. C06 Details of refuse & recycling
9. C07 Refuse implementation
10. C08 Use of Flat Roofs
11. C09 Balcony Screening

12. D11 Construction Times
13. F05 Tree protection
14. F8 Site Supervision (Trees)
15. F1 Landscaping
16. F2 Landscaping implementation
17. C04 Obscured glazed (flank windows at upper levels obscured glazed up to 1.7m above internal floor level)
18. H06 Cycle Parking – Details to be submitted
19. H07 Cycle Parking to be implemented
20. H10 Construction Vehicles, washdown facilities etc.
21. Removal of pd rights (extensions and boundary treatment)
22. No part of the development hereby approved shall commence until evidence has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority confirming that the development will achieve a CO2 reductions of not less than a 19% improvement on Part L Regulations 2013, and wholesome water consumption rates of no greater than 105 litres per person per day.

Reason - The condition is required to ensure that the development achieves a high standard of sustainability and makes efficient use of resources and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: Policy 5.2 of the London Plan 2015 and Policy CS15 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011.
23. Prior to commencement of development, intrusive site investigation (boreholes) shall be undertaken and groundwater shall be monitored by way of a groundwater standpipe. The ground investigation report (including the borehole scans) shall be submitted to the approval of the Local Planning Authority and shall inform a Construction Method Statement and address the risk of potential changes to hydrological setting with particular regard to groundwater impacts. Should dewatering be required during construction, the Construction Method Statement will need to address the measures to minimise silt dispersal and where waters will be discharged to.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future users, and ensure groundwater 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.

22. No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a 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 LPA. Before these details are submitted an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) to ground, watercourse or sewer in accordance with drainage hierarchy contained within the London Plan Policy 5.13 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) and control the rate of surface water discharged from the site to greenfield runoff rates, and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;
- ii. include a timetable for its implementation; and
- iii. provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption authority and any other arrangements.

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.

Planning Informative

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. No surface water runoff should discharge onto the public highway including the public footway or highway. When it is proposed to connect to a public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. 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).
3. Damage caused by the construction of the proposed development shall be made good by the applicant.
4. Carbon emissions evidence requirements for design stage assessments must provide:
 - Detailed documentary evidence outlining the Target Emission Rate (TER), Dwelling Emission Rate (DER) and percentage improvement of DER over TER based on 'As Designed' SAP outputs (i.e. dated outputs with accredited energy assessor name and registration number, assessment status, plot number and development address).

Water efficiency evidence requirements for Design Stage assessments must provide:

- Detailed documentary evidence representing the dwellings 'As Designed'; and Water Efficiency Calculator results to demonstrate that the dwelling will achieve no for greater than 105 litres per person per day.
5. Demolition of buildings and tree felling should avoid the bird nesting and bat roosting seasons. Anyone who takes, damages or destroys the nest of any wild bird whilst that nest is in use, or who kills, injures or disturbs bats, obstructs access to bat roosts or damages or disturbs bat roosts, even when unoccupied by bats, is guilty of an offence under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Buildings and trees should be inspected for bird nests and bat roosts prior to demolition or felling by an appropriately qualified person. If bats are found, Natural England should be contacted for advice.

[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