

## PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 14 DECEMBER 2017

**APPLICATION NO.**            **DATE VALID**  
17/P2921                        28/07/2017

**Address/Site**            15 garages, R/O 218 Morden Road, South Wimbledon, London

**Ward**                        Merton Park

**Proposal:**                Outline application for the demolition of existing garages and the erection of 3 x 3 bedroom two-storey terraced houses. Approval is being sought for access, layout and scale with landscaping and appearance reserved matters

**Drawing Nos;**            L(2) 311, 312, 313, 314; L(3) 310, 311, 312; L(4) 310, 311, 312, 313

**Contact Officer:** Mark Brodie

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Grant Outline planning permission subject to conditions.

---

### **CHECKLIST INFORMATION.**

- Heads of agreement: No
- Is a screening opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental Statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Impact Assessment been submitted: No
- Design Review Panel consulted: No,
- Number of neighbours consulted: 11
- Press notice – No
- Site notice – Yes
- External consultations: Transport for London
- Archaeological Priority Zone – No
- Controlled Parking Zone - No
- Number of jobs created: N/A

### **1    INTRODUCTION**

1.1    The application has been brought before the Committee due to the level of public interest.

### **2.    SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

2.1    This existing backland site comprises 15 single-storey garages located to the r/o 214-218 Morden Road and r/o 49-53 Daybrook Road. With the exception of the existing church at 214 Morden Road, the application site is bounded on

three sides by residential gardens to the (north east & west).in Morden Road and Daybrook Road. The application site also runs alongside part of the garden areas of 55 Daybrook Road and 206 Morden Road. Along the southern boundary of the site is a large car showroom warehouse. The existing gated site lies at the end of a shared vehicular/pedestrian access for which it appears others have “rights of way” over, in particular to serve the existing garages to the r/o of 216 & 218 Morden Road.

### 3. **CURRENT PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 The proposal involves an application for Outline planning permission for the demolition of existing garages and the erection of 3 x 3- bedroom two-storey terraced houses (approval is being sought for access, layout and scale) with landscaping and appearance reserved matters
- 3.2 Each dwelling will have a ground and first floor footprint of 52 sq.m’ House 1 will benefit from a rear garden of 55 sq.m (as well as a side garden area of 33 sq.m) and Houses 2 & 3 will both have 46 sq.m gardens to the rear in a single uniform level and usable space. Parking for one vehicle associated with House 1, will be provided to the north of the site and cycle storage is located to the front of each dwelling alongside an area allocated for refuse storage

plots	Building footprint Sq.m	Amenity/garden Sq.m	Size of units Sq.m	Mayor’s Minimum space standards
1	52	55	104	93
2	52	46	104	93
3	52	46	104	93

- 3.3 The block of three terraced properties would measure (overall width 18m, overall depth 10m, overall height with a flat roof 5.95m).
- 3.4 In support of the scheme the applicants submitted the following documents:- Transport Statement; Planning Statement & Daylight & sunlight report. The reports main conclusions are summarised below
- 3.5 Transport Statement: The proposals are for three houses with 3 bedrooms each with 1 parking space. There will be a minimum of 6 cycle spaces . The site has excellent public transport accessibility at PTAL 6a. The site is within a CPZ and on a red route so on street parking will not be possible apart from one hour parking in a parking bay. The proposals conform to the London Borough of Merton’s policy for reduced parking in a controlled parking zone. Large servicing vehicles will unload in the parking bay on-street and refuse collection will be made from Morden Road. Smaller service vehicles will be able to access and turn within the site.
- 3.6 Daylight and Sunlight Report : The proposed development is substantially below a vertical angle of 25 degrees taken from the ground floor windows of

51 Daybrook Road and 214 Morden Road that the proposed development comfortably satisfies the BRE initial screening test for daylight and sunlight and that detailed modelling and testing is not required. As the development is below the 25 degree screening test, the residual VSC values received by the neighbouring houses will continue to be not just over 27% but substantially above 27% VSC and the annual APSH values will be in excess of 25% with more than 5% of those APSH being recorded in the winter months. The overshadowing analysis demonstrates that 78.87% of the rear garden behind 55 Daybrook Road will continue to receive more than two hours of sun when measured on the Spring Equinox and will therefore comfortably satisfy the BRE target of 50%. In addition, the pattern of overshadowing illustrated in the analysis shows that those areas that fall below the two hour target are the areas directly adjacent to the existing boundary fence and rear shed and already receive less than two hours of sun on the Spring Equinox under existing conditions. In overall conclusion the proposed development comfortably satisfies all the BRE recommendations in respect of daylight, sunlight and overshadowing.

3.7 Planning Statement: The scheme has evolved in response to appeal dismissals in June 2017 and has been amended to improve separation to the northern site boundary. The Inspectors decision represents a key material consideration in determination of this subsequent planning application. The Inspector agrees with the Council that the principle of residential development at the site is acceptable and has clarified that elements of the scheme that are acceptable in planning terms. A revised scheme is proposed informed by the original reasons for refusal, as well as the Inspector's comments within the appeal dismissal, that centre on the relationship of the development on the residential gardens to the north. The key changes to the scheme, informed by the Council's and inspector's comment to date are as follows:-

- Reduction in the number of units from 4 to 3 dwellings to reduce bulk, scale and massing of the development.
- Setback from the northern boundary by 3m to minimise impact on the adjoining occupiers.
- Provision of single, useable rear garden spaces totalling 55 sq.m for house 1 and 46 sq.m for houses 2 and 3 (despite the Inspector's acceptance of smaller gardens as previously proposed) and
- Provision of onsite parking space for house 1 along with swept path analysis of access and turning within the site

The proposed development reflects various comments made by the Inspector's decision and responds positively to these. The proposal is therefore compliant with relevant development plan policy and reflects various key material considerations. It is further demonstrated that the proposal represents sustainable development and that the planning balance is in favour of the scheme.

#### **4. PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 M/M8387 – (1960) p.p. granted for the erection of 15 lock up garages.
- 4.2 MER1044/72 – Erection of a single-storey building for use as a building contractors office, involving the demolition of 15 lock up garages - refused - Would not accord with the provisions of the Initial Development Plan for Greater London which allocates the area primarily for use for residential purposes; (2) introduce a commercial use on this back land site which would be likely to affect adversely the amenities of adjoining residential properties by reason of noise and increased activity; (3) result in the loss of 15 lock up garages on the site for which there is an unsatisfied demand in the locality)
- 4.3 MER1320/73 – Erection of a single-storey office building and the formation of a car parking area involving the demolition of 15 garages – refused – (The proposed development for office purposes would – (1) not accord with the provisions of the Initial Development Plan for Greater London which allocates the area primarily for use for residential purposes; (2) introduce a commercial use on this back land site which would be likely to affect adversely the amenities of adjoining residential properties by reason of noise and increased activity; (3) result in the loss of 15 lock up garages on the site for which there is an unsatisfied demand in the locality - subsequent appeal dismissed.
- 4.4 MER872/73 – Erection of a single-storey office building for use as a building contractor’s office – refused
- 4.5 MER202/73 - Erection of two bungalows and two detached houses – refused – (By reason of the restricted size and shape of the site, the proposed development would result in unsatisfactory over-development of back land resulting in insufficient amenity open-space being available for the normal day- to- day outdoor activities of the occupier of the proposed dwellings.
- 4.6 MER290/81 – Outline application for a pair of semi- detached bungalows – refused (By reason of the restricted size and shape of the site, the erection of a pair of semi-detached bungalows and garages as proposed would result in unsatisfactory over-development of insufficient amenity open space being available for the normal day to day outdoor activities of the occupiers of the proposed buildings)
- 4.7 MER.501/85 - Outline p.p. refused for the demolition of existing lock-up garages on the site and the erection of a new detached two bedroom bungalow with double garage. – (1) would result in the loss of the existing lock-up garages on this site which would lead to an undesirable increase in kerbside parking in the area to the detriment of occupiers of adjoining residential properties. (2) The proposed bungalow and its garden would be severely overlooked from adjoining properties resulting in the lack of any private amenity space for the occupiers of the new dwelling and (3) be an undesirable and unneighbourly form of development prejudicial to the amenities of occupiers of adjoining dwellings.

- 4.8 16/P3254 p.p. refused for the demolition of existing garages and the erection of 4 x 2 bedroom, two-storey terraced houses.

**((1). The proposals by reason of design, size, massing, and relationship to the surrounding pattern of development, would result in an un-neighbourly visually intrusive and oppressive form of development that would give rise to a loss of outlook and privacy to the detriment of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. The proposals would be contrary to policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2011), policy CS14 of the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011) and policies DM D2 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014).**

**(2) The proposed layout would result in an unsatisfactory environment for future occupiers, arising from a failure to provide gardens that meet the Council's minimum garden space standard as a single regular shaped amenity space to the detriment of the amenities of future occupiers. The proposals would be contrary to policy 7.6 of the London Plan (2011), policy CS.14 of the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011) and policy and DM D2 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014).**

**(3) In the absence of a legally binding Unilateral Undertaking which would restrict future occupiers of the proposed residential units from obtaining parking permits in controlled parking zones which operate within the locality, the development would have a detrimental impact on the safety and convenience of other road users and the free flow of traffic. The development would therefore be contrary to Policy CS20 of the Sites and Policies Plan and Policy 6.13 of the London Plan.**

- 4.9 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017 Subsequent appeal dismissed. A copy of the inspector's decision notice is attached to appendix 1 of this report.

- 4.10 16/P3252 p.p. refused for the demolition of existing garages and the erection of 4 x 3 bedroom part two/part three-storey residential dwellings.

**((1) The proposals by reason of design, size, massing, and relationship to the surrounding pattern of development, would result in an un-neighbourly visually intrusive and oppressive form of development that would give rise to a loss of outlook and privacy to the detriment of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. The proposals would be contrary to policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2011), policy CS14 of the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011) and policies DM D2 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014).**

**(2) The proposed layout would result in an unsatisfactory environment for future occupiers, arising from a failure to provide accommodation in respect to units 2, 3 & 4 that meet the minimum floorspace standards of the London Plan and the gardens to all of the units fail to meet the Council's minimum garden space standard as a single regular shaped**

amenity space to the detriment of the amenities of future occupiers. The proposals would be contrary to policies 3.5 & 7.6 of the London Plan (2011), policy CS.14 of the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011) and policy and DM D2 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014).

**(3) In the absence of a legally binding Unilateral Undertaking which would restrict future occupiers of the proposed residential units from obtaining parking permits in controlled parking zones which operate within the locality, the development would have a detrimental impact on the safety and convenience of other road users and the free flow of traffic. The development would therefore be contrary to Policy CS20 of the Sites and Policies Plan and Policy 6.13 of the London Plan.**

4.11 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017 Subsequent appeal dismissed. A copy of the inspector's decision is attached to appendix 1 of this report.

## **5. CONSULTATION**

5.1 The application has been advertised by means of a site notice and letters to 11 neighbouring occupiers. In response to the consultations to the scheme as originally submitted objections were received from 8 neighbouring occupiers raising the following concerns:

- Overbearing and oppressive;
- Visually intrusive and dominate outlook;
- Overlooking and loss of privacy;
- Inappropriate scale for a backland site;
- Loss of light and overshadowing;
- Loss of outlook;
- Insufficient parking;
- Limited access & vehicular conflict resulting in road safety concerns;
- Insufficient garden space for two of the three proposed houses;
- Design & appearance not in keeping;
- Set precedent for development at rear;
- Not in keeping with existing pattern of development;
- Noise and disturbance;
- Cramped overdevelopment development in backland location;
- Road and traffic implications;
- Trees have already been removed;
- Merton can demonstrate a five year supply of housing therefore no presumption in favour of granting planning permission as per paragraph 49 of the NPPF;
- Insufficient parking.

The John Innes Society – We agree with the Inspector's decisions on two recent previous applications and we consider that the proposal will still have an unacceptably adverse effect on the amenities of the properties in Daybrook

Road behind the site. In our view the site is unsuitable for residential development due to the close proximity of the surrounding housing.

- 5.2 Transport planning section were consulted and raised no objection. As with the previous application, taking into consideration the very good connectivity by public transport (PTAL 6a rating) one parking space for 3 dwellings is considered acceptable, although turning a vehicle could prove difficult if residents of 2016/218 choose to park in front of their own garages. Refuse servicing would be via Morden Road with residents required to place their bins at back of footway, which is considered satisfactory. Similarly off-peak short stay parking is available nearby on Morden Road for deliveries. The site is not within the adjacent CPZ therefore future residents would not be eligible for parking permits. As stated in the earlier appeal decision the inspector considered a permit free requirement was not justified for this reason. Given the above there is no objection from a transport planning perspective. Given the sites constrained location adjacent to the red route network a construction management plan is also required.
- 5.3 Climate Change Officer advises The applicant has provided detailed information around the developments energy strategy and I am content that the development will meet the sustainability policy objectives and emissions reductions targets. As this an outline application I would recommend that the pre-commencement and pre-occupation conditions are applied.
- 5.4 Transport for London (1) The site of the proposed development is on A24 Morden Road, which forms part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN). TfL is the highway authority for the TLRN, and is therefore concerned about any proposal which may affect the performance and/or safety of the TLRN (2) TfL welcomes the car-free nature of the proposal. Notwithstanding the above, it is requested that residents are excluded from applying for parking permits in the local CPZ and that this is secured through the section 106 agreement. (3) A minimum of 6 long stay cycle spaces as stated in the Transport statement should be provided for additional 3 units in line with the standards in the London Plan. All cycle spaces should be located in a secure sheltered and accessible location (4) It is understood from the Transport Statement (TS) that the existing vehicular access of the site is subject to constraints in accommodating larger vehicles. The applicant has therefore proposed that delivery and servicing vehicles use a red route parking bay. Please note that a red route parking bay is subject to restrictions which should be taken into account in the details of delivery and servicing plans. (5) Considering the location of the site, TFL requests the applicant provides further information in regards to construction (vehicle trip generation, delivery area and how the construction will be undertaken) (6) The footway and carriageway on the A24 Morden Road must not be blocked during the construction of the development. Temporary obstructions during the construction must be kept to a minimum and should not encroach on the clear space needed to provide safe passage for pedestrians or obstruct the flow of traffic on the A24 Morden Road. (7) All vehicles associated with the construction of the development must only park/stop at permitted locations and within the time periods permitted by existing on-street restrictions (8) No

skips or construction materials shall be kept on the footway or carriageway on the TLRN at any time. Should the applicant wish to install scaffolding or a hoarding on the footway whilst undertaking this work, separate licences may be required with TfL Subject to the above conditions being met, the proposal as it stands would not result in an unacceptable impact to the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN).

5.5 Neighbours re-consulted on amended scheme involving the introduction of first floor obscured glazing to rear windows fronting rear of properties in Daybrook Road. 6 objections reiterating original concerns outlined above and advising:-

- Fitting partial obscured glazing to bedroom windows is contrived and will result in living conditions unacceptable to future occupiers;
- The fitting of obscured glazed windows would not prevent overlooking if the windows were opened

The John Innes Society We think that the proposal will still have an unacceptably adverse effect on the amenities of the properties in Daybrook Road behind the site. Fitting partial obscured glazing to bedroom windows is contrived and will result in living conditions unacceptable to the future occupiers of the new houses. In our view the site is unsuitable for residential development due to the close proximity of the surrounding housing. This is the conclusion which has been reached on a series of previous planning applications for a variety of forms of development.

## **6 POLICY CONTEXT**

### **6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (2012)**

The following principles are of particular relevance to the current proposals:-

- At the heart of the National Planning Policy is a presumption in favour of sustainable development which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking;
- The NPPF states that local authorities should act to boost significantly the supply of housing and use their evidence base to ensure that Local Plan documents meet the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing;
- Proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local place that the Country needs. Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth;
- Encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value;



- Local Planning Authorities should approach decision-taking in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development and should look for solutions rather than problems. Planning should not simply be about scrutiny but instead be a creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives;
- Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and it should contribute positively to making places better for people.

Other NPPF sections of relevance :

- 4 Promoting sustainable transport.
- 6 Delivering a wide choice of quality homes.
- 7 Requiring good design.
- 10 Meeting the challenge of climate change

6.1 Relevant policies in the London Plan 2015 are; 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), 5.7 (Renewable energy), 5.13 (Sustainable drainage), 7.5 (Public realm), 7.6(Architecture) & 7.21 (Trees and woodlands).

6.2 Relevant policies in the Core Strategy 2011 are; CS8 (Housing choice), CS 13 (Open Space, Nature conservation), CS 14 (Design), CS 15 (Climate change) & CS 20 Parking, Servicing & delivery

6.3 The relevant policies in the Sites and Policies Plan 2014 are; DM D1 (Urban Design and the public realm), DM D2 (Design considerations in all developments), DM F1 (Flood risk management), DM H2 (Housing mix), DM T2 (Transport impacts of development) & DM T3 (Car parking and servicing standards).

DCLG Technical standards 2015

## 7. **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

7.1 The main planning considerations in this case relate to the principle of development, the scale, layout and access of the proposed houses, the effect of the development on living conditions of neighbouring properties with particular reference to outlook, privacy light and sunlight; whether the proposed development would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupants; parking and access.

### 7.2 Principle

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012, London Plan 2015 policy 3.3 and the Council's Core Strategy policy CS9 all seek to increase sustainable

housing provision where it can be shown that an acceptable standard of accommodation will also provide a mix of dwelling types.

7.3 The requirement for additional homes is a key priority of the London seeks to significantly increase the ten year minimum housing targets across London from 322,100 to 423,389. The minimum ten year target has also increased by more than 30% to 4,107, with a minimum annual monitoring target of 411 homes per year. The delivery of three new residential houses at this site would contribute to meeting housing targets providing family accommodation in a sustainable location. New housing is considered to be in accordance with the objectives of the NPPF, London Plan targets and objectives of LBM policy.

7.8 Scale, layout & impact on neighbour amenity.

London Plan policy 7.6, and Sites and Policies Plan policy DM D2 require proposals not to have a negative impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers through loss of light, overshadowing, outlook, privacy, visual intrusion or disturbance. The supporting Daylight and sunlight Reports confirm that neighbouring dwellings will continue to receive good levels of natural daylight and sunlight, above Building Research Establishment Guidelines.

7.9 The application is in a back land location being the surrounded on three sides by residential gardens. As such the redevelopment of the site for housing presents considerable challenges in producing a scheme that meets minimum standards, that provides an acceptable standard of accommodation and respects the amenity of surrounding residential occupiers. The closest property to the proposal is the church at 214 Morden Road, 20m to the east. No.216 Morden Road is set further back at 25m. No.218 has recently constructed a two-storey rear addition which is positioned approximately 21m from the proposed houses. Nos.49, 51 and 53 Daybrook Road are positioned some 23.5m to the west. These separation distances are within the tolerances set out at paragraph 2.3.36 of the Mayor's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance in respect to overlooking between buildings at first floor level.

7.10 In his deliberations in respect to the recently dismissed appeals, the Inspector acknowledged that the appealed schemes would introduce built form of significantly greater scale and massing and imposing presence than existing. He considered that the garden area of No.55 Daybrook Road would be most affected as the full two or three storey built form of unit 4 of the appealed schemes would immediately abut its side boundary and that its overall size and proximity would amount to a visually obtrusive, overbearing and oppressive structure which would dominate the outlook from that space in a manner which would be substantially worse than the existing situation. In response the current proposal has been reduced from 4 units to 3 & the amended scheme has now been pulled away to the south from the northern boundary of the site with 55 Daybrook Road and 206 Morden Road by 3m, which essentially means that the end house will no longer command views directly along these gardens. In addition, in order to address concerns of neighbours in respect to the perception of overlooking into neighbouring gardens, the applicants have indicated that they are happy to accept a condition that requires the first floor rear facing windows facing the rear of

properties in Daybrook Road to be obscured glazed up to a height of 1.7m which will serve to restrict views directly into neighbouring gardens. Suitably conditioned to ensure that no additional windows are inserted into the northern and southern flank will prevent the potential for overlooking of neighbouring sites. Overall it is not considered that overlooking would be of a degree that will cause harm to existing and future occupiers

#### 7.11 Noise and disturbance

The proposed houses have generated objections in regard to noise and disturbance being greater than currently experienced from the existing garages use. The issue of disturbance from residential developments such as this have frequently not been supported at appeals where Inspectors have considered that noise from a residential use would not normally be so detrimental to neighbour amenity as to warrant a refusal of permission. Nor did it form part of the Council's reason for refusal in the recently dismissed appeals.

#### 7.12 Suitability of accommodation.

7.13 Core Strategy policy CS 9 calls for the provision of well-designed housing and The DCLG Technical Standards and the London Plan policy 3.5 set out a number of required design criteria for new residential developments including room and space standards. All three of the proposed houses comfortably exceed Gross Internal minimum Area requirements set out in the London Plan.

7.14 SPP policy DM D2 requires, amongst other matters, proposals for all developments to ensure appropriate provision of outdoor amenity space whether public, private or communal which accords with appropriate minimum standards and is compatible with the character of the surrounding area. Paragraph 6.17 of the SPP requires the provision of a 50sqm private amenity space configured in a single usable space. Notwithstanding that none of the gardens in the appealed scheme (House 1, 41sq.m; Houses 2-4, 43 sq.m) complied with this minimum standard the Inspector considered that the appealed houses would benefit from a flat, relatively private garden of conventional shape and positioning with a layout that that would be physically capable of meeting the reasonable day to day needs and expectations of future occupants by accommodating clothes drying facilities, play equipment as well as seating and facilities for outdoor dining along with reasonable levels of circulation space. While acknowledging that it was no substitute for private amenity space the Inspector, did weigh in favour of the proximity of Morden Hall Park in justifying the short fall in minimum garden space. The Inspector considered that adopted minimum standards could be applied flexibly. The current scheme provides 55 sq.m for House 1 exceeding minimum standards & 46 sq.m for houses 2 & 3 and while falling marginally below the 50 sq.m minimum requirement would however exceed the amount of available amenity space proposed under the appealed scheme & a refusal in this respect could not be reasonably supported in planning terms.

## 7.15 Parking and Access

Core Strategy policy CS 20 and policy DM T2 in the Sites and Policies Plan require developers to demonstrate that their development will not adversely affect safety, the convenience of local residents or on street parking and traffic management. The proposal will introduce three new houses with just limited scope for one off-street parking space and Morden Road is a designated “red route” where vehicle stopping is prohibited. The Inspector in the appealed scheme considered given the very good Public Transport Access Level (PTAL) 6a rating that the site is ideally suited for a “car free” scheme and did not consider it necessary for future residents to be excluded from the adjacent CPZ by the means of a Unilateral Undertaking. The appeal site does not fall within a CPZ and neither is it conveniently located to the nearest provision along Dorset Road, so as to make it attractive for future occupiers to park in that location. The Council’s Transport planning section were consulted and raised no objection confirming that “As with the previous application, taking into consideration the very good connectivity by public transport (PTAL 6a rating) one parking space for 3 dwellings is considered acceptable, although turning a vehicle could prove difficult if residents of 216/218 choose to park in front of their own garages.

- 7.16 Refuge servicing would be via Morden Road with residents required to place their bins at back of footway, which is considered satisfactory. Similarly off-peak short stay parking is available nearby on Morden Road for deliveries”. The site is confined however and a condition requiring details of the storage of materials and construction vehicles etc. during the construction process is recommended. A condition requiring the car parking space to be provided prior to occupation is recommended along with a condition that the hardstanding be permeable to mitigate impacts of water runoff.

## 8 Sustainability

- 8.1 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 19% improvement on Part L Regulations 2013 and wholesome water rates of no greater than 105 litres per person per day. In this instance the Council’s Climate Officer has confirmed that there are no foreseen barriers preventing the applicant meeting the above targets.

## 9. **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS**

- 9.1 The proposal does not constitute Schedule 1 or Schedule 2 development. Accordingly there is no requirement for an EIA submission.

## 11 CONCLUSION

11.1 The proposal will provide a new family sized houses for which there is an identified need within the borough and London at large. The layout

access and scale is considered acceptable and it is considered that the concerns of the Inspector have been satisfactorily been addressed In view of these factors officers consider that the proposals are acceptable and will not have a negative impact on the appearance and character of the local area or upon neighbour amenity and the proposal is therefore recommended for approval subject to appropriate conditions.

## RECOMMENDATION

### Grant Outline planning permission subject to planning conditions

#### Conditions

1. A2 Commencement of development (Outline)
2. A3 Submission of reserved matters (Outline) - Landscaping & appearance
3. A7 Approved Plans
4. B1 Materials to be approved
5. B5 Details of boundary treatment
6. C1 No permitted development extensions
5. C04 Obscured glazed (west facing first floor obscured glazed windows up to 1.7m above internal floor level)
6. C06 Refuse & recycling (implementation)
7. C8 No use of flat roof
6. D11 Construction Times
7. F1 Landscaping
8. F2 Landscaping implementation
9. F9 Hardstandings
10. H4 Provision of vehicle parking
- 11 Sustainable Design and construction – Pre-commencement 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 no less than a 19% improvement on Part L Regulations 2013, and internal water usage rates of no greater than 105 litres per person per day.  
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.

12. Sustainable Design and construction – Pre-occupation

No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until evidence has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority confirming that the development has achieved CO2 reductions of not less than a 19% improvement on Part L regulations 2013, and internal water usage rates of not more than 105 litres per person per day.

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.

13. No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Demolition and Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved

Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for: The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors; loading and Unloading of plant and materials; Storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate; Wheel washing facilities; Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction; A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction work.

Reason for condition: To ensure the safety of pedestrians and vehicles and the amenities of the surrounding area and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies 6.3 and 6.14 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM T2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

INFORMATIVE:

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).

---

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