

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
23 AUGUST 2018**

APPLICATION NO. DATE VALID

17/P1602 21/04/2017

Address/Site Lee House, 2 Lancaster Avenue, Wimbledon, SW19 5DE

Ward **Village**

Proposal: Erection of a two storey extensions to existing residential care home to provide 7 additional en-suite bedrooms, internal alterations to provide improved communal areas, formation of new reception area and alterations to roof profile above former stable block and cottage and laying out of parking area.

Drawing Nos P50190/03_0001 A, 003 B, 0004 B, 0006 B, 0007 , 0010 C, 0011 C, 0020 B, 0030 A and P50190/03_0002 Rev D, Design and Access Statement, Arbouricultural Survey and Report and Tree Protection Plan (MWA TPP001) and Travel Plan

Contact Officer: Richard Allen (020 8545 3621)

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT Planning Permission subject to competition of a S.106 Agreement and conditions

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- Heads of agreement: Yes
- Is a screening opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental impact statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Impact Assessment been submitted: No
- Press notice- Yes
- Site notice-Yes
- Design Review Panel consulted-No
- Number neighbours consulted – 13
- External consultants: None
- Density: n/a
- Number of jobs created: 5
- Archaeology Priority Zone: No

1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 This application has been brought to the Planning Applications Committee due to the number of objections received.

2. **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

2.1 The application site comprises a residential care home complex situated on the north east side of Lancaster Avenue. Lancaster Avenue is an un made dead end road which is also a private road. The main building is a three storey Victorian Villa with a former stable block to the north east corner and an 'L' shaped two storey deck accessed wing with corner tower that dates from the early 1990's. The application site is within the Merton (Wimbledon North) Conservation Area and is a Locally Listed Building. The application site is within a Controlled Parking Zone (VOn). The site surroundings comprise various residential plots.

3. **CURRENT PROPOSAL**

3.1 The main aspects of the proposal are:-

- Erection of a new two storey wing comprising six new en-suite bedrooms. The new two storey wing to the building would be sited alongside the north east boundary of the site and would be 16.8 metres in length and 8 metres in width. The extension would have an eaves height of 6 metres and have a pitched roof with a ridge height of 8 metres
- Enclosure of existing open area between the main building and former stable block to provide glazed entrance to Care Home.
- Internal alterations to improve circulation within the Care Home and additional dining room space.
- Extension of pitched roof at first floor level to 1990's wing of building.
- Landscaping works including rationalization of garden levels to reduce steps.
- Remodelling the existing store to create a bedroom and replacement of existing staff bedroom with a new bedroom.
- The formalisation of on-site parking spaces.

4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 In March 1990 planning permission and conservation area consent was granted for alterations to and erection of a two-storey rear extension and part two storey, part three storey side extension to residential home for the elderly involving demolition of existing single storey extensions to side and rear (LBM Ref.89/P1283 and 89/P1284).

4.2 In December 1992 planning permission was granted for the erection of a dormer window to front roof (LBM Ref.92/P0794).

4.3 In December 1993 planning permission was granted for the retention of roof void ventilators to north west and north east elevations of the roof (LBM Ref.93/P0401).

4.4 In August 2009 planning permission was granted for the erection of a brick lift enclosure on rear elevation of building (LBM Ref.09/P1472).

4.5 In March 2016 an pre-application meeting was held on-site to discuss proposed extensions and alterations to the existing residential care home (LBM Ref.P0543/NEW).

5. CONSULTATION

5.1 The application has been advertised by Conservation Area site and press notice procedure. In response 29 representations have been received from local residents raising objections. The comments are set out below:-

-The property was originally run by a small private charity and was subsequently purchased by Abbeyfield in 2009. In 1990 the property was expanded with the erection of a two storey wing. The current proposal to add 6 further rooms would make that garden even smaller in an area characterised by large gardens and very little communal space would be available for residents.

-What started as a small charity run home has turned into a large commercial operation in a residential area.

-There are currently 4 -5 parking spaces for the care home and the care home has 22 staff and regular visitors. Why is more parking not provided?

-The proposal represents an intensification of use.

-The proposed extension would fail to preserve or enhance the conservation area.

-The extension to the care home will put too much pressure on parking in the area.

-Lancaster Road cannot cope with the existing traffic and the extension to the care home will make the situation worse.

-The existing traffic levels in the area are already affecting the quality of life in the area.

-The proposal represents over development of the site.

-Lancaster Road is a narrow private road with parking for residents only.

-Lee House is one of five properties in the road but seems to have taken over the road.

-The access to Lee House is insufficient for large delivery vehicles, refuse vehicles and ambulances.

-Construction works would obstruct Lancaster Road.

-Further expansion of Lee House would affect the amenities of occupiers of nearby properties.

-Lee House used to be a small home that was in keeping with the area and is now a large commercial operation.

-The applicant should undertake a full and formal parking survey.

5.2 Belvedere Estates Residents Association

The extension is very close to the boundary with 37 Lancaster Road. Although in summer the trees provide a high degree of privacy too neighbours this is not so in winter and plans show windows that would overlook neighbouring properties. In the arbouricultural report two trees, a Holm Oak T2 and a Pear T4 are recommended for removal. These trees are visible from Lancaster road and Lancaster Gardens and provide valuable screening between Lee House and Lancaster Road. BERA is concerned, in general about the number of trees being removed to facilitate ever larger developments in the village

and surrounding area. There is also no evidence of a construction management plan being submitted to minimise disturbance to neighbours during the construction period.

The trees in the garden of 37 Lancaster Road are no shown on the plans and the root protection areas of these trees would be affected by the proposed development.

5.3 Tree Officer

There are no arbouricultural objections to the proposed development providing the retained trees are protected during the course of site works. The standard tree protection conditions should therefore be imposed on any grant of planning permission.

5.4 Conservation Officer

The Conservation Officer has no objections to the proposal.

5.5 Transport Planning

The existing care home at Lee House provides a total of 31 bedrooms comprising 27 registered bed spaces, a staff bedroom, a guest room and two further bedrooms. Occupancy will increase from 27 residents to 34, as well as staff numbers increasing from 22 to 27.

The position on room numbers is shown below.

<u>Room Types</u>	<u>Residents</u>	<u>Guest</u>	<u>Staff</u>	<u>Unused</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Existing</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>31</u>
<u>Proposed</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>1</u>			<u>34</u>
<u>Net Change</u>	+6		-1	-2	

There will not be any staff or unused bedrooms on the proposed scheme with all but the guest room being occupied by residents.

Access

Lee House is currently served by two accesses off the northern side of Lancaster Avenue. The western end access is some 5m wide and serves car parking and the main building entrance and the eastern end access is some 3.3m wide and serves car parking and the service entrance to the building.

The existing western and eastern site accesses would be retained and servicing would continue to be undertaken from the eastern access.

Lee House, nos.1 and 3 Lancaster Avenue and nos. 31 and 33 Lancaster Road are members of the Lancaster Avenue Residents Association (LARA). Membership entitles all members to use Lancaster Avenue for both access and parking. Lee House therefore has rights to use the parking spaces on Lancaster Avenue. Lancaster Avenue is not an adopted highway and so there is no public duty to maintain it or power to improve it.

Local Highway Network

All roads in the vicinity of the site are subject to a 30mph speed limit.

The local area forms part of Controlled Parking Zone VC. Restrictions are enforced from Monday to Saturday between 8:30 am and 6.30 pm with a maximum stay of 2 hours for pay and display customers. The majority of on-street parking in the vicinity of the site is dual-use and can be utilised by resident permit holders and the general public on a pay and display basis.

The number of parking bays available for Pay & Display use for at least two hours has been reviewed for walking distances of some 200m and 400m from Lancaster Avenue:

Walking Distance	Available Car Spaces			
	Pay & Display Only	Permit Holder and Pay & Display	Resident and Pay & Display	TOTAL
200m	17	29	17	63
400m	51	63	17	131

Car Parking Surveys

The applicant has carried out parking surveys on a weekday and weekend on the surrounding roads to ascertain the parking availability during peak demand for visitors to Lee House. The surveys were undertaken at 30 minute intervals between 08:00hrs -20:00hrs on Friday 19th and Saturday 20th January 2018. On street surveys were undertaken on the following public roads. Lancaster Road/Lancaster Gardens, CPZ ref. VOn – 51 spaces; High Street, CPZ ref. VC – 8 spaces; and Church Road, CPZ ref. VC – 12 spaces. Out of the overall 93 car parking spaces available for visitors to use the maximum occupation during the Friday survey period was 81 spaces or 87%. There was a minimum of some 12 car spaces available at any time during the survey period. Out of the overall 93 car parking spaces available for visitors to use the maximum occupation during the Saturday survey period was 75 spaces or 81%. This means there was a minimum of some 18 car spaces available at any time during the survey period. In summary the parking survey indicate there are unoccupied car parking spaces (12 spaces on Friday and 18 spaces on Saturday) available for use by visitors that would more than accommodate the very small potential increase in visitors as a result of the additional rooms at Lee House. In addition there are some 16 parking bays on the High Street in Wimbledon Village some 250m from Lee House that are Pay and Display with a maximum stay of 1 hour.

Proposed Car Parking:

Car parking standards for care homes are not provided in either the Merton Local Plan or the London Plan. The Mayor of London “wishes to see an appropriate balance being struck between promoting new development and preventing excessive car parking provision that can undermine cycling, walking and public transport use.” The available car parking on site at Lee House is not currently formalised. The proposed parking layout shows eight marked car spaces including one disabled space. The cars can enter and leave the site in a satisfactory manner.

Travel plan

A Travel Plan is not currently implemented at Lee House. However the applicant has submitted a Travel Plan with the planning application with measures to encourage use of sustainable travel by staff and visitors. This would help reduce the existing as well as future demand for car parking and therefore benefit conditions on site and on Lancaster Avenue. The implementation of the Travel Plan will help increase the use of sustainable travel modes such as walking, cycling, public transport and car sharing by staff and visitors to Lee house and therefore reduce the demand for car parking. Visitors will also be informed of the availability of Pay and Display parking spaces in the local area that would be satisfactory for short-term parking.

Traffic Generation:

Given that the site already has consent for a care home the key consideration in traffic terms is whether the additional bedrooms proposed would generate, if at all, a level of additional traffic that would be detrimental to existing conditions. By their nature care homes are low traffic generators. The proposals include a small increase in bedrooms at Lee House as well as formalised on-site parking and new sustainable travel measures to help reduce car travel by way of the Travel Plan and cycle parking. Based on trip rates from the TRICS national traffic survey database for care homes in London an increase in six bedrooms as is proposed could generate a maximum of one or two additional vehicle movements in any one hour. In traffic terms this is not a material increase and in any case there is more than enough parking available in the local area to accommodate these.

Care staff work over three shifts to provided 24 hour care. There is a maximum of 15 staff on site at the moment and with the proposals there could be up to 18 staff on site at any one time depending on specific resident needs. This modest increase in staffing level is unlikely to have a severe impact on the existing conditions.

Servicing: In terms of servicing the applicant informs that there will be one large food delivery per week, three smaller grocery deliveries per week, two refuse collections per week and one clinical waste collection per week. Operationally the minimal increase in room numbers at Lee House would not require an increase in delivery and other service vehicles to the site above the current schedule. The additional goods required would be accommodated in the vehicles already delivering to Lee House.

Emergency Vehicles: Will operate similar to current arrangements.

Waste Collection would occur as existing. Refuse collection will take place from the Lancaster road carriageway in the same manner as the existing nearby premises.

Cycle Parking:

The London Plan 2016 sets out cycle parking standards and indicates for care homes a minimum provision of 1 space/5 staff for long stay and 1 space/20

bedrooms for short stay. The proposal would require 6 long term cycle parking spaces (secure & undercover) and 2 visitor short term cycle parking spaces.

Recommendation:

The number of person trips likely to be generated by the proposed residential units will be low and consequently the development proposals would not have a material impact on the operation of the public highway or public transport network. Therefore there are no objections to the proposal objection subject to:

- The car parking areas shown on the approved plans shall be provided before the full occupation.
- Cycle parking provision (secure & undercover) to be shown on approved plans.
- The details of the travel plan should be subject to detailed agreement and monitoring over a five year period. A sum of £2,000 (two thousand pounds) is sought to meet the costs of monitoring the travel plan over five years, secured via the Section106 process.
- Demolition / Construction Logistic Plan (including a Construction Management Plan compliant with Chapter 8 of the Road Signs Manual for temporary Works) sent LPA before commencement of work be required.

5.6 Amended Plans

The applicant amended the site plan to show existing and proposed parking spaces and the elevation drawings were amended to show obscure glazing to north/south and east/west elevations of the stairwell. Additional transport and travel plan information was also submitted. A re-consultation took place on the 20th July, notifying third parties of the -parking surveys, parking note and swept path analysis. In response a further 12 letters of objection have been received. The grounds of objection are set out below:-

- Lancaster Avenue is a private gated road and both the residents of the road and the care home are against this proposal.
- Although residents of Lancaster Road have lived side by side with the care home for many years this is the third expansion since 1990. The expansion also begs the question why Abbeyfield closed Pelham House which is just two miles away.
- There is insufficient parking for the development.
- On street pay and display spaces are no use to staff as the maximum stay is 5 hours.
- A Travel Plan that encourages staff to use public transport id not practical for staff on shift work.
- Lee house is a cramped site and the development would cover 40% of the site.
- The proposal will result in the loss of views of trees through the site.
- The development would affect wildlife.
- The development will result in traffic generation and noise.

-The private road is already clogged up with care home staff and visitor's cars and proposal will make matters worse.

5.7 Transport Consultant (Paul Mew Associates) engaged by a group of residents
A Transport Statement has been prepared by Paul Mew Associates on behalf of local residents and the statement concluded that:-

-The applicant's current amended site layout fails to provide sufficient parking such that overspill is likely to occur.

-There is limited on-street parking availability in the area to accommodate the overspill parking from the care home.

-Despite the obvious conclusion that there will be increased pressure on local on-street parking facilities as a result of increased site parking demand and the limited level of on-street parking provision, the applicant has failed to address this issue by not carrying out parking surveys on current levels of on-street parking demand. In doing so they have also failed to provide a full planning submission as the assessment of the impact of the development in terms of parking is a key requirement of a transport assessment, and indeed a planning application.

-Servicing of the site will not be possible in line with the applicants suggested methodology and will result in vehicles continuing to make use of residential driveway access and reversing the length of Lancaster Avenue.

-It must be concluded that these aspects have still not been fully considered and addressed and as such the application continues to be deficient and should be refused.

5.8 Reconsultation – Additional highways Information

The applicant submitted additional highways information in the form of additional parking surveys and swept path analysis drawings. A reconsultation was undertaken and a further 4 letters of objection have been received. The grounds of objection are set out below:-

-The Belvedere Estates Residents association state that the Parking Survey and Swept Path analysis are all out of date and do not refer to the current drawings.

-The Abbeyfield Society Services statement dated March 2017 makes no reference of the current residents of Lee House. The Dementia and Alzheimers suffers need constant care and do not need sudden changes in their day to day living that can be upsetting.

-The development could be detrimental to the health of residents of the care home.

-The application should be refused if not withdrawn.

5.9 Transport Consultant (Paul Mew Associates) engaged by a group of residents

The applicants 'Parking Note' has over estimated the number of parking bays that can be used by visitors by exceeding the prescribed 200m walk distance the survey area inaccurately reports the presence of 'Pay and Display' machines on bays in Lancaster Road and Lancaster Gardens. The applicant's Swept Path Analysis fails to demonstrate that the current proposed site layout is workable and that the development could be safely serviced with increased parking on Lancaster Avenue.

5.10 Transport Planning -Observations on Paul Mew Associates Survey

In the Rebuttal Statement submitted by Paul Mew Associates (PMA) much emphasis is placed in the PMA Rebuttal on the criteria of the Merton Parking Survey Methodology. However this guidance is specifically for resident parking with surveys required to be undertaken during the night when it can be assumed that all residents are home. The Pay & Display parking on the local roads is provided for use by short-term visitors to the area during the day including spaces vacated by residents that would otherwise remain empty. This allows a turn-over of occupiers of the bays across the day. There are no visitors to care homes overnight and therefore this does not affect the parking conditions for local residents. It is debatable therefore whether a parking survey for a non-residential use using the residential parking Methodology is entirely appropriate.

The PMA parking survey was undertaken hourly and over shorter periods of 6 hours on the Friday and 5 hours on the Saturday. For the care home parking note 12 hour parking surveys were undertaken by an independent survey company during the day. The parking was counted every 30mins over the 12 hours on both the Friday and Saturday. The applicant's survey therefore provides a wider view of parking levels across the survey period.

The PMA note also refers to the extent of parking survey indicated in the Methodology to be 200m. However the Methodology allows for extending the survey area where the 200m falls before the end of a road as in practice drivers looking for a space will continue to the end of a road. The PMA survey has not allowed for this flexibility and the survey area stops in the middle of roads such as Church Road that have a high number of Pay & Display bays. These were included in the applicant's survey. In practice visitors looking for a parking space will circulate around a route which in this case includes both the High Street and Church Road which we included in our survey.

The PMA parking review has not included the parking at Lee House and on Lancaster Avenue in their 'parking stress' calculations. Given that this parking is available for use by staff and visitors to Lee House then it should be included in the overall review.

The PMA Rebuttal refers to a refused application for a development of 8 flats in Merton on the basis of increased pressure on car parking. However that is a residential development and therefore not comparable to the care home use, operation and circumstances.

The key consideration in terms of parking is whether the minimal likely increase in vehicle movements is 'severe' (NPPF) and detrimental to highway conditions. The Merton Parking Methodology does not state a guideline maximum accepted parking stress level. In absolute numbers the increase in parking demand could be for 1 or 2 cars at any one time. Our surveys have confirmed that with a minimum of 12 car spaces available on the Friday and 18 on the Saturday this minimal demand can be met satisfactorily either on site, on the private road Lancaster Avenue or in local

Pay & Display parking bays near the site. This would therefore not affect traffic, parking or safety conditions on the local road network.

Consideration should also be given to the implementation of a Travel Plan at Lee House that will encourage staff and visitors to use sustainable travel modes and help reduce travel by car and therefore the demand for parking. There is no Travel Plan at Lee House at present and therefore there would be a benefit with the proposals by implementing one. Generally policy in regards to sustainability is to minimise parking at development to discourage use of the car.

5.11 Recommendation from Transport Planning

The number of person trips likely to be generated by the proposed residential units will be low and consequently the development proposals would not have a material impact on the operation of the public highway or public transport network.

Raise no objection subject to:

- The car parking areas shown on the approved plans shall be provided before the full occupation.
- Cycle parking provision (secure & undercover) to be shown on approved plans.
- The details of the travel plan should be subject to detailed agreement and monitoring over a five year period. A sum of £2,000 (two thousand pounds) is sought to meet the costs of monitoring the travel plan over five years, secured via the Section106 process.
- Demolition / Construction Logistic Plan (including a Construction Management Plan compliant with Chapter 8 of the Road Signs Manual for temporary Works) sent LPA before commencement of work be required.

6. POLICY CONTEXT

6.1 Adopted Merton Core Strategy (July 2011)

CS14 (Design), CS18 (Active Transport) and CS20 (Parking, Servicing and Delivery).

6.2 Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014)

DM 02 (Nature Conservation, Trees, Hedges and Landscape Features), DM H1 (Supported care Housing), DM D2 (Design Considerations in all Developments), DM D3 (Alterations and Extensions to Existing Buildings), DM D4 (Managing Heritage Assets), DM T1 (Support for Sustainable and Active Travel), DM T2 (Transport Impacts of Development), DM T3 (Car parking Standards).

6.3 The London Plan (2016)

The relevant policies within the London Plan are 3.17 (Health and Care Facilities), 6.13 (Parking), 7.4 (Local Character), 7.6 (Architecture), 7.8 (Heritage and Archaeology)

6.4 The NPPF (2018)

7. **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

7.1 The main planning considerations concern the existing lawful use, design/visual impact upon the Conservation Area, Locally Listed Building, impact on neighbour amenity, trees and parking/highway issues.

7.2 Existing Use

The application submission outlines that the site has an established use as a Residential Care Home (Class C2 Use) and Lee House provides a total of 31 bedrooms and 27 registered bed spaces, a staff bedroom, a guest bedroom and two further bedrooms. Lee House currently has some 29 staff, including managers, carers, administration, maintenance, kitchen, domestic, laundry and activities co-ordinator with different shift times. Up to a maximum of 15 staff are on-site at any one time. Care staff work over three shifts to provide 24 hour care with five staff on site during the morning/early afternoon, four during the afternoon/evening and three overnight. The shift times are 07.30-14.00, 14.00-21.00 and 21.00-07.30. Other staff working during the morning/afternoon includes the manager, head of care, administrator, cook and assistant, maintenance, laundry, domestic and activities co-ordinator. Staff are provided with a staff room and have access to showers and changing facilities. The proposal would provide an additional 7 care home bedrooms, which would result in an increase in staffing numbers by 5.

7.3 The applicant has submitted a Travel Note that sets out the staff travel modes used by Lee House staff, following a response from staff to a staff survey. A response rate of 96% (28 returns out of 29 staff) had been achieved. The results identify the following modal split.

Travel Mode	Lee House Staff Modal Split
Walking	0%
Bicycle	3.6%
Bus	39.3%
Train	0%
Underground	3.6%
Motorcycle	0%
Car Passenger	14.3%
Car Driver	39.3%
Taxi	0%

The data indicates that around 54% of staff at Lee House travel by car either as a driver or passenger, 4% cycle and the remainder use public transport. It should be noted that Lee House has rights to use Lancaster Avenue for parking for staff and visitors. In terms of servicing the care home has one

large food delivery per week, three smaller deliveries per week, two refuse collections per week and one clinical waste collection per week. Visitors to Lee House are permitted throughout the day which helps to spread traffic movements and avoid peak times. On average there are eight visitors over a day with 9 or 10 at weekends. Therefore, officers consider that the proposal would not result in a major intensification in use of the site.

7.4 Design/Conservation Issues and Locally Listed Building

The proposed works involve improvements to existing facilities at the Lee House Care Home, including provision of 7 additional en-suite bedrooms and formation of new entrance and a first floor link between the former stable block and the 1990's wing together with associated internal alterations. Although the main frontage building is Locally Listed the proposed two storey extension would be to the 1990's wing situated at the rear of the care home site. No significant alterations are proposed to the Locally Listed Building itself and the proposed two storey extension and other extensions and alterations would not harm the setting of the Locally Listed building or its character.

7.5 The Wimbledon North Conservation area is characterised by mainly larger residential properties set with mature gardens. The siting of the proposed new accommodation block adjacent to the northern boundary of the site is considered to be acceptable, with the new building being a continuation of the existing wing. The separation distance between the building and the side boundaries is considered to be acceptable. The only window in the flank elevation would be to a staircase and would be obscure glazed. It is however noted that it has not been possible to respect the existing eaves level of the 1990's wing, due to the 1990's block having a very shallow roof pitch which limits the internal headroom. In order to provide adequate headroom for both ground and first floor levels of the new accommodation block vertical two storey bays have been incorporated into the garden façade. The resulting building would also have a higher ridge height than the 1990's wing albeit that in the context of the Care home complex this is considered to be acceptable with the 1990's wing becoming a link between the new wing and the taller tower feature.

7.6 The enclosure of the open area between the former stable block and the Victorian Villa with a glazed link is considered to be acceptable and would provide a clear point of entry to the Care Home, as at present the entrance is not obvious. Part of the former stable block would also provide a dedicated reception area adjacent to the glazed link for improved security. The design of the link and internal works are considered to be acceptable. The alterations to the roof of the rear section of the stable block to enable the formation of a first floor link between the former stable block and the 1990's wing to improve circulation within the building is also acceptable. The rationalization of the steps and levels within the rear garden area and raised terrace are also acceptable and would improve accessibility to the terrace and garden for the residents of the Care Home. Officers note the concerns raised with regard to the scale of the extensions and resultant garden size. However, the garden would remain of an appropriate size and the extension is considered to be appropriately accommodated in the sites back land location and surrounding

context. Overall, the proposal is considered to not cause harm to the Conservation Area or character of the area.

7.7 Neighbour Amenity

SPP policy DM D2 states that proposals must be designed to ensure that they would not have an undue negative impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, quality of living conditions, privacy, visual intrusion and noise. The main concerns of the objections relate to intensification of use of the care home and parking issues. In terms of intensification of use the proposal involves the provision of 7 additional bedrooms which will increase the occupancy of the care home from 27 residents to 34 residents, representing a 26% increase in the number of residents at the care home. In order to care for the additional 7 residents the number of care staff would increase from 22 to 27 staff. However the staff work a shift system so not all the staff would be on site at any given time. It is therefore not considered that the additional 7 bedrooms would result in such an intensification of use to warrant refusal of the application, in terms of its effect on neighbour amenity.

7.8 The main aspect of the current application involves the erection of a new wing to the existing care home. The new wing would be sited alongside the north east boundary of the site. Windows to bedrooms at first floor level within the new block would face into the care home site and there would be no windows at first floor level facing the boundary with the large garden of number 36 Marryat Road. Although there would be windows within the south east elevation of the new wing, facing number 37 Lancaster Road and 1 Lancaster Gardens, the glazing within the east elevation would be obscured to prevent any overlooking and/or loss of privacy to occupiers of nearby residential properties. The other aspects of the proposal relate to improvements in the internal layout of the care home, provision of a more visible entrance and simplifying the roofs of the existing former stable block and cottage. None of these changes would have any impact upon neighbour amenity. Overall, the proposal is considered to be accommodated on the site that would not cause material harm to the surrounding neighbour amenity and is compliant with policy DM D2 (Design Considerations in all Developments).

7.9 Trees

The applicant has undertaken a Tree Survey that concluded that the proposal would not harm any trees of significance. The proposal includes the removal of 2 trees (1 Oak tree and 1 Pear tree). These are not considered to be of significant value and are Category C trees. The Councils Tree Officer has raised no objections to the proposed development, subject to conditions being imposed on any grant of planning permission to protect existing retained trees during construction works.

7.10 Parking/Highway Issues

The main concern of the objectors relates to traffic and parking issues. The application site is an already established care home and the key consideration in traffic terms is whether the additional bedrooms would generate a significant increase in traffic generation and increase parking pressure on the

local road network. The Council's Transport Planning section has examined the parking surveys undertaken by the applicant's consultant which indicates that the very small potential increase in visitors to the care home can be accommodated in the available on-street parking spaces. Several representations refer to parking conditions in Lancaster Avenue and the condition of the road. However, Lancaster Avenue is not an adopted highway and so there is no public duty to maintain it or power to improve it. The current proposal formulates the parking arrangements within the care home site. Although the site has a low PTAL rating, the site is within a short walk to High Street and a 10/15 minute walk from Wimbledon Town Centre. Therefore since the number of person trips likely to be generated by the proposed additional bedrooms is likely to be low, the development proposal would not have a severe impact on the public highway or transport network, or cause an unacceptable impact on highway safety. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of policies CS20 (Parking), DM T3 (Car Parking and Servicing Standards) and DM T2 (Transport Impacts of Development).

8. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

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

9. CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The concerns of the objectors have been carefully considered. However, the proposal involves the erection of a new two storey wing to the existing care home to provide an additional 7 bedrooms, together with internal alterations to improve the layout of the care home and alterations to the roof profile of the former stable block and cottage and formalising the layout of the car park. The proposed two storey wing has been designed to protect neighbour amenity with main windows facing onto the existing garden within the care home complex. There would be no windows at first floor level facing towards the rear gardens of properties in Marryat Road or Lancaster Road and the design of the proposed extension and associated alterations to the existing care home buildings are considered to be acceptable.
- 9.2 The proposal would result in the provision of 7 additional bedrooms for the care home and the additional traffic generation as a result of the proposal is considered to be low. However, at the present time there is no formal parking layout at the care home and the proposal provides 8 parking spaces (including a disabled space) and a condition requiring provision of secure cycle parking would assist with supporting sustainable travel for staff and visitors. Although representations have been made about traffic and car parking in the vicinity of the care home there are no adopted parking standards in either the Merton Local Plan or the London Plan that require on-site parking and the proposed parking provision is considered to be sufficient for the proposed use. A Travel Plan for the site secured through a S.106 Agreement would also support sustainable transport initiatives. Accordingly it is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to completion of a S.106 Agreement and conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION

Subject to completion of a S.106 Agreement covering the following heads of terms:

1. The submission of a Travel Plan (to be monitored for a five year period) with a sum of £2,000 secured to meet the costs of monitoring the agreement.
2. The developer paying the Council's legal costs in drafting and completing the legal agreement.

and subject to the following conditions:-

1. A.1 (Commencement of Development)
2. A.7 (Approved Drawings)
3. B.1 (Approval of Facing Materials)
4. C.2 (No Additional Window or Door Openings-North and East of New Wing)
5. D.11 (Hours of Construction)
6. F.1 (Landscaping Scheme)
7. F.5 (Tree Protection)
8. F.8 (Site Supervision-Trees)
9. H.4 (Provision of Parking –Drawing Number P50190/03_0002 D)
10. H.6 (Cycle Parking – Details to be Submitted)
11. H.8 (Travel Plan)
12. H.9 (Construction Vehicles)
13. H.13 (Construction Logistics Plan)

[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