

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
20th August 2020.

UPRN	APPLICATION NO. 19/P4118	Item No: DATE VALID 20.11.2019
Address/Site	8 Preshaw Crescent Lower Green West Mitcham CR4 2AE	
(Ward)	Cricket Green	
Proposal:	ERECTION OF 2 x RESIDENTIAL BLOCKS OF TWO AND THREE STORIES, COMPRISING 9 x SELF-CONTAINED FLATS, WITH NEW ACCESS ROAD FROM RUSSELL ROAD, PLUS CAR PARKING PROVISION AND ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING.	
Drawing Nos;	Site location plan and drawings A165:P:1001, A165:P:1002 Rev A, A165:P:1003, A165:P:1005 & A165:P:1006	

Contact Officer: Leigh Harrington (020 8545 3836)

RECOMMENDATION

The application is subject to appeal for non-determination. Officers recommend to inform the Planning Inspectorate that the Council would have granted 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: 256
- Press notice – Yes (CA)
- Site notice – Yes
- External consultations: Yes, GLAAS
- Archaeological Priority Zone – Yes
- Flood risk zone - No
- Controlled Parking Zone – Yes
- Number of jobs created: N/A
- Density 90 Dwellings per hectare
- PTAL 3 on a scale of 0 to 6B where 6B is highest.
- Located within Mitcham Cricket Green Conservation Area

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application has been brought before the Committee due to the level of objections. The application is subject to a current appeal for non determination and the opinion of members is sought as to whether the proposals are acceptable and if not, to obtain a council position on them.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The existing site comprises an open area of land that has its southern boundary with 8 Preshaw Crescent having previously formed the rear garden of this property. To the east and most of the north of the site it is bordered by houses on Russell Road with access out to the road that is currently blocked. The west of the site faces the car park area of beadle Court and Vine Cottage and the main vehicle access to the site would be via Harwood Avenue. The land would appear to have never been built on.
- 2.2 The site is not designated with the Sites and Policies Plan 2014, there are no locally or statutorily listed buildings on site or adjoining it and the Mitcham Cricket Green is within 200m of the site.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 This application involves the ERECTION OF 2 x RESIDENTIAL BLCKS OF TWO AND THREE STORIES, COMPRISING 9 x SELF-CONTAINED FLATS, WITH NEW ACCESS ROAD FROM RUSSELL ROAD, PLUS CAR PARKING PROVISION AND ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING
- 3.2 The proposals would provide 3x1 bed, 3x2 bed and 3x3 bed units within the development.

- 3.3 Entrance to the site would be provided through opening the access from Russell Road and creating a new access road to the site.
- 3.4 The smaller of the two blocks would be located towards the entrance to the site with a 1 bed/2 person unit on the ground floor. Adjacent to this unit would be the main site refuse store accessed set within an undercroft arrangement from the access road with the communal cycle store located to the rear of that.
- 3.5 6 Parking spaces would be provided in an undercroft of the main block. In the middle of this block on the ground floor there would be 2x 2bed/4person units with a 1bed 2person unit located in the SE corner of the site. Each of these ground floor units would be provided with large amenity gardens and new landscaping and trees would be provided.
- 3.6 The first floor of the smaller entrance block would accommodate a 2bed/4 person unit with rear amenity deck. This unit would be accessed via a walkway from the main block.
- 3.7 That flat and the front two in the main block would be accessed via dedicated stairwell. The front flat over the parking undercroft would be a 2bed/4person unit with amenity balcony to the side. The third flat serviced by this stairwell would be a 3bed/4person duplex unit. This flat would have amenity balconies to the front and rear.
- 3.8 A second staircase to the SE of the main block would service the other centrally located 3bed/4person duplex and another 1bed/2person unit with amenity balcony in the SE end of the block.
- 3.9 The building would be predominantly finished in exposed brickwork incorporating sections of articulated patterned brickwork. The gabled roofs would be treated in tile work and include PV panels on the southern elevations.

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 17/P1942 Planning permission refused for DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE REAR OF 8 PRESHAW CRESCENT AND ERECTION OF TWO DETACHED BUILDINGS PROVIDING 9 x SELF-CONTAINED FLATS WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND LANDSCAPING WITH ACCESS FROM RUSSELL ROAD. Reasons for refusal; *The size, siting and design of the proposed development would represent an unneighbourly form of development that would be (i) visually intrusive, unduly dominant and lead to loss of light, privacy, outlook and additional disturbance for neighbouring occupiers, (ii) fails to relate positively and appropriately to the siting, rhythm, scale, density and massing of surrounding buildings and existing street patterns and (iii) fails to conserve and enhance the historic context, local character and distinctiveness*

of this part of the Mitcham Cricket Green Conservation Area and would be contrary to policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan 2016, policies CS 13 & CS14 of the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011), policies DM D2 and DM D4 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014) and the Mitcham Cricket Green Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan 2013.

And

The proposals by reason of design and layout fail to provide a high standard of design and layout of accommodation that would provide a safe and secure layout and a high quality living environment to the detriment of the amenities of future occupiers. The proposals would therefore be contrary to policy DM D2 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014) and Standard 10 of the London Plan Housing SPG (2016).

And

The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the positioning of the refuse store and the layout of the site would allow for the collection of refuse by standard Council refuse vehicles. The proposals are therefore contrary to policy 5.17 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS 17 in the Merton Core Strategy 2011 and Standard 22 of the Mayor's London Housing SPG 2016.

- 4.2 16/P1456 Application withdrawn by applicant for DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE AT 8 PRESHAW CRESCENT AND ERECTION OF A DETACHED BUILDING PROVIDING 15 x SELF-CONTAINED FLATS ASSOCIATED WITH THE EXISTING DEVELOPMENT AT BEADLE COURT

15/P0290/NEW Pre application advice for Erection of a block of 15 affordable homes linked to the existing properties of Beadle Court and Vine Cottages with associated car parking.

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1 The application was advertised by means of a Conservation Area Site Notice and Press Notice and letters to 256 neighbouring properties.

In response to the consultation letters of objection were received from 22 residents which raised concerns relating to;

- Russell Road is extremely narrow so construction vehicles will have problems entering the site - big vehicles will certainly have problems turning the bend and will have to mount on a footpath. This will a dangerous hazard for pedestrians and lead to cars being scratched.

- Russell Road is so narrow parking is only allowed on one side.
- Access to the site should be through the existing house
- building site having access in front of our door is unacceptable as it would cause the potential risk to the health or life to our family
- The construction method statement is flawed and unrealistic. Delivery vehicles wont have room on site to turn around.
- Previously in the Ground Investigation report put forward, the development applicants have stated that a '*cable percussion borehole was planned at the site, but the access onto the site was too tight and the rig had to turned away and the borehole abandoned*'. If this is the case for just one vehicle, it would be safe to assume that this will be an ongoing issue with many vehicles coming to the site.
- A 10m rigid truck is going to be difficult to manoeuvre on this road that is even if it will fit down these roads, this could lead to complete gridlock and in emergencies this could put people's life's at risk.
- Refuse and delivery vehicles already have trouble accessing the area.
- Emergency vehicles will struggle to gain access
- Dispute parking survey results that there are ever spare spaces.
- Impact on parking, not enough spaces on the site and now Love lane has double yellow lines it is worse.
- 8 on site spaces is not enough, they will have two cars each
- Disturbance from site access being in front of our house
- Noise pollution from the construction process
- Neighbouring properties will be vulnerable if the site is opened up.
- Loss of privacy from the flats on the higher floors
- Overlooking of gardens from the balconies contrary to human rights.
- Will overlook 26, 28, 32, 34, 36 and 38 Russell Road.
- The main building is simply too tall. The windows are also very large.
- structure will also be overbearing, imposing and create a visual intrusion from our garden
- Loss of sunlight to gardens
- development of two to three family houses would be better but 9 self-contained flats is too many for such a small residential road
- Very little outdoor space offered for children's play area
- Very little space for landscaping
- Loss of mature garden space it has been a garden since 1871.
- This is garden grabbing.
- Leave the garden as it is.
- Harm to trees and biodiversity
- Large number of mature trees removed from the site without consent, how can residents have faith in a company that breaks the law.

- The removal of these trees was in no way necessary or in the interest of good arboriculture practice; it was a blatant disregard for the council's policies
- No need to replace trees if they hadn't cut them down in the first place
- 18 flats are too many
- Building more than two stories is out of keeping with the area
- the area is a conservation area and therefore should not be subject to felling of trees and increased pollution
- The proposed development is not in context with the surrounding area and the design does not respect the other houses surrounding it, in particular, the scale and proportions of surrounding buildings and would be entirely out of the character of the area, and it would also be to the detriment of the local environment.
- The proposed dwelling would significantly alter the fabric of the area and amount to serious 'cramming' in what is a low density road
- When 24 Russell Road wanted to build up on her garage at the side of the house this was refused. Now your looking for planning permission for 2 and 3 story blocks almost beside her house.
- more people in and out of the road is detrimental to the people that live here now
- Russell Road has dangerous gas pipes close to the surface on the bend of Russell Road where the access will be
- The lorries will damage the already damaged sewers
- Additional impact on water pressure
- Additional demand on GP surgeries, schools, policing, emergency services, waste services
- The proposals will devalue our properties, will compensation be offered
- The proposed application has already been turned down on two previous occasions and I do not believe the reasons for refusal have changed

5.2 **Historic England** advised that the development could cause harm to archaeological remains and field evaluation is needed to determine appropriate mitigation. However, although the NPPF envisages evaluation being undertaken prior to determination, in this case consideration of the nature of the development, the archaeological interest and/or practical constraints are such that they consider a two-stage archaeological condition could provide an acceptable safeguard. This would comprise firstly, evaluation to clarify the nature and extent of surviving remains, followed, if necessary, by a full investigation. They therefore had no objections subject to the imposition of suitable conditions

5.3 **Mitcham Cricket Green Community and Heritage**

- Not opposed to the principle of some development on the site

- Applicants have not engaged with the local community for more than three years
- The matter of the illegal tree felling has not been resolved and site is now largely bare earth
- The proposed replacement trees are not sufficient to mitigate the lost trees.
- The development should provide for trees of equivalent CAVAT value to those lost as a minimum for permission to be granted
- The species and proposed locations are also inappropriate
- Proposals fail to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area and are in conflict with development plan policies for the area.
- proposals fail to demonstrate how they will overcome the loss of important open space which makes a positive contribution to the urban scene and to the character of the Conservation Area
- proposals provide very little by way of open space or additional greenery and much of the site is converted to car park
- proposals intensify development in an already congested area and damage the outlook from neighbouring residences at significant loss to local amenity.
- lack evidence that they will not have an unacceptable impact on local amenity and nearby residential properties
- fails to respond to the rich character of the surrounding neighbourhood and will not add positively to the Conservation Area
- proposed is everyday and ubiquitous and no examples of local references of sources of design inspiration are provided in the Design and Access Statement
- continues to be a lack of any contextual study, despite this being cited as a gap in the officer's report refusing planning consent for the previous scheme
- intrusive balconies and the honeycomb detailing and mixed shades of grey (or brown) bricks and roof tiles combined with brown edging has no local references.
- The buildings lack greenery and there is no provision for either green walls or a green roof by way of compensation for the loss of existing green space.
- Issues of site access and integration with surroundings
- Site access extremely limited especially for larger vehicles.
- Details of the proposed sustainable urban drainage system and how it will be maintained are unclear
- poor quality information presented with this application. Many of the architectural drawings are accompanied by images of people and animals that are out of scale.

5.4 **Conservation officer commented** that the applicants are trying to squeeze too much on the site with not enough amenity space with just not enough breathing space around the development. The loss of trees is a concern, and the proposed replacement trees do not really make up for the loss. It is loss of

a green space which will be a negative impact on the conservation area. Therefore if they reduced the footprint and the volume of development it would be more acceptable in my mind. No concerns with the height and general proportions of the buildings.

- 5.5 **Transport officer** The proposal provides 6 car parking spaces including one disabled bay with one space provided with active charging facilities, with the remaining five spaces provided with passive provision which satisfies the London Plan Standards.

Vehicle swept path analysis has been undertaken which demonstrates that cars can access/egress the site in forward gear.

A total of 18 cycle parking spaces is to be provided in sheltered and secure storage within the curtilage of the building in the form of Josta two-tier racks. The total provision of cycle parking satisfies the Draft New London Plan minimum parking standards.

Whilst on street parking is at a premium the level of likely trip generation means that the proposal is unlikely to have significant impact on the adjoining highway. No objection raised subject to conditions:

- Car parking as shown maintained.
- The condition requiring cycle parking.
- The condition requiring Refuse collection.
- Demolition/Construction Logistic Plan (including a Construction Management plan in accordance with TfL guidance) should be submitted to LPA for approval before commencement of work.

- 5.6 **Arboricultural officer;** Raised no objections to the principle of the development although she considered the choice of proposed trees to be unsatisfactory

- 5.7 **Waste Services Officers** had concerns about the ability of refuse vehicles to enter the site and engaged in protracted discussions with the applicants however in relation to the option of a private provider for waste collection. Normally a development of this size would have communal refuse facilities. They would need to provide a very large store if each unit had individual facilities

6. **POLICY CONTEXT**

- 6.1 NPPF (2019). Key sections:
5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes.
12. Achieving well-designed places.
- 6.2 Relevant policies in the London Plan 2016 are; 3.3 (Increasing housing supply), 3.4 (Optimising housing potential), 3.5 (Quality and design of housing developments), 5.1 (Climate change mitigation), 5.2 (Minimising carbon dioxide emissions), 5.3 (Sustainable design and construction), 5.7 (Renewable energy), 5.13 (Sustainable drainage), 5.17 (Waste Capacity), 6.9 (Cycling), 6.13 (Parking), 7.2 (Inclusive environment), 7.3 (Designing out crime), 7.4 (Local character), 7.5 (Public realm), 7.6 (Architecture), 7.8 (Heritage assets and archaeology), 7.21 (Trees and woodlands).
- 6.3 Emerging London Plan 2017 Policy H1 Increasing Housing supply
- 6.4 London Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance 2016
- 6.5 GLA Guidance on Preparing Energy Assessments (2018).
- 6.6 DCLG Technical standards 2015
- 6.7 Relevant policies in the Merton Core Strategy 2011 are; CS 9 (Housing targets), CS 11 (Infrastructure), CS 13 (Open Space, Nature conservation), CS 14 (Design), CS 15 (Climate change), CS 17 (Waste management), CS 18 (Transport) & CS 20 (Parking, Servicing & delivery).
- 6.8 The relevant policies in the Merton Sites and Policies Plan 2014 are; DM C1 Community facilities, DM D1 (Urban Design and the public realm), DM D2 (Design considerations in all developments), DM D4 (Managing Heritage assets), DM EP 2 (Reducing and mitigating noise), DM EP4 (Pollutants), DM H2 (Housing mix), DM 02 (Trees, hedges and landscape features), DM T2 (Transport impacts of development) & DM T3 (Car parking and servicing standards).

7. **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 7.1 The key considerations are; The principle of the use of the site for the provision of dwellings, the standard of accommodation provided, the impact of the development on the conservation area, the amenity of local residents and parking and servicing.

7.2 **Principle**

The National Planning Policy Framework 2019, London Plan 2016 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. The Council and the Mayor also have minimum standards for the design of new residential developments of this nature and these are set out in various SPP and Core Strategy policies, The London Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance 2016, the London Plan 2016 and DCLG Technical housing standards-nationally described space standards 2015. The proposals meet these standards.

- 7.3 Merton's Core Strategy Policy CS 13 requires that proposals for new dwellings in back gardens must be justified against the local context and character of the site. Whilst technically a back garden, the scale of the site is such that officers consider the site capable of residential redevelopment on a limited scale without being materially harmful to the context and character with the locality.

7.4 **Need for additional housing**

The emerging London Plan, now accorded moderate weight in recent appeal decisions issued by the Secretary of State, and anticipated to be adopted in the coming months, will signal the need for a step change in the delivery of housing in Merton. While AMR data shows the Council has exceeded its current 411 target, the target of 918 units per year will prove considerably more challenging. The relaxation of the earlier target (1300+ units) for Merton following the Inspector's finding following the London Plan Examination in Public Panel Report Appendix: Panel Recommendations October 2019 was predicated on not adopting a particular GLA formula to delivering significant new housing on small sites, with larger opportunity sites such as the application site rising in importance.

The National Planning Policy Framework requires Councils to identify a supply of specific 'deliverable' sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing with an additional buffer of 5% to provide choice and competition.

Table 3.1 of the London Plan identifies that LBM has an annual housing target of 411 units, or 4,107 over the next ten years. However, this minimum target is set to increase significantly to 918 set out in the 'London Plan Examination in Public Panel Report Appendix: Panel Recommendations October 2019', and which is expected to be adopted later this year. This significant increase will require a step change in housing delivery within the LBM.

Policy H1 'Increasing housing supply' (Draft London Plan Policy) and Table 4.1 of the draft London Plan sets Merton a ten-year housing completion

target of 13,280 units between 2019/20 and 2028/29 (increased from the existing 10-year target of 4,107 in the current London Plan). However, following the Examination in Public this figure of 13,280 has been reduced to 9,180. Page 82 7.4.5 Merton's overall housing target between 2011 and 2026 is 5,801 dwellings (Authority's Monitoring Report Draft 2017/19, p12). The latest (draft) Monitoring report confirms:

- All the main housing targets have been met for 2017/18.
- 665 additional new homes were built during the monitoring period, 254 above Merton's target of 411 new homes per year (London Plan 2015).
- 2013-18 provision: 2,686 net units (813 homes above target)
- For all the home completions between 2004 and 2017, Merton always met the London Plan target apart from 2009/10. In total Merton has exceeded the target by over 2,000 homes since 2004.

Policy H1 of the emerging London Plan sets out that boroughs should optimise the potential for housing delivery on all suitable and available brownfield sites through their Development Plans and planning decisions, especially the following sources of capacity: b) mixed-use redevelopment of car parks and low-density retail parks.

The proposal to introduce residential use to this under-utilised site responds positively to London Plan, draft London Plan policies and Core Strategy planning policies to increase housing supply and optimise sites and is supported.

7.5 **Residential density**

A number of objections were concerned with the density of development. Table 3.2 of the London Plan identifies appropriate density ranges based on a site's setting and PTAL rating.

The area has a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 3, where 1 is poor and 6 is excellent. It is considered that the site is located within an suburban area for the purposes of Table 3.2 of the London Plan, given the nature of surrounding built form and the criteria set out in the supporting text to Table 3.2 (density matrix) of the London Plan.

The proposed development would have a density of 90 dwellings per hectare. With a Ptal of 3 the density of 90u/ha accords with the London Plan policy 3.4 recommendation of 50-95 u/ha which would be considered to demonstrate an acceptable level of development of the site.

7.6 **Design/Bulk and massing/Appearance/Layout.**

Design of new buildings should ensure appropriate scale, density and appearance, respecting, complementing and responding to local characteristics (London Plan policy 7.6, LDF policy CS.14 and SPP policy DM D2).

7.6.1 Bulk and massing.

7.6.2 London Plan policy 7.4 and SPP policy DM D2 require developments to relate positively and appropriately to the siting, rhythm, scale, density and proportions of surrounding buildings and the pattern and grain of existing streets.

7.6.3 Housing in the local area is predominantly low rise in the form of two storey suburban housing although the adjacent flats are higher at three storeys.

7.6.4 The proposals reflect a reduction in the bulk and massing of previous iterations of the scheme and now limit the higher three storey element to a more central position on the site such that for most of the proposals the lower two storey elements are the closer to the neighbouring occupiers. The Council's Conservation Officer raised no objection to the height and general proportions of the buildings and although the officer was concerned about the quantum of development Officers consider that the proposals are optimising the site whilst still being respectful of neighbouring residents and the wider conservation area.

7.6.5 Design- Appearance.

The proposals are considered to have been attractively designed with a modern approach whilst retaining a house like quality rather than a more standard flatted design so that they more closely reflect the predominant stock of houses in this part of the Mitcham Cricket Green Conservation Area.

Although brickwork and fenestration is indicated on the accompanying CGIs a condition to have the materials approved is recommended to ensure a suitable appearance to the development.

7.6.6 Design- layout and standard of accommodation

The proposed units all meet the minimum space standards for GIA and amenity space, SPP Policy DM D2, Core Strategy 2011 policies CS 9 Housing Provision and CS 14 Design and London Plan policies 3.3 Increasing Housing Supply, 3.4 Optimising Housing Potential, 3.5 Quality and Design of Housing Developments are all policies that seek to provide

additional good quality residential accommodation including the provision of a safe and secure layout.

Unit	No Bed	Proposed GIA in SQM	Required GIA in SQM
1	1B 2P	51.6	50
2	2B 4P	81.5	70
3	2B 4P	78.80	70
4	1B 2P	55.6	50
5	3B 5P	92	86
6	2B 4P	72.2	70
7	3B 4P	91.9	74
8	3B 4P	91.9	74
9	1B 2P	55.3	50

All the proposed units readily exceed the minimum space standards and all provide sufficient private amenity space and consequently the proposals are considered to provide a good standard accommodation for future residents.

7.9 **Affordable housing**

As the proposal is for less than 10 units there is no longer any requirement to provide either on site or off site affordable housing contributions.

7.10 **Neighbour Amenity.**

London Plan policies 7.4 and 7.6 and SPP policy DM D2 relate to amenity impacts such as loss of light, privacy, overshadowing and visual intrusion on neighbour amenity and the need for people to feel comfortable with their surroundings.

7.10.1 Objections were received in relation to the impact of the block on the amenity of neighbouring residents. Neighbours were concerned in relation to loss of privacy and overlooking from the new flats and in particular the upper floors. The layouts were subsequently amended such that through

the use of angled openings and more obscure glazing panels it is considered that the proposals would not cause material harm to the amenity of neighbours from overlooking and loss of privacy.

- 7.10.2 Objections were received raising concerns that the proposals would result in a loss of light to neighbouring properties. However a combination of the separation distance and relative positioning of the block to the closest neighbouring properties means that officers consider that the proposals would not materially harm the amenity of neighbours from a loss of light.

7.11 **Parking, servicing and deliveries.**

Core Strategy Policy CS 20 requires proposals to have regard to pedestrian movement, safety, servicing and loading facilities for local businesses and manoeuvring for emergency vehicles as well as refuse storage and collection.

- 7.11.1 The vast majority of objections to the proposals related to parking and access to the site and it is acknowledged that the surrounding roads are very narrow and congested with on street parking. The site is land that was the back garden of a house on Preshaw Crescent and access to this proposal would be via a new access created from Russell Road.
- 7.11.2 Whilst this access would be sufficient for car access the issue of an access large enough for a larger vehicles to enter the site without mounting the kerb does remain and many objections related to the impact on the area during the construction phase as larger vehicles, even large transit type vehicles have difficulty using the local roads.
- 7.11.3 During construction the development would require large vehicle access to the site and this would require a system to be approved whereby a combination site marshals and parking restrictions would be needed in order to ensure adequate space could be provided for access for construction vehicles. Conditions requiring Construction logistics and delivery and servicing plans are recommended to address this. A s171 Highways licence on the entrance to the site which will cover the use of the crossover during construction works and will be used to ensure that the crossover is put back to its appropriate condition following completion of the works is recommended. A legal agreement with the highways department for rectifying any damage to the pavements during construction is also recommended.
- 7.11.4 The Council's transport officer was satisfied that as the proposal provides 6 car parking spaces including one disabled bay with one space provided

with active charging facilities, with the remaining five spaces provided with passive provision, it satisfies the London Plan Standards.

7.11.5 The officer also confirmed that with a total of 18 cycle parking spaces being provided in sheltered and secure storage within the curtilage of the building in the form of Josta two-tier racks, the total provision of cycle parking satisfies the Draft New London Plan minimum parking standards

7.11.6 A flatted development of this size would normally require communal refuse facilities but these would require a refuse vehicle to enter the site as the drag distance is too great. If individual facilities were to be provided the drag distance would be acceptable but a greater area would possibly be needed to accommodate the higher number of variously assorted waste receptacles. It is possible that this could be addressed by condition and given the importance of this issue the condition should be required to be discharged prior to the commencement of the development and so a condition to this effect is recommended.

7.12 **Trees**

The applicants did undertake the unauthorised clearance of larger trees from the site which would be protected by virtue of the site's location within a Conservation Area. The proposals do include replacement trees and a condition requiring details of the replacement trees and confirmation that they would have a CAVAT rating of at least equal to that of the removed trees is recommended.

8. SUSTAINABILITY AND 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.

8.2 A condition requiring the proposals to comply with current sustainability criteria for a development of this size is also recommended.

9. CONCLUSION

9.1 The proposals will provide 9 new flats in a policy compliant mix of sizes that will provide a good standard of accommodation for future residents within what is considered to be an attractively designed development that will preserve the appearance and character of the Mitcham Cricket Green Conservation Area.

- 9.2 The proposals have been designed to mitigate their impact on neighbour amenity and are not considered materially harmful to the amenity of neighbours and whilst access to and servicing of the site is relatively restricted this could be overcome by conditions.
- 9.3 Therefore, subject to the imposition of suitable planning conditions, the proposal is considered to be acceptable and in compliance with relevant planning policy and is therefore recommended for approval.

10. **RECOMMENDATION:**

The application is subject to appeal for non-determination. Officers recommend to inform the Planning Inspectorate that the Council would have granted planning permission subject to conditions

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions;

A1 Commencement

A7 A165:P:1001, A165:P:1002 Rev A, A165:P:1003, A165:P:1005 & A165:P:1006

B1 Materials to be approved

B4 Surface treatment

B5 Boundary treatment

C5 No cables or flues

C6 Refuse details to be approved

C7 refuse details to be implement

D9 No external lighting

F1 No development shall take place until full details of a landscaping and planting scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The replacement trees shall be of at least equivalent CAVAT rating as those removed. These works shall be carried out as approved before the commencement of the use or the occupation of any building hereby approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include on a plan, full details of the size, species, spacing, quantities and location of proposed plants, together with any hard surfacing, means of enclosure, and indications of all existing trees, hedges and any other features to be retained, and measures for their protection during the course of development.

F2 Landscaping implementation
F8 trees site supervision
H1 Details of new vehicle access
H2 vehicle access to be provided
H4 Vehicle parking to be provided
H7 Cycle storage to be implemented
H10 Construction working method statement
H11 Parking management strategy
H12 Delivery and servicing plan
H13 Construction logistics plan

Non standard condition

The applicants shall enter into a s171 highways licence agreement with the Highways authority to ensure the safe operation of the site access and its restoration to a suitable standard should any damage occur during the construction process.

Reason to protect the integrity of the public highway and to ensure safe access to the site.

Non standard condition

No demolition or development shall take place until a stage 1 written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition or development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, and the programme and methodology of site evaluation and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works.

If heritage assets of archaeological interest are identified by stage 1 then for those parts of the site which have archaeological interest a stage 2 WSI shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the stage 2 WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed stage 2 WSI which shall include:

- A. The statement of significance and research objectives, the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works
- B. Where appropriate, details of a programme for delivering related positive public benefits.
- C. The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination and deposition of resulting material. this part of the

condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the stage 2 WSI.

Reason: This pre-commencement condition is necessary to safeguard the archaeological interest of this site.

No standard Condition: No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a final detailed scheme for the provision of surface and foul water drainage has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The drainage scheme will dispose of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) at a restricted runoff rate (no more than 2l/s), in accordance with drainage hierarchy contained within the London Plan Policy (5.12, 5.13 and SPG) and the advice contained within the National SuDS Standards. A CCTV will inform the final design to demonstrate the routing (line and level) and condition of all existing drainage runs. The final drainage scheme will be maintained in perpetuity by the applicant unless adopted by Thames Water.

Reason: To reduce the risk of surface and foul water flooding to the proposed development and future users and ensure surface water and foul flood risk does not increase offsite in accordance with Merton's Sites and Policies Plan policies CS16, DMF2 and the London Plan policy 5.13.

Non standard condition 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 consumption rates of no greater than 105 litres per person per day.'

Reason: 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 2016 and Policy CS15 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011

Informative

Written schemes of investigation will need to be prepared and implemented by a suitably qualified professionally accredited archaeological practice in accordance with Historic England's Guidelines for Archaeological Projects in Greater London. This condition is exempt from deemed discharge under schedule 6 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

An archaeological field evaluation involves exploratory fieldwork to determine if significant remains are present on a site and if so to define their character, extent,

quality and preservation. Field evaluation may involve one or more techniques depending on the nature of the site and its archaeological potential. It will normally include excavation of trial trenches. A field evaluation report will usually be used to inform a planning decision (pre-determination evaluation) but can also be required by condition to refine a mitigation strategy after permission has been granted.

This page is intentionally left blank