

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
11th February 2021

| <u>UPRN</u> | <u>APPLICATION NO.</u> | <u>Item No:</u> | <u>DATE VALID</u> |
|-------------------------|--|-----------------|-------------------|
| | 20/P0823 | | 20/02/2020 |
| Site Address: | Fair Green Parade London Road Mitcham CR4 3NA | | |
| Ward: | Cricket Green | | |
| Proposal: | ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY ROOF EXTENSION TO ALLOW PROVISION FOR NINE SELF-CONTAINED FLATS. | | |
| Drawing No.'s: | (drawing set amended 28.01.21) 001 FG-A-02-101 Rev 3, 001 FG-A-02-102 Rev 3, 001 FG-A-03-101 Rev 3, 001 FG-A-03-102 Rev 2, 001 FG-A-03-103 Rev 2, 001 FG-A-03-104 Rev 3, 001 FG-A-03-105 Rev 3, 001 FG-A-03-106 Rev 3, 001 FG-A-05-101 Rev 3, 001 FG-A-06-101 Rev 3, 001 FG-A-06-102 <input type="checkbox"/> Rev 3, and CGI image. Documents: Energy & Sustainability Statement dated 23/06/2020 V2 prepared by eb7, Water Calculations dated 23/06/2020, Energy Consumption and Emissions Analysis. | | |
| Contact Officer: | Catarina Cheung (020 8545 4747) | | |

RECOMMENDATION

Grant Permission Subject to Section 106 Obligation or any other enabling agreement, and relevant conditions.

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- Is a screening opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental Statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Statement been submitted: No
- Press notice: No
- Design Review Panel consulted: No
- Number of neighbours consulted: 67
- Controlled Parking Zone: No, but the site is bounded on the south by CPZ MTC and MTC1 is in close proximity, west of Raleigh Gardens
- PTAL: 4
- Archaeological Zone: Yes, Tier 2

- Conservation Area: No, but in close proximity further south and east and the borders of the Mitcham Cricket Green Conservation area
- Listed Building: No
- Trees: None on the site

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The application is being brought to the Planning Applications Committee for determination due to the nature and number of objections received.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The application site is located on the corner of London Road and Upper Green West in the heart of Mitcham Town Centre.

2.2 The site currently accommodates a three storey frontage building which wraps around the corner of London Road and Upper Green West, displaying an L-shape. The site is bound by highways on three sides.

2.3 The building was constructed in the 1950s. The principal facing material is London stock brickwork, featuring small projecting balconies overlooking the street. The building has a flat roof and the elevations have the appearance of an Art Deco style building.

2.4 The ground floor is occupied by commercial uses, accommodating a range of town centre type uses. Mitcham Town Centre is a primary shopping area, and 1-13 Fair Green Parade is a designated Secondary shopping frontage.

2.5 The first and second floors accommodate 20 existing self-contained flats, 14-33 Fair Green Court.

2.6 Vehicular access to the site is via Raleigh Gardens (to the south of the site). The single width vehicular access is security gate controlled and leads to a parking area within the courtyard, behind the main frontage building. The courtyard provides for a number of activities, such as parking, servicing and rubbish storage.

2.7 Residential properties located on the first and second floors are accessed via a single door pedestrian entrance on Raleigh Gardens, with another entrance from Upper Green West.

2.8 Adjoining east of Fair Green Parade is 13-15 Upper Green West, a three storey flat roof building comprising ground floor commercial (Iceland supermarket) and upper residential levels. Toward the west (rear of the L-shape building) is Eldacrest House, another three storey flat roof development providing wholly residential accommodation. Eldacrest House overhangs the vehicular access path into Fair Green Court's courtyard.

2.9 The application building is not a statutorily Listed Building and the site is not located within a Conservation Area.

2.10 The site has a PTAL rating of 4 (measured on a scale of 0 to 6b, 0 being the worst) and is not located within a Controlled Parking Zone, but the site is bounded toward the south by CPZ MTC and MTC1 is in close proximity, west of Raleigh Gardens.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The proposal seeks to erect a 2 storey roof extension which would provide an addition of 9 self-contained duplex units.
- 3.2 The entrance to the units would be via Raleigh Gardens, a new stairwell and lift access are provided separate from the existing.
- 3.4 Refuse and cycle facilities shall be provided in the courtyard for both the existing and future residential occupiers, a separate area for commercial refuse is also provided with its own dedicated area for collection.
- 3.5 The roof extension would have a height of 5.9m, increasing the maximum height of the building up to approximately 15.6m. The depth of the building toward London Road would be 5.6m and toward Upper Green West 5.8m. The extension would be set back from the front façade of the building by approximately 2m to allow external terrace amenity spaces, and set in from the rear building line by approximately 0.8m with a 1.5m external walkway.
- 3.6 The extension would be externally finished in copper cladding, fitted as a series of vertical and horizontal panels.
- 3.7 The proposed dwelling mix would be as follows:

| | Type | Storeys | Proposed GIA (sqm) | Proposed amenity (sqm) |
|--------|------|---------|--------------------|------------------------|
| Unit 1 | 2b3p | 2 | 73.1 | 17.52 |
| Unit 2 | 1b2p | 2 | 65.37 | 10.04 |
| Unit 3 | 2b3p | 2 | 74.18 | 11.42 |
| Unit 4 | 2b3p | 2 | 73.04 | 10.67 |
| Unit 5 | 2b4p | 2 | 120.27 | 26.51 |
| Unit 6 | 2b3p | 2 | 73.08 | 10.52 |
| Unit 7 | 2b3p | 2 | 73.04 | 10.53 |
| Unit 8 | 2b3p | 2 | 70 | 10.06 |
| Unit 9 | 1b2p | 2 | 62.16 | 18.22 |

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 20/P2750: ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT FOR THE REMOVAL OF 2 x EXISTING DISPLAYS AND INSTALLATION OF 1 x INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED DIGITAL ADVERTISEMENT SCREEN AT FIRST FLOOR LEVEL – Advertisement consent granted 30/10/2020
- 4.2 91/P0264: ERECTION OF 1 X 48 SHEET ADVERTISEMENT HOARDING ON FLANK WALL. – Refused 15/05/1991
Reason - The 48 sheet hoarding, by virtue of its size and siting, is detrimental to the visual amenities of this part of the Mitcham Town Centre.
- 4.3 MIT1643: OUTLINE 12 SHOPS AND 20 FLATS OVER. – Granted 22/02/1951
- 4.4 MIT1405A: OUTLINE 13 SHOPS AND 13 FLATS OVER. – Granted 29/09/1950
- 4.5 MIT1405: 14 SHOPS AND 14 FLATS OVER. – Refused 31/03/1950

Related applications

Yard rear of Fair Green Court

- 4.6 09/P2592: APPLICATION FOR DISCHARGE OF CONDITION 2 (FACING MATERIALS) 3 (SURFACE MATERIAL) 5 (CYCLE PARKING) 8 ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORT) 9 (LANDSCAPING SCHEME) AND 10 ATTACHED TO LBM PLANNING APPLICATION 01/P1254 DATED 29/07/2002 RELATING TO THE VARIATION OF ERECTION OF A 4 STOREY BUILDING COMPRISING 3 LIVE/WORK UNITS AND 8 SELF CONTAINED FLATS (5 X 1 BED & 3 X2 BED) WITH ASSOCIATED OFF-STREET CAR PARKING – Granted 22/01/2010
This permission has been implemented, the development is known as Eldacrest House which is sited at the rear of the application building.
- 4.7 01/P1254: ERECTION OF A 4 STOREY BUILDING COMPRISING 3 LIVE/WORK UNITS AND 8 SELF CONTAINED FLATS (5 X 1 BED & 3 X2 BED) WITH ASSOCIATED OFF-STREET CAR PARKING – Granted at PAC 29/07/2002
- 4.8 00/P1887: ERECTION OF A 4 STOREY BUILDING COMPRISING 3 LIVE/WORK UNITS AND 8 SELF CONTAINED FLATS (5 X 1 BED & 3 X 2 BED) WITH ASSOCIATED OFF-STREET CAR PARKING – Refused 24/05/2001
Reason - The proposal, by reason of its design, bulk and massing, would constitute an overdevelopment of the site with inadequate amenity space provision detrimental to residential amenity by reason of noise and nuisance from additional activity on the site contrary to policies EB.23 & H.14 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (April 1996) and BE.23 & HS.2 of the Second Deposit Draft Unitary Development Plan (October 2000).
Appeal lodged 25/06/2001 but withdrawn 06/08/2001.
- 4.9 There are a number of historic applications determined between 1951 to 2014, relating to the use of the retail units on the ground floor, various external alterations and signage/shop front proposals.

5. CONSULTATION

External

- 5.1 Public consultation was undertaken by way of letters sent to 67 neighbouring properties.
- 5.2 8 objections were received to the initial proposal.
- 5.3 A 14 day re-consultation was undertaken 13/08/2020. 1 objection was received in this instance.
- 5.4 A further re-consultation was undertaken to rectify the development description 22/12/2020. No objections were received.
- 5.5 Objections received during the initial public consultation period:

The Mitcham Society raised the following concerns:

- 1) This planning application follows a trend we are seeing in Mitcham for applications to add extra storeys to existing buildings. It is an unwelcome trend. Any individual addition of height detracts from the village-like characters of Mitcham, and cumulatively such additions permanently change the character of Mitcham, making it a 'bland any town' rather than celebrating its special and unique character. The site lies in the London Road Character Area of the draft Character Appraisal for the Mitcham sub area and

this identifies it as an “area with scope to reinforce the existing character.” The proposal does the reverse.

- 2) Mitcham Village lacks formal recognition or specific designation. Policy N3.2 in the emerging Merton Local Plan is weak in its assertion of the special character of Mitcham Village. Our own assertion of this special character, and our expectations of Merton Council in relation to development, can be found in our full submission to the Local Plan consultation. To quote from that submission:

“It is detrimental to the character of Mitcham Village to add floors onto existing buildings. We have seen planning applications for this in recent times, including along London Road, and it is likely to be a growing trend. This trend should be halted in the Local Plan because raising height in this way is absolutely contrary to the continued existence of Mitcham Town Centre as a 21st Century Village.”

We also assert that all new development should “Recognise, value and protect the village character of Mitcham”, and that Merton Council should “Actively discourage development, built or otherwise, which:

- Disrupts or damages the existing elements which characterise Mitcham Village
- Detracts from the continuation of a village feel in Mitcham
- Over urbanises
- Removes Green Spaces
- Prioritises the ‘generic’ over the local, special and unique

- 3) The proposal to add two floors to Fair Green Parade falls foul of four of the five principles stated above, the only one it does not fail on is the removal of green spaces.
- 4) Fair Green Parade is a 1950s building with a distinctive curve facing onto Fair Green. The two existing residential floors present a pleasing symmetry in design. The building is the most distinctive of those facing directly onto Fair Green, and is a highly regarded local landmark.
- 5) The proposal to add two further storeys in height destroys the symmetry and the design appeal of the existing building. Mimicking window design and using green cladding is not enough to fool the eye into thinking the building is all of a piece. The new addition jars, and looks exactly like a later addition rather than belonging to the structure as a whole.
- 6) The Design and Access statement references a ‘pre-app meeting’, and the receipt of pre application advice. This advice has not been published at the Planning Portal, and is not available to the public. It should be published as a matter of course, and we would expect the public to have access to it.
- 7) There is no evidence presented with this application of any form of public discussion or consultation relating to these proposals, and we have received no communication from the applicant. The National Planning Policy Framework states that “applications that can demonstrate early, proactive and effective engagement with the community should be looked on more favourably than those that cannot” (paragraph 128). In the absence of any evidence of any effort being made to reach out or consult, this application cannot be looked on more favourably.
- 8) We believe this application is detrimental to the building it is designed to extend, and detrimental to the character of Mitcham Village. It has been progressed with no visible signs of public engagement in its design and development. We believe it contravenes policies:
 - a. DM R1 relating to location and scale of development in Merton’s town centres, states development must ensure it “respects or improves the character and local environment of the area”
 - b. DM D1 development must “impact positively on the character and quality of the public realm”

- c. CS2 requiring development in Mitcham Town Centre to be of “high quality design and architecture”
- d. CS14 requiring all development “to be designed in order to respect, reinforce and enhance the local character of the area”
- e. NPPF guidance on community engagement

5.6 Summary of other objections:

- Overlooking;
- Impact on sunlight;
- Damage the character of Mitcham Village;
- Support the provision of more much-needed genuinely affordable housing in the borough, but none of the 9 units would be “affordable”;
- Damage to the existing structure of the existing property – cracks, leaks, vibration, lighting;
- Stability of the existing building foundation, may it become unstable and weaken/strong enough to hold a 2 storey extension? ;
- Compensation for during/after effects of construction – noise, drilling and dust;
- Service charge increase to building;
- What benefit will existing residents receive;
- Increase of noise and disturbance;
- Not enough car parking spaces;
- Allocation of parking, bins, bike sheds etc. needs to be considered for everyone and not just the new levels;
- Existing residents do not bother to clean the existing bins;
- Enough flats in Mitcham Fair Green, why not concentrate on the Burn Bullock which seems to have squatters;
- Existing 3 levels need to be modernised to match the new levels;
- Plan for a lift? (The new storeys of the roof development would be at the 4th floor level, this question looks to raise concerns around accessibility).

5.7 Objections during the re-consultation:

- Impact existing flats’ environment and private life;
- Cover sun light and increase noise;
- Too close to existing flats, will lose private life security.

5.8 Secure by Design –

- The D&A statement mentions there is an issue of rough sleepers using the rear yard. The existing gates allow them to be breached by climbing, allowing them to be opened so providing unrestricted access. The proposed full height gates with access control would be of great benefit in the prevention of this issue.
- Storage for commercial refuse would be directly in front of the pedestrian gate forcing pedestrians onto the vehicle carriage way. The location of these bins should be moved.
- The cycle storage should incorporate stands/racks secured into concrete foundations, which should enable cyclists to use at least two locking points so that the wheels and crossbar are locked to the stand rather than just the crossbar.
- CCTV would be of benefit for this development. Lighting fixtures should not be in conflict with the CCTV cameras’ field of view.
- Lighting across the entire development should be to the required British Standards, avoiding the various forms of light pollution (vertical and horizontal glare).

Internal

5.9 Urban Design officer –

Following the amendments submitted 08/07/2020, a large majority of the issues raised in the Urban Designer’s initial comments were addressed:

- The proposal has been amended to a wholly two storey extension moving away from the 'alien' wedge shape which made it appear inappropriately tall at its corner. No objections raised to a two storey addition on this building;
 - Roof looks quite tall, materiality separation could make it appear less vertical, add some aspect of horizontality to create a horizontal break between the two storeys (Officers note this has been addressed and is further discussed in paras 7.3.5 and 7.3.6);
 - The extension should not extend to the ends of the building, i.e. the way the extension extends to the very south end breaking a hole in the end parapet is very unceremonious and disrespectful to the host building. This parapet has been retained;
 - The illuminated 'Fair Green Parade' sign has been relocated back to its current position on the main building as the previously proposed sign on top of the new floors was considered divorced from the street and less noticeable;
 - A lift has been incorporated into the proposal, concerns were raised by the Urban Design officer that residents would need to walk up four flights of stairs;
 - The deck has been widened to provide defensible space for the kitchen;
 - Remove covering over walkway to improve lighting, or include CCTV security element;
 - Duplex units are good, Unit 5 would be provided with a spacious double height living space;
 - The Urban Design officer commented that the proposal should have regard to the internal configuration as required by the Mayors housing SPG Standard 25 and its successor document 'Good Quality Homes for all Londoners'. Standard 25: "Dwelling plans should demonstrate that dwellings will accommodate the furniture, access and activity space requirements relating to the declared level of occupancy and the furniture schedule set out in Approved Document Part M".
 - Overall, the Urban Design officer is generally content with the amendments. Notably the 2 storey amendment and provision of duplex units. In the later amended proposal in January 2021, horizontality has been introduced in the materiality (which is later discussed) and internal layouts have been reconfigured to demonstrate the usability of the rooms.
- 5.10 Conservation officer – Supportive of the initial concerns raised by the Urban Design officer. E.g Not convinced about the wedge shape, (it would be better as a two storey addition set back from the ends). and about the position of the name sign not being re-positioned higher and the possibility of including lifts.
- 5.11 Transport officer –
 Car Parking: The proposed car parking spaces will be reduced from 13 to 10, this reduction is due to the communal facilities being proposed. These car spaces will not benefit the additional 9 units, there is no car parking provided for the proposed development. 2 disabled parking spaces are provided within the proposed 10 spaces one of which is capable of EVCP.

Permit free option would be acceptable subject to the applicant entering into a Unilateral Undertaking which would restrict future occupiers of the units from obtaining an on-street residential parking permit to park in the surrounding controlled parking zones to be secured by via S106 legal agreement.

Cycle: 18 spaces are provided for the 9 units, this satisfies the London Plan Standards.

Refuse: The refuse & recycling facilities are located within the courtyard with separate secured stores for both commercial and residents.

Gate: The gate should be sited 6m from back of footway to enable a car to stand without obstructing the footway.

Recommendation: The proposal is unlikely to have a significant impact on the adjoining highway network. No objections raised subject to the following conditions:

- Parking maintained.
- Cycle parking (secure & undercover) maintained.
- The applicant enters into a UU which would restrict future occupiers of the unit from obtaining an on-street residential parking permit to park in the surrounding CPZs to be secured via S106 legal agreement.
- Refuse - Standard Condition.
- 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.

5.12 Highways officer - Any security gates must be set back within the property to ensure that any vehicles entering do not block the public highway and should be suitably conditioned should the application be recommended for approval.

5.13 Climate Change – Following receipt of additional information requested by the Council’s Climate Change officer, they are satisfied that the the application meets adopted policies and a condition is recommended should the application be recommended for approval:

- The information provided shows a carbon saving of 64% improvement compared to part L of building regulations (using SAP10 calculations provided). A condition is recommended that is consistent with the emission saving evidenced by their calculations.
- The applicant has provided enough information to demonstrate that they have thought through, to some extent, the practical installation of air sourced heat pumps (ASHP).
- The water calculations provided show that average internal water consumption is below 105l/person/day.

5.14 Environmental Health – No overall objections but would recommend the inclusion of conditions to protect the future and existing residents in the area, including a construction method statement and noise survey including provision of details of appropriate remedial measures.

5.15 Waste services –

In mixed use developments, the Council requires separate waste arrangements for the domestic and commercial aspects. This has been carefully considered within the drawings/design and access statement.

Residential Waste - For the block of 29 units, the proposed bin capacities are sufficient for once a week refuse and recycling collection service. The applicant has provided 3x 1100L for refuse, 3x 1100L for mixed recycling and 1x 240L for food waste recycling consistent with the initial comments.

Refuse will only be collected by the collection crew if the storage area is within 10 distance from the collection vehicle.

Commercial waste - Arrangements are usually based on contract with service provider. Presentation policy should be part of the contract.

6. POLICY CONTEXT

6.1 NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework (2019):

- Part 5 Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- Part 6 Building a strong, competitive economy
- Part 7 Ensuring the vitality of town centres
- Part 8 Building a strong, competitive economy
- Part 9 Promoting sustainable transport
- Part 11 Making effective use of land
- Part 12 Achieving well-designed places
- Part 14 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

6.2 London Plan 2016:

Relevant policies include:

- 3.3 Increasing housing supply
- 3.4 Optimising housing potential
- 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
- 3.8 Housing choice
- 3.9 Mixed and balanced communities
- 4.7 Retail and town centre development
- 5.1 Climate change mitigation
- 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- 5.7 Renewable energy
- 5.10 Urban greening
- 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs
- 5.13 Sustainable drainage
- 5.14 Water quality and wastewater infrastructure
- 5.17 Waste Capacity
- 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
- 6.9 Cycling
- 6.11 Smoothing traffic flow and easing congestion
- 6.13 Parking
- 7.2 An Inclusive environment
- 7.3 Designing out crime
- 7.4 Local character
- 7.5 Public realm
- 7.6 Architecture
- 7.14 Improving air quality
- 7.15 Reducing and managing noise, improving and enhancing the acoustic environment and promoting appropriate soundscapes
- 8.2 Planning obligations
- 8.3 Community infrastructure levy

6.3 Merton Sites and Policies Plan July 2014 policies:

Relevant policies include:

- DM D1 Urban design and the public realm
- DM D2 Design considerations in all developments
- DM D3 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
- DM D4 Managing heritage assets
- DM D7 Shop front design and signage
- EM EP2 Reducing and mitigating noise
- DM EP4 Pollutants

DM F2 Sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) and; Wastewater and Water Infrastructure
DM H2 Housing mix
DM R1 Location and scale of development in Merton's town centres and neighbourhood parades
DM T1 Support for sustainable transport and active travel
DM T2 Transport impacts of development
DM T3 Car parking and servicing standards
DM T5 Access to road network

6.4 Merton Core Strategy 2011 policy:

Relevant policies include:

CS 2 Mitcham Town Centre
CS 8 Housing choice
CS 9 Housing provision
CS 14 Design
CS 15 Climate change
CS 17 Waste management
CS 18 Transport
CS 19 Public Transport
CS 20 Parking servicing and delivery

6.5 Supplementary planning documents

London Plan - Housing SPG 2016
London Plan - Affordable housing and viability SPG 2017
Mayor of London - Energy Planning Guidance 2020.

Technical Housing standards – Nationally described space standards 2015
Merton's Waste and Recycling Storage Requirements – For Commercial and Residential Premises in the London Borough of Merton

7. **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

7.1 The key planning considerations of the proposal are as follows:

- Principle of development and the delivery of housing.
- Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the area
- Impact on neighbouring amenity
- Standard of accommodation
- Transport, parking and cycle
- Refuse
- Sustainability
- Other matters

7.2 Principle of development

Need for additional housing

7.2.1 London Plan Policy 3.3 and the Council's Core Strategy Policy CS8 and CS9 all seek to increase sustainable housing provision and access to a mixture of dwelling types for the local community, providing that an acceptable standard of accommodation would be provided. Policy 3.3 of the London Plan 2016 also states that boroughs should seek to enable additional development capacity which includes intensification, developing at higher densities.

- 7.2.2 The National Planning Policy Framework sets out that planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions. Policies and decisions should (e) support opportunities to use the airspace above existing residential and commercial premises for new homes. In particular, they should allow upward extensions where the development would be consistent with the prevailing height and form of neighbouring properties and the overall street scene, is well-designed (including complying with any local design policies and standards), and can maintain safe access and egress for occupiers.
- 7.2.3 The site currently contains a three storey mixed use development within the heart of Mitcham Town Centre which currently provides 20 self-contained units and a variety of ground floor commercial units. The proposal would increase the housing provision through the construction of a roof extension to provide 9 additional homes. This is generally supported by policies seeking to encourage proposals for well-designed and conveniently located new housing that will create socially mixed and sustainable neighbourhoods through the effective use of space. Notwithstanding the need to carefully consider the design, impact toward neighbouring amenity, transport and other technical aspects of the proposal in more detail, officers consider that a more intensive residential development is in principle acceptable within this location.

Density and Housing mix

- 7.2.4 The proposed development would have a density of 179.9 dwellings per hectare (including the 20 flats already on the site).
- 7.2.5 This would be within the relevant density range (70-260 dwellings per hectare), as set out in Table 3.2 for the setting (Urban) and PTAL 4 in the London Plan.
- 7.2.6 In terms of housing mix, the proposed development would provide the following housing mix:

| Type | Number | Percentage |
|-------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 1b 2p | 2 | 22.2% |
| 2b3p /2b4p | 7 | 77.8% |

- 7.2.7 Policy 3.8 of the London Plan requires new developments to offer a genuine choice of homes that Londoners can afford and which meet their requirements for different sizes and types of dwellings in the highest quality environment. Merton's Policy DM H2 sets out that residential development proposals will be considered favourably where they contribute to meeting the needs of different households such as families with children, single person households and older people by providing a mix of dwelling sizes, taking account of the borough level indicative proportions concerning housing mix.
- 7.2.8 The supporting text Policy DM H2 explains that research in London and in Merton shows that there is an overwhelming need in London and in Merton for all types and sizes of new homes, which must be balanced against the need for supporting infrastructure. Assessment of historical provision in the borough indicates a disproportionately greater delivery of smaller homes compared to larger homes: 84% of dwellings completed in the borough between April 2000 and March 2011 consisted of 1 or 2 bedroom units.
- 7.2.9 In assessing development proposals the council will take account of Merton's Housing Strategy (2011-2015) borough level indicative proportions which are set out as follows:

| Number of bedrooms | Percentage of units |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| One | 33% |
| Two | 32% |
| Three + | 35% |

- 7.2.10 The borough level indicative proportions concerning housing mix will be applied having regard to relevant factors including individual site circumstances, site location, identified local needs, economics of provision such as financial viability and other planning contributions. Where a developer considers a site unsuitable to apply the borough level indicative housing mix, set out above, the developer will be responsible for demonstrating why this is the case.
- 7.2.11 It is noted that the proposals would deviate from the indicative housing mix set out in Policy DM H2 which envisages a broadly equal split between 1, 2 and 3 bedroom (and larger) units. This mix is informed by a number of factors, including Merton's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA 2010). Further work is currently being undertaken as part of the preparation of a new local plan, and in July 2019 a Strategic Housing Need Assessment (or Strategic Housing Market Assessment -SHMA) was newly published for Merton.
- 7.2.12 As set out in Table 2 of the SHMA 2019, the housing stock in Merton at June 2018 shows that Mitcham has the second highest percentage of 3 bedroom houses in the borough, which is higher than the borough average. And so, an assessment is required as to whether a focus on smaller units would be harmful to the area and whether by focusing on smaller units the development fulfils other planning objectives such as optimising housing output.
- 7.2.13 The site is within an area of high public transport accessibility, so attractive to those needing to regularly commute and can rely less on the ownership of cars. Furthermore, the site fronts a main road with the delivery of balcony terraces as the offer of external amenity which is not the expected garden size/location for a more traditional family household, accommodation for families are also more attractive with the provision of car parking facilities – there would be a restriction of parking permits in the new flats of this development (further discussed under section 7.6).
- 7.2.14 So, whilst the proposal of only smaller units would not strictly adhere to the indicative borough mix set out above, the proposed housing mix would in fact respond realistically to the characteristics of the site and its location whilst still promoting policy objectives of Policies 3.8 and 3.9 of the London Plan. Therefore, officers consider that the proposed housing mix would be acceptable in this instance.

7.3 Design and impact on character and appearance of the area

- 7.3.1 The NPPF states that developments should function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development. Developments should ensure that they are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character and history, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities).
- 7.3.2 Policies CS14, DMD1 & DMD2 require that new development reflect the best elements of the character of the surrounding area, or have sufficient distinctive merit so that the development would contribute positively to the character and appearance of the built

environment. Policy DM D2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan requires development to relate positively and appropriately to the siting, rhythm, scale, density, proportions, height, materials and massing of surrounding buildings and existing street patterns, historic context, urban layout and landscape features of the surrounding area and to use appropriate architectural forms, language, detailing and materials which complement and enhance the character of the wider setting. The requirement for good quality design is further supported by the London Plan London Plan Policies 7.4 and 7.6.

- 7.3.3 London Plan Policy 3.3 seeks to optimise housing output while design policies CS14, DMD1 and DMD2 seek to ensure that new development is compatible with the surrounding townscape. Mid-rise development such as is proposed provides a suitable melding of these two overarching policy objectives, and is an approach which has support from the Urban Design officer.

Design and materials

- 7.3.4 The most notable amendment of the scheme is its alteration from a part single part two storey 'wedge' shaped roof extension to a wholly two storey form. Responding to comments that the initial shape was considered 'alien' and had the effect of creating an exaggerated perspective making the higher part (corner) appear more prominent and unnecessarily tall. This did not relate well to the existing building. The extension being two storeys the entire length is considered appropriate.
- 7.3.5 The original cladding pattern and window arrangement further accentuated a sense of unnecessary height to the extension. The cladding system and long windows proposed ran through both storeys of the roof, predominantly without horizontal breaks. A horizontal break would help the extension to be read as two floors, so as not to overwhelm the main body of the building beneath with an overly tall top-heavy vertical bulk.
- 7.3.6 The amended cladding system shows an appropriate interest to the design with a series of vertical and horizontal panels which helps to show a differentiation and division between the roof levels. The windows have broken away from the tall vertical emphasis originally proposed, whilst still aligned with the main building, a horizontal accent is introduced to the window pattern through the use of continuous sills which help to identify the individual units. This approach has also been executed at the rear to ensure consistency.
- 7.3.7 The extension has also been amended to further increase its setbacks from the main building's frontages. This has resulted in the widening of the deck access at the rear and balcony spaces at the front, as well as removing the need to increase the height of the parapet division between itself and the adjoining building and retaining the existing parapet toward the southern end of the building – where the roof extension originally pierced this edge creating an abrupt break in the elevation and was considered disrespectful to the host building.
- 7.3.8 The extension appropriately sets itself away from the main building, respecting its mass and establishing itself as a secondary component which does not seek to overwhelm its lower half. And coupled with the number of details amended as described above, whilst it is an enlarged scheme from that originally submitted and reflects a more modern finish, it does not appear unduly dominant and comfortably sits within the roofscape.

Signage

- 7.3.9 The 'Fair Green Parade' sign was originally proposed to be relocated to the top of the new extension. However, this relocated position was considered somewhat divorced from the street and designed to be noticed from a distance which signals the promotion of height – especially with it being internally illuminated.
- 7.3.10 However, this junction of Mitcham Town Centre is not an area of high rise. The existing building looks out toward an open space and it has a relationship with street level activity and views. Therefore, the sign has been repositioned across the corner frontage of the existing building. An appropriate condition shall be attached requesting details and specification of the proposed signage to ensure there not be inappropriate light spill into the residential units and it would be of a complementary design.

Terrace/balcony areas

- 7.3.12 There would be no change to the existing front parapet of the main building, this has a height of 0.9m. A 1.1m secondary parapet/ balustrade has been introduced setback from the existing parapet to provide safety. As mentioned in paragraph 7.3.7, the roof extension has been amended to increase its setback from the existing building's frontages. Therefore, the balconies provide an increased depth of 1.6m depth (1.5m being the minimum depth as set out in the London Housing SPG).

Security considerations

- 7.3.13 Notable improvements the amendments deliver in terms of security:
- Widened deck access allows for the provision of defensible space in front of the kitchen windows but also allows sufficient width for wheel chair movement, a better balance between security and natural surveillance;
 - The canopies over the rear deck access would be clear glazed rather than solid, providing shelter but also increased light, minimizing hidden/dark spaces and increasing natural surveillance. CCTV cameras would also be introduced;
 - New 2.3m security gates installed at the entrance from Raleigh Gardens. The Secure by Design officer has commented that the installation of new gates would be of great benefit to help prevent the issue of rough sleeping.
- 7.3.14 The existing building is of a good quality and has a positive architectural and built presence in the Fair Green, any proposal to extend this building upwards need to be carried out sensitively and finished to a high quality. Overall, it is considered that the applicant has continually responded to officers and consultees' comments and worked proactively with the LPA to achieve a design which appears seemingly simple in its design and form, but well-considered in its details externally and internally. It introduces a modern yet sensitive extension to respect the host building and preserves and enhances views from the Fair Green as well as views from the surrounding streetscene.
- 7.3.15 The selection of high quality finishing materials are integral to the design of the extension, therefore a condition shall be attached requiring details and samples of the materials to be submitted to the Council for approval.

7.4 Neighbouring amenity

- 7.4.1 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.
- 7.4.2 The proposed roof extension would not project beyond the existing footprint of the flats below, for this reason, it is not considered there would be materially harmful impact to

the outlook of the existing residential units on the site. It is acknowledged that there would be some very slight reduction in daylight and sunlight (toward the rear elevation) at certain points of the day, but this would be limited and not considered to be so materially harmful as to warrant refusal.

7.4.3 Due to the separation distances to other nearby residential properties, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in material harm to the amenities of these neighbours. From the northern (rear) elevation of Eldacrest House, there would be a separation distance of around 24m from the proposed extension, and approximately 30m from their eastern (side) elevation. Standor House is separated from the application site by Raleigh Gardens, which provides a separation gap of approximately 14m, and a separation of approximately 24m from the properties along London Road.

7.4.4 The adjoining building 13-15 Upper Green West presents a large unused flat roof top, but toward the rear of their main three storey building is an area of amenity space on the first floor. However, the roof extension has been designed to set itself back from the shared boundary and set in from the rear building line (around 0.8m), so whilst the extension would be visible from the amenity areas, any potential experience of overshadowing would not be considered overwhelming, these amenity areas also benefit from an unobstructed southern aspect.

7.5 Standard of accommodation

Internal

7.5.1 Policy 3.5 of the London Plan 2016 requires housing development to be of the highest quality internally and externally, and should satisfy the minimum internal space standards (specified as Gross Internal Areas –GIA) as set out in Table 3.3 of the London Plan. Table 3.3 provides comprehensive detail of minimum space standards for new development; which the proposal would be expected to comply with. Policy DMD2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan (2014) also states that developments should provide suitable levels of sunlight and daylight and quality of living conditions for future occupants.

| | Type | Storeys | Proposed GIA (sqm) | Required GIA (sqm) | Compliant |
|--------|------|---------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| Unit 1 | 2b3p | 2 | 73.1 | 70 | Yes |
| Unit 2 | 1b2p | 2 | 65.37 | 58 | Yes |
| Unit 3 | 2b3p | 2 | 74.18 | 70 | Yes |
| Unit 4 | 2b3p | 2 | 73.04 | 70 | Yes |
| Unit 5 | 2b4p | 2 | 120.27 | 79 | Yes |
| Unit 6 | 2b3p | 2 | 73.08 | 70 | Yes |
| Unit 7 | 2b3p | 2 | 73.04 | 70 | Yes |
| Unit 8 | 2b3p | 2 | 70 | 70 | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|--------|------|---|-------|----|-----|
| Unit 9 | 1b2p | 2 | 62.16 | 58 | Yes |
|--------|------|---|-------|----|-----|

7.5.2 As demonstrated by the table above, all the units would comply with the minimum space standards.

7.5.3 The design achieves dual aspects for all the residential units, and noting the amendment of the design from a part single part two storey roof extension to being wholly two storeys, all units would be duplex which is considered a very comfortable and flexible offer of internal living accommodation. Noting especially Unit 5 with the offer of a double height living area.

Affordable Housing

7.5.4 The scheme is for 9 flats and therefore just falls below the affordable housing threshold. However the units are of a size that could enable their division without there being any changes to the bulk and massing of the extension tipping the scheme over the affordable housing threshold.

7.5.5 It would be prudent to anticipate any potential subsequent application during the latter stage of implementation, which on its own would not necessarily trigger consideration of the viability of the scheme, and whether it could deliver affordable housing on or off site (a financial contribution). Given the floorspace of the proposed development could readily deliver 10 dwellings, a suitably drafted S106 agreement is recommended. This should require that any application proposing additional units within the building envelope or added to it and submitted within a period of two years from substantial completion of the current scheme, should provide a full viability assessment including financial inputs derived from the known costs of constructing the development, rather than from predicated costs, with the objective of delivering where possible on or off site contributions towards affordable housing.

External

7.5.6 For flatted dwellings, a minimum of 5sqm of private outdoor space should be provided for 1-2 person flatted dwellings, specified in the Mayor's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance, and an extra 1 sqm should be provided for each additional occupant.

| | Type | Proposed amenity (sqm) | Required amenity (sqm) | Compliant |
|--------|------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------|
| Unit 1 | 2b3p | 17.52 | 6 | Yes |
| Unit 2 | 1b2p | 10.04 | 5 | Yes |
| Unit 3 | 2b3p | 11.42 | 6 | Yes |
| Unit 4 | 2b3p | 10.67 | 6 | Yes |
| Unit 5 | 2b4p | 26.51 | 7 | Yes |
| Unit 6 | 2b3p | 10.52 | 6 | Yes |
| Unit 7 | 2b3p | 10.53 | 6 | Yes |
| Unit 8 | 2b3p | 10.06 | 6 | Yes |
| Unit 9 | 1b2p | 18.22 | 5 | Yes |

7.5.7 As demonstrated by the table above, all the units would provide sufficient external amenity areas.

7.5.8 The introduction of the lift is a welcome addition and increases the accessibility of the development.

7.6 Transport, parking and cycle storage

7.6.1 Core Strategy Policy CS20 requires that development would not adversely affect pedestrian or cycle movements, safety, the convenience of local residents, street parking or traffic management. Cycle storage is required for all new development in accordance with London Plan Policy 6.9 and Core Strategy Policy CS18. It should be secure, sheltered and adequately lit and Table 6.3 under Policy 6.13 of the London Plan stipulates that 1 cycle parking space should be provided for a studio/1 bedroom unit and 2 spaces for all other dwellings.

7.6.2 The site is located in an area with a PTAL of 4 which is very good being well located to all the services and facilities afforded by the district centre.

7.6.3 The Council's Transport officer has been consulted and raises no issues in relation to parking. The new flats would not be provided with dedicated parking spaces but it is considered a permit free option would be acceptable subject to the applicant entering into a Unilateral Undertaking which would restrict future occupiers of the units from obtaining an on-street residential parking permit to park in the surrounding controlled parking zones. This shall be secured via a S106 legal agreement, this arrangement has been agreed by the applicant.

7.6.4 In relation to the cycle parking, 18 spaces are provided for the nine residential units which satisfies the London Plan Standards.

7.6.5 The security gate provided should be set back 6m from back of footway to enable a vehicle to safely approach the site and to be able to wait outside the gates without conflict with pedestrian or highway safety. The positioning of the gates has been amended and retained in their existing location to satisfy the Transport officer's observation.

7.6.6 Overall, the Transport officer considers that proposal would unlikely have a significant impact on the adjoining highway network and raises no objection subject to the attachment of appropriate conditions.

7.7 Refuse

7.7.1 The London Plan Policy 5.17 and Merton Core Strategy Policy CS17 require new developments to show capacity to provide waste and recycling storage facilities.

7.7.2 The Council's Waste Services team were consulted on the original and amended refuse strategy for the proposal. They have commented that for mixed use developments, LBM policy states that separate waste management arrangements are required for the domestic and commercial aspects, and this has been carefully considered within the proposal.

7.7.3 The new communal residential refuse store area would provide 3x 1100L for refuse, 3x 1100L for mixed recycling and 1x 240L for food waste recycling. This is considered sufficient for the whole block of 29 flats (existing and proposed). The refuse area would be within 10m pull distance from the collection vehicle on the highway which would be satisfactory for the collection crew.

- 7.7.4 For commercial refuse, arrangements are usually based on contract with service provider, and a presentation policy should be part of the contract. However, the plans do show a collection point for the commercial refuse which would be within 6m from the highway for visible presentation and collection.
- 7.7.5 The Secure by design officer initially raised concerns that the refuse bins were located directly in front of the pedestrian gate which would force pedestrians onto the vehicle carriage way. The amended location of the bins would be positioned away the pedestrian route leaving it clear of obstruction.
- 7.7.6 The amended location of the commercial refuse and cycle store areas would be positioned underneath the existing podium roof of Eldacrest House. Therefore, a condition shall be included requesting details of a lighting scheme for this area.
- 7.7.7 Overall, the refuse arrangement is considered acceptable.

7.8 Sustainability

- 7.8.1 All new developments comprising the creation of new dwellings should demonstrate how the development will comply with Merton's Core Planning Strategy (2011) Policy CS15 Climate Change (parts a-d) and the policies outlined in Chapter 5 of the London Plan (2016). As a minor development proposal, the development is required as a minimum to achieve a 19% improvement on Part L of the Building Regulations 2013 and water consumption should not exceed 105 litres/person/day.
- 7.8.2 The additional information provided by the applicant has been reviewed by the Council's Climate Change officer, and they confirm the following:
- The information provided shows a carbon saving of 64% improvement compared to part L of building regulations (using SAP10 calculations provided).
 - The applicant has provided enough information to demonstrate that they have thought through, to some extent, the practical installation of air sourced heat pumps (ASHP).
 - The water calculations provided show that average internal water consumption is below 105l/person/day.
- 7.8.3 The information provided shows that the application will meet Merton's policies, and as suggested by the Climate Change officer, a condition shall be attached to any grant of permission which is consistent with the calculations submitted.
- 7.8.4 The London Plan contains a range of energy policies that new major developments are required to comply with. This includes a net zero carbon target for major residential developments, which has applied since October 2016. The target requires a minimum on-site carbon reduction to be achieved and allows for any carbon shortfall to be paid as a cash-in-lieu contribution into the relevant local authority's carbon offset fund. The new draft London Plan includes a new recommended carbon offset price of £95 per tonne which was tested as part of the plan's viability assessment. So as to avoid assessment of further proposals (i.e brought forward at a later stage in the implementation process, or within two years of substantial completion of the development), that increased the overall number of dwellings to 10 or more as a result of either division of consented units or by enlargement of the envelope of the extension, being treated individually rather than as part of what would essentially be a major development, it may be prudent to require a review of the sustainability credentials of

the building as measured against targets for the overall development as a major development. A suitably drafted S106 agreement would enable the Council to assess whether changes to the scheme as a whole warranted carbon offset payments and for it to secure such payments.

8. CONCLUSION

8.1 The National Planning Policy Framework has at its heart a planning system that is geared towards delivering sustainable development. This is achieved through pursuing three overarching objectives economic, social and environmental. The proposals:

- Support the economy by facilitating construction activity and increasing footfall directly into the town centre,
- Support social objectives by providing much needed housing and
- Support environmental objectives by delivering arguably well designed housing in a highly accessible location in the heart of a town centre, where reliance on car use can be relaxed and where the fabric and functioning of the new dwellings is such that it reduces its carbon footprint and does not place an unnecessary burden on other resources including water usage.

The Framework has an underlying presumption of supporting sustainable development and it may reasonably be asserted that the application delivers this.

8.2 The proposed roof extension is an opportunity for appropriate intensification of the site in the heart of Mitcham Town Centre. Officers consider the upward extension has been carefully considered in its context and that it would not increase the building's height such that it might appear to detract from or dwarf the main building or appear unduly dominant with those surrounding. The details and appearance of the extension have been well-considered and would positively contribute a modern addition to Mitcham Town Centre.

8.3 The nine additional residential units would provide a good level of internal and external living accommodation, and the extension would not prejudice the amenity of existing neighbouring occupiers. The scheme also provides the opportunity to redevelop the courtyard which currently is in a neglected state with issues of overflowing rubbish and rough sleeping. The scheme has considered the provision of shared facilities, including cycle parking, car parking for disabled users and refuse/recycling storage, for the benefit of the existing and future residents.

8.4 Therefore, it is recommended that planning permission is granted subject to conditions and S106 agreement requiring: the development to be permit free, and in the scenario where additional units are proposed within the building envelope (i.e. division of the consented units) or added to it (i.e. enlargement of the envelope of the extension) and submitted at a later stage /within a period of two years from substantial completion of the current scheme which increases the over number of dwellings to 10 or more, the requirement of a full viability review and assessment of whether the scheme as a whole would warrant carbon offset payments.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to the completion of a S106 agreement to deliver the following:

- Restrictions on parking permit eligibility.

And the following conditions:

1. A1 Commencement of Development
2. A7 Approved Plans
3. B1 External Materials to be approved – No development shall take place until details of particulars and samples of the materials to be used on all external faces of the development hereby permitted, including the external cladding material, window frames, doors and canopy over the external walkway (notwithstanding any materials specified in the application form and/or the approved drawings), have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. No works which are the subject of this condition shall be carried out until the details are approved, and the development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS14 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and D3 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.
4. B5 Details of Gate – No development shall be occupied until details of the new security gates are submitted in writing for approval to the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied / the use of the development hereby approved shall not commence until the details are approved and works to which this condition relates have been carried out in accordance with the approved details. The gates shall be permanently retained thereafter.
Reason: To ensure a satisfactory and safe development in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies 7.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS14 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D1, D2 and T5 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.
5. C07 Refuse & Recycling (implementation) – The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the refuse and recycling storage facilities shown on the approved plans have been fully implemented and made available for use. These facilities shall thereafter be retained for use at all times.
6. C08 No Use of Flat Roof – Access to the flat roof of the development hereby permitted shall be for maintenance or emergency purposes only, and the flat roof shall not be used as a roof garden, terrace, patio or similar amenity area.
7. C09 Balcony/Terrace – Details of the division/screening between the terraces and any safety rails or balustrade for the terraces shall be submitted to the Local Authority for approval prior to occupation of the development. Approved details of the division/screening to the terraces shall be implemented before the development is first occupied and retained permanently thereafter.
8. Non-standard condition (lighting) – Details of a lighting scheme for the cycle and commercial refuse area shall be submitted to the LPA for approval prior to occupation of the development.
Reason: To ensure a safe and secure environment for the users, and to ensure compliance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies DM D2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

9. Non-standard condition (signage details and lighting) – Details of the new external signage with specification details of its illuminance levels shall be submitted to the LPA for approval prior to the commencement of the development.
Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development, to safeguard the amenities of the area and the occupiers of neighbouring properties and in the interests of highway safety. To ensure compliance with the following: policies DM D2, DM D5 and DM EP4 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.
10. D11 Construction Times – No demolition or construction work or ancillary activities such as deliveries shall take place before 8am or after 6pm Mondays - Fridays inclusive, before 8am or after 1pm on Saturdays or at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.
11. H07 Cycle Parking to be implemented – The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the residential cycle parking shown on the plans hereby approved has been provided and made available for use. These facilities shall be retained for the occupants of and visitors to the development at all times.
12. H04 Provision of Vehicle Parking – The vehicle parking area shown on the approved plans shall be provided before the commencement of the use of the approved development, and shall be retained for parking purposes for the existing eligible occupiers and users of the development and for no other purpose.
Reason: To ensure the provision of a satisfactory level of parking and comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 6.13 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM T3 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.
13. H9 Construction Vehicles – The development shall not commence until details of the provision to accommodate all site workers', visitors' and construction vehicles and loading /unloading arrangements during the construction process have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details must be implemented and complied with for the duration of the construction process.
Reason: 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 2016, policy CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM T2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.
14. H10 Construction Vehicles, Washdown Facilities etc. – No development shall take place until a 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 demolition and construction period.
The Statement shall provide for (where appropriate):
- hours of operation
 - 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
 - the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative -displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate
 - wheel washing facilities
 - measures to control the emission of noise and vibration during construction.
 - measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction/demolition
 - a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works

Reason: 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 2016, policy CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM T2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

15. H12 Delivery and Servicing Plan to be submitted – Development shall not commence until a Delivery and Servicing Plan (the Plan) has been submitted in writing for approval to the Local Planning Authority. No occupation of the development shall be permitted until the Plan is approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and implemented in accordance with the approved plan. The approved measures shall be maintained, in accordance with the Plan, for the duration of the use, unless the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority is obtained to any variation.

Reason: 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 2016, policy CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM T2, T3 and T5 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

16. H13 Demolition/Construction Logistics Plan – Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a Demolition/Construction Logistics Plan (including a Construction Management plan in accordance with TfL guidance) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the demolition and construction period unless the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority is first obtained to any variation.

Reason: 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 2016, policy CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM T2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

17. Non-standard condition (sustainability) – 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 in accordance with submitted documents “Energy & Sustainability Statement dated 23/06/2020 V2 prepared by eb7, and “Energy Consumption and Emissions Analysis” (of not less than a 64% improvement on Part L regulations 2013 using SAP10 values) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, 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.

18. Non-standard condition (Noise) – Due to the potential impact of the surrounding locality on the development a noise survey is to be undertaken by a competent acoustic consultant having regard to all relevant planning guidance, codes of practice and British Standards for the investigation of noise and residential noise acceptability standards. The survey shall include recommendations and appropriate remedial measures, including a scheme for protecting residents from noise. The scheme shall include methods of ventilation and actions to minimise the impact of the surrounding locality on the development, acoustic data for the glazing

system and ventilation system. The internal noise levels shall meet those within BS8233:2014 Guidance on Sound Insulation and Noise Reduction for Buildings and ProPG: Planning and Noise – Professional Practice Guide, Publ: (ANC, IOA, CIEH) May 2017 as a minimum. The scheme shall be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development, and the approved recommendations shall be implemented prior to first occupation.

Reason: To protect the amenities of future occupiers and those in the local vicinity.

Informatives

1. INF 01 Party Walls Act
2. INF 09 Works on the Public Highway
3. INF 12 Works affecting the public highway
4. INF 15 Discharge conditions prior to commencement of work
5. INF 20 Street naming and numbering
6. INF Sustainability
7. Note to Applicant – approved schemes

This page is intentionally left blank