

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
29th June 2021

| <u>UPRN</u> | <u>APPLICATION NO.</u> | <u>DATE VALID</u> |
|-------------------------|--|-------------------|
| | 21/P0380 | 08/02/2021 |
| Address/Site: | The Pavilions (17-40 Greenview Drive) Raynes Park SW20 9DS | |
| Ward: | West Barnes | |
| Proposal: | APPLICATION TO DETERMINE WHETHER PRIOR APPROVAL IS REQUIRED IN RESPECT OF THE PROPOSED ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY ROOF EXTENSION TO PROVIDE 10 X SELF CONTAINED FLATS, WITH ASSOCIATED CAR AND CYCLE PARKING AND REFUSE PROVISION (AMENDED). | |
| Drawing No.'s: | WP-0748-A-0050-P-00; WP-0748-A-0100-P-00 Rev B; WP-0748-A-0200-E-XX Rev C; WP-0748-A-0201-E-XX Rev C. | |
| Documents: | Daylight & Sunlight Report (ref 4655) dated 20 January 2021; Flood Risk Assessment & Surface Water Drainage Strategy #5921 (ref 5921_FRA_SWDS); Transport Technical Note (ref 205694/N01) dated January 2021. | |
| Contact Officer: | Catarina Cheung (020 8545 4747) | |

RECOMMENDATION

Grant prior approval subject to conditions.

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- Heads of Agreement:
- Is a screening opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental Statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Statement been submitted: No
- Press notice: No
- Site notice: Yes
- Design Review Panel consulted: No
- Number of neighbours consulted: 50
- External consultations: Yes
- Controlled Parking Zone: No
- Archaeological Zone: No
- Conservation Area: No
- Flood Zone: 2 and 3

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is being brought to the Planning Applications Committee for determination due to the number of objections received.
- 1.2 This is a prior approval application submitted under The Town and Country Planning (Permitted Development and Miscellaneous Amendments) (England) (Coronavirus) Regulations 2020, Schedule 2, Part 20, Class A, **New dwellings on detached blocks of flat**: Development consisting of works for the construction of up to two additional storeys of new dwellinghouses immediately above the existing topmost residential storey on a building which is a purpose-built, detached block of flats.
- 1.3 Therefore, the only issues that can form material considerations are as follows:
- (a) transport and highways impacts of the development;
 - (b) air traffic and defence asset impacts of the development;
 - (c) contamination risks in relation to the building;
 - (d) flooding risks in relation to the building;
 - (e) the external appearance of the building;
 - (f) the provision of adequate natural light in all habitable rooms of the new dwellinghouses;
 - (g) impact on the amenity of the existing building and neighbouring premises including overlooking, privacy and the loss of light;
 - (h) whether because of the siting of the building, the development will impact on a protected view identified in the Directions Relating to Protected Vistas dated 15 March 2012 issued by the Secretary of State, and
 - (i) where the existing building is 18 metres or more in height, the fire safety of the external wall construction of the existing building.

1.4 The assessment against these criteria is set out later in this report.

2. **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 The buildings within Greenview Drive were constructed under outline planning permission ref. 05/P2802 and reserved matters approval ref. 07/P3679.
- 2.2 The development, known as The Pavilions, consists of 2 detached blocks and 10 townhouses. The north-eastern block contains 16 flats and south-western block (facing toward the Alliance Sports Ground), contains 24 flats. The blocks have 4 storeys and a maximum height of 11.7m.
- 2.3 This application concerns the south-western block, no development is proposed to the north-eastern block or townhouses.
- 2.4 The site is located south of Bushey Road and to the west of Fairway.
- 2.5 At the centre of the development is a grassed area, 2 private access roads are provided within the development with 2 parking courts – one toward the eastern side and one between the 2 detached blocks. The townhouses are provided with a front off-street parking space.
- 2.6 The buildings are finished with yellow brick with white render across the ground floor level.
- 2.7 Existing cycle and bin stores, for the flats, are provided toward the northern boundary.
- 2.8 Adjoining south-west of the application site is the Alliance Sports Ground, this is a designated Open Space and Green Corridor. Other than this green space, the

surrounding area is predominantly residential. Fairway (east/south east) and Bushey Road (north east) comprises 2 storey 1930s terrace and semi-detached dwellings. Bushey Court (north) is a 4 storey 1950s flatted blocks.

- 2.9 The site is not located within a Conservation area nor are the buildings listed.
- 2.10 The site is not located within an Archaeological Priority area.
- 2.11 The site is located within a Flood risk area, Zone 2 and 3.
- 2.12 The site has a PTAL of 4 and is not located within a Controlled Parking Zone.

3. PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The application proposes a 2 storey roof extension to provide a further 10 residential dwellings:
 - 2x 1bed 2 person flat (47sqm and 49sqm)
 - 5x 2bed 3 person flat (66sqm and 67sqm)
 - 1x 3bed 5 person flat (85sqm)
 - 2x 2bed 4 person flat (70sqm)
- 3.2 All units would have access to private external amenity, in the form of balconies/roof terraces.
- 3.3 The proposed fourth storey of the building would be finished in yellow brick, with white framed windows and metal balconies to match the existing. The setback roof level would be metal clad in a grey colour with grey aluminium windows and doors.
- 3.4 The new maximum height of the building would be 17.7m.
- 3.5 12 additional car parking spaces shall be provided, an extension to the eastern parking court will be provided to accommodate these spaces. 24 cycle parking spaces proposed (22 long-stay and 2 short-stay), these shall be provided within a bike store positioned adjacent to the existing (northern) bike and bin store.
- 3.6 The existing bin stores will be extended to accommodate refuse provision for the additional units.
- 3.7 Pedestrian and vehicular access to the site will be maintained as per the existing arrangement from Fairway.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.2 Relevant applications in relation to the housing development
11/P2084: PROVISION OF ACCESS GATES OF SITE ENTRANCE AND SCREENS AND FENCING – Refused 10/10/2011

Reason - The proposed access gates would unnecessarily deter and restrict members of the public and vehicles from entering the development, which forms a residential extension to the surrounding residential street network, to the detriment of achieving good urban design and an appropriately accessible built environment, and would be contrary to the objectives of policy 7.3 of the

London Plan (2011) CS14 of the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011) and policy BE16 of the Merton Unitary Development Plan (2003).

- 4.3 09/P1391: CONSTRUCTION OF AN ADDITIONAL FIFTH STOREY TO THE PREVIOUSLY APPROVED BLOCK OF FLATS [UNDER REF 07/P3679] TO THE SOUTH WEST CORNER OF THE SITE ADJACENT TO BUSHEY ROAD TO PROVIDE 2 X 1 BED, 3 X 2 BED AND 1 X 3 BED FLATS. – Refused 01/02/2010. Appeal lodged and dismissed 31/08/2010.

Reason - The proposed development, by reason of its height, bulk, orientation and design would - (a) be too large for the site and would fail to respect the scale and height of (proposed) surrounding buildings; and (b) result in an unneighbourly development by reason of visual intrusion, overlooking and an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbours, especially the occupiers of the (proposed) nearby new town houses. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies BE.22 and BE.25 of the Adopted Merton Unitary Development Plan (October 2003).

- 4.4 07/P3679: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AND DEVELOPMENT OF NORTHERN PART OF SITE (LAND BETWEEN THE REAR OF 5 TO 15 FAIRWAY AND BUSHEY ROAD) FOR 50 RESIDENTIAL UNITS COMPRISING FLATS AND HOUSES.

APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS (LAYOUT, SCALE, APPEARANCE AND LANDSCAPING) FOLLOWING THE GRANT OF OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION REF 05/P2802. – Reserved matters approved 09/05/2008

- 4.5 05/P2802: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AND DEVELOPMENT OF NORTHERN PART OF SITE (LAND BETWEEN THE REAR OF 5 TO 15 FAIRWAY AND BUSHEY ROAD) FOR 50 RESIDENTIAL UNITS COMPRISING 40 FLATS AND 10 TOWN HOUSES, LANDSCAPING AND PROVISION OF 55 CAR PARKING SPACE WITH VEHICLE ACCESS FROM FAIRWAY. APPLICATION FOR OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION WITH ACCESS ONLY TO BE DETERMINED AT THIS STAGE.

ILLUSTRATIVE PLANS SHOW 3 DIFFERENT OPTIONS FOR A POSSIBLE LAYOUT. EACH OPTION INCLUDES 4 STOREY BLOCKS OF FLATS AND HOUSING WITH THREE FLOORS OF LIVING ACCOMMODATION OVER GARAGES. – Outline planning permission refused at PAC 05/10/2006 (reason provided below). But an appeal was lodged against the LPA's refusal and the appeal was allowed 04/04/2007.

Reason - The applicant has failed to demonstrate that, in consulting with the Local community regarding the proposals, as required by PPG 17 (para.10) Planning for Open Space, Sport & Recreation, there is widespread support for the proposed access arrangements. The proposed access arrangements would give rise to unacceptable levels of traffic movement prejudicial to existing highway and pedestrian safety to the detriment of neighbouring residential amenity contrary to policy LU.3 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (2003).

- 4.6 02/P2681: REDEVELOPMENT OF PART OF SPORTS GROUND (1.76 HA) TO PROVIDE 69 DWELLINGS, TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING AND CAR PARKING, VEHICULAR ACCESS OFF FAIRWAY AND ENHANCEMENT OF

REMAINING OPEN SPACE (OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION) – Outline planning permission refused 16/01/2004

Reason 1 - The proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of open space, and represents an inappropriate development on a greenfield site, contrary to policies L.5 (Urban Green Space), ST.19 (Natural Environment), HP.1 (Housing Target) and ST.12 (Development on Previously Developed Land) of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (October 2003) and PPG3.

Reason 2 - The proposal would result in the irretrievable loss of a substantial proportion of the existing sports and recreational facilities with insufficient compensatory sports and recreational benefits, contrary to policies ST.24 (Leisure and Recreation, Arts and Culture) and L.7 (Recreational Open Space) of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (October 2003) and PPG17.

Reason 3 - The siting and layout of proposed dwellings would result in an unacceptable form of development which fails to reflect locally distinct patterns of development or provide convenient pedestrian and cycle routes, to contrary to policy BE.16 (Urban Design) of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (October 2003).

Related applications (Sun Alliance Sports Club):

- 4.7 12/P1185: APPLICATION FOR NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENTS TO LBM PLANNING PERMISSION 09/P0868 (DATED 13/08/2009) INVOLVING ALTERATIONS FROM PERFORATED TO WELD MESH ON ALL SECURITY SHUTTERS, ADDITIONAL VENTILATION LOUVRE AND RAIN WATER PIPES TO FRONT ELEVATION, INSTALLATION OF AIR SOURCE HEAT PUMP TO SIDE ELEVATION AND INSTALLATION OF SOLAR PANELS TO ROOF. – Granted 27/07/2012
- 4.8 11/P1516: APPLICATION FOR DISCHARGE OF CONDITIONS 8 [LANDSCAPING], 26 [CO2 EMISSIONS] AND 29 [SURFACE WATER] ATTACHED TO LBM PLANNING PERMISSION 09/P0868 (DATED 13/08/2009) – Granted 22/08/2011
- 4.9 11/P1419: APPLICATION FOR DISCHARGE OF CONDITION NO. 16, (FACILITIES FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES) NO. 18 (NOISE) AND NO. 27 (BAT AND TREE SURVEY) ATTACHED TO LBM PLANNING APPLICATION 09/P0868 DATED 13/08/2009 – Granted 14/10/2011
- 4.10 11/P0581: APPLICATION FOR NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENTS TO LBM PLANNING PERMISSION 09/P0868 (DATED 13/08/2009) INVOLVING THE REMOVAL OF STEPS FROM PLAYING FIELD SIDE OF PAVILLION, CHANGE OF 3 x SLIDING/FOLDING SECURITY SCREENS TO FIXED SCREENS AND ADDITION OF 1 x NEW SLIDING/FOLDING SECURITY SCREEN TO NORTH ELEVATION. – Non-material amendment granted 18/04/2011
- 4.11 11/P0364: APPLICATION FOR DISCHARGE OF CONDITION 14 (ARCHAEOLOGICAL WORK) ATTACHED TO LBM APPLICATION 09/P0868 DATED 13/08/2009 – Granted 12/05/2011
- 4.12 09/P0868: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DISUSED BUILDING PROVIDING SQUASH COURTS AND REMOVAL OF EXISTING CONCRETE AND TARMAC HARDSTANDING AND CLUB HOUSE FOUNDATIONS WITH THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE STOREY PAVILION BUILDING PARALLEL WITH BARNSCROFT AND WESTWAY CLOSE PROVIDING CHANGING FACILITIES

STORAGE, OFFICE AND SOCIAL AREA AND KITCHEN WITH PEDESTRIAN AND VEHICLE ACCESS FROM WESTWAY CLOSE WITH 8 CAR PARKING SPACES AND 12 CYCLE SPACES , IMPROVEMENTS TO DRAINAGE AND NEW PROTECTIVE FENCE TO THE REAR OF PROPERTIES IN LINKWAY – Granted at PAC 26/08/2009

- 4.13 01/P1198: APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS IN RESPECT OF THE PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF THE GROUNDSMAN'S BUNGALOW – Certificate of lawfulness issued 22/06/2001 (the Bungalow was located in the land now occupied by the Pavilions development)
- 4.14 Various historic decisions pertaining to the sports club use.

5. CONSULTATION

External

- 5.1 21-day site notice procedure and individual letters to neighbouring occupiers.
- 5.2 1 comment received from the Wimbledon Swift Group. They neither support nor oppose the application but wish to raise awareness of declining local swifts and how the building project presents a golden opportunity to help local swifts through the inclusion of artificial nest sites (i.e. swift bricks or boxes) into the new construction.
- 5.3 Objections have been received from 66 address points (100 individuals). Concerns raised summarised below:

Consultation and planning process

- The proposal is being slipped through the system while the country is in national lockdown, concerned residents could not hold meetings/gather to discuss the proposal;
- Neither the developer nor the borough have directly informed the household about the proposals;
- The developer is attempting to create additions (12 new apartments) asserting that planning permission is not required. This cannot be correct and cannot be within the spirit of what recent changes to legislation are intended to achieve;
- The failure of the developer to engage with local residents and the insensitive nature of their proposals suggest they are out of step with the real needs of local residents, solely interested in lining their pockets.

Character and appearance

- Negative impact on the development, the Pavilions were intentionally designed as a trio of sibling buildings with the same height. significant alteration to one building would comprise the entire development;
- We all have a responsibility to preserve the character of Raynes Park, as a liveable, breathable suburb. That means not allowing the prevailing low-rise design of Raynes Park buildings to be compromised;
- Protect human scale in residential architecture;
- Too large and fail to respect the surrounding neighbours;
- Dwarf the neighbouring buildings;
- Look out of place and not blend with neighbourhood;
- Adding further storeys would take away the development's symmetry;
- Existing properties are already visually obtrusive, adding a further 2 storeys would increase visual impact and is unacceptable;

- Cladding will reflect sun and will not be in keeping with the existing brick construction – reflected light from metal roofing could have negative impact on neighbouring buildings, residents and the A3;
- Visually an eyesore;
- The scheme would not enhance the overall design quality of the borough. The current buildings are built from a hideous diarrhoea yellow atypical to the whole of London, let alone Merton – its original approval demonstrates a total lack of respect for quality buildings and basic good design aesthetic. The local area is typified by a red brindle brick, so the addition of yet more awful brick would not respect the local environment;
- Proposed eaves are of poor design, heavy, overhanging, cumbersome fascia board. The Planning department should not add insult to injury in allowing any extension to this unattractive building;
- In 2009, prior to the construction of a block, an application to add an additional 5th floor was rejected by the Council due to: height, bulk, orientation and design (09/P1391). While the law has changed regarding permitted development rights, the Council's position on these core views have not. 2 further storeys will cause greater harm;
- The scheme detrimentally affects the skyline of adjacent properties and the local area;
- The visible skyline for properties in Fairway will be drastically reduced to an intolerable level, the sky will not be visible above the proposed scheme when stood by the windows;
- No attempt to disguise the apparent height of the extension;
- Scheme does not emphasise a point of civic or visual significance, or a centre of urban activity or regeneration;
- Scheme not of outstanding architectural merit, in fact has zero architectural merit whether considered from a traditional, Modernist or contemporary perspective;
- No similar high rise developments (6 storeys) in the area;
- Existing development has a balance of open space verses built up area;
- Developer is not allowed to have visible pipework structures externally. Only way to run pipework would be through the existing top floor flats, which will not be granted, so the pipework would have to run externally – this would not be covered by permitted development rights;
- The proposal runs contrary to Merton's design policies for Tall Buildings (Tall Buildings Background Paper 2010);
- Scheme would be in direct contradiction to Policy CS14-c and CS14-d.

Condition of existing structure /flooding issues

- State of pavement within the development is a clear indicator of the presence of water underneath the ground;
- Entire area is in a flood plain and adding significant weight and bulk to the foundation of the building, intended for a low-rise building, is patently irresponsible;
- Proposed development will be at the upper levels so shall not be affected by surface water flooding, however, access/egress could be affected by flooding of up to between 300mm and 600mm;
- Existing building sways in high winds and sensitive to heavy arterial traffic;
- Can hear footsteps between the floors of the existing flats.

Impact on neighbouring occupiers and amenity

- Suffer needlessly from inevitable noise pollution (harmful to children and elderly people), dust, dirt, the bottlenecks of vehicles and the barrage of workmen;

- Proposed timescale of 18 months for construction would disrupt existing residents;
- Amount of noise and disruption during construction will be detrimental to productivity as well as mental health;
- Will not be able to open windows during construction due to air pollution;
- Construction will not only impact flats 17-40 but also those in the adjacent site, town houses and users of the common areas;
- Elderly residents would be distressed and disturbed by the process;
- Residents in the top floor flats deliberately purchased these units, they would not wish further noise above;
- Block sunlight into neighbouring gardens & flats;
- Overshadow nearby trees;
- Loss of privacy and overlooking into neighbouring flats;
- Imposing height of the planned floors will mean a material impact to the loss of natural daylight within the amphitheatrical and intimate design of the site;
- This is a quiet, peaceful and pleasant block of flats. The quiet is extremely important, how would this be maintained with another 12 flats in the same building? ;
- Amenity of existing building will be reduced as the common areas, car parking and limited open green space will be more crowded;
- Impact of construction should be taken into account after lockdown orders over the past year – need to work from home and residents looking to enjoy their outdoor space for mental health;
- Not safe to have construction workers on site, how will social distancing take place and sanitisation of communal areas;
- Residents paid extra for the privilege of the top floor flat in order to secure a quieter and more secure environment;
- Any restriction of use of the outdoor common area would be entirely unacceptable during a period of lockdown;
- If it is taken 2 occupants for each [new] bedroom, the development would add 44 residents. The site simply does not have the capacity to absorb that level of extra persons on site;
- Proposed location for bike stores will be intrusive to the ground floor flats in the building, will increase noise and congestion;
- Request of method statement as to how the new floors shall be constructed –e.g. use of cranes, management of dust/mess, timescale, hours?

Impact on surrounding area/environment

- Negative impact on the local amenities, e.g. NHS surgery, train station, utilities, sewers, waste collection, dentists, already under significant pressure from the ever-increasing influx of residents. Proposed development would exacerbate this;
- Development will be contrary to the Council's commitment to reduce harmful effects on the environment. Occupants of additional flats will be subject to harmful emissions from traffic on Bushey Road. Merton already has dangerous levels of PM2.5.

Parking and traffic

- An increased flow of traffic, development would add to the congestion –within the development and surrounding streets;
- All the houses have small driveways with only just enough room for parking a car and off-loading shopping;

- Big vans and delivery trucks often park on the kerb blocking driveways, this existing access is a nuisance and causes challenge to kids and elderly people towards the corner of this development;
- Children are often warned about delivery vans. We live in a close not a through road. Family's safety and security is of prime importance;
- Fairway is so congested as it is. 12 additional households using the road is too much strain for the existing households who are already under strain because of noise and car exhaust pollution;
- 12 additional flats will mean around 24% increase in traffic movements;
- Proposed plans omit the proposed location for car parking and cycle parking;
- Only 2 parking spaces for visitors, not enough room for added visitors;
- How would keyworkers [residents] be able to exit the site with increased congestion?

Standard of accommodation - internal and external

- Some of the proposed bedrooms fall very close to the minimum size require for habitable rooms under the Housing Act 1985. This leads me to believe the additional floors and spaces are being designed with a view to maximise profit rather than providing reasonable accommodation;
- The proposal would reduce the available green space, turning it into parking spaces. Flats and townhouses that overlook this green area will in future have a view of a parking lot, great loss to the community and not in keeping with council policy to maintain greenspaces;
- Existing communal spaces are precious for children to play outside;
- The green space is regularly used by the residents (children and adults).

Others

- The only 'improvement' that has been proposed as a form of compensation is a bike shed. Do not know anyone in the development who owns a bike so this is a pointless and unnecessary addition;
- Detrimental impact on the property value of existing properties;
- Owners and landlords of top floor flats will see the value of their investment decrease, tenants will no longer be paying a premium for the coveted 'top floor' flat;
- Overpopulated area with considerable housing being developed into flats;
- Lack of details on cladding, may be a fire risk;
- There is only a very small wooden/timber frame lift which is out of action, the strain of additional flats would not be sufficient;
- Assume lift would be out of use for a substantial period during the development. Being deprived of the use of a working lift would constitute discrimination against those with disabilities;
- Staircase is narrow, should there be a fire up to 40 people could be trying to escape safely, not to mention with firemen simultaneously trying to gain entry;
- Additional flats will mean more waste and an increased risk of pest infestations;
- There is an adequate supply of homes in the area;
- Height in daylight and sunlight report looks to contradict that stated in the application form.

5.4 Thames Water – no objections raised. Conditions and informatives to be included in the event of the application being granted.

5.5 Environment Agency – The development is an existing residential development, the additional residences are to be situated from level 5. There is no increase to the footprint and no off site flood risk implications, therefore we don't have any objection.

5.6 The scheme was amended and a 14 day re-consultation carried out 20/05/2021, objections were received from 21 address points (34 individuals). Many comments reiterated the concerns initially put forward (above), summary of new concerns raised below:

- The character of the area will not be helped by such tall buildings which are more suitable to a town centre location;
- Increase of traffic short and long term to the proposed development and surrounding roads;
- Recent press coverage on damage to flats following upward extensions under PD legislation;
- How is it possible to carry out construction works as the building is occupied with families and children;
- The block of flats next to the building is owned by the Notting Hill Trust with some residents who are blind, having to navigate the a construction site is likely to be very dangerous for them;
- No planned extension of bin store;
- The developer we are dealing with operates through several different companies. Cannot find any documentation showing they have a track record in property development. Do not want to find ourselves in a similar position to the residents of Apex Court [West Ealing, an example of a similar extension carried out];
- All leaseholders may take legal action due to Section 5 breach. The leaseholders wish to purchase the freehold of the Building. It appears that this planning application was made without this knowledge. Highly possible if this goes ahead the planning will not be approved by Court of Law;
- Loss of green space will be yet another reduction in water capture into the soil.

5.7 Internal
LBM Transport –

Access: Pedestrian and vehicular access to the site will be maintained as per the existing arrangement via Greenview Drive which is a private road.

Fairway, from which access to Greenview Drive is taken, is a residential road and has areas of unrestricted on-street parking on the eastern side of the carriageway and double yellow line parking restrictions on the western side of the carriageway.

The site is located approximately 550m walk south west of Raynes Park Train Station.

Existing parking: Two parking courts serve the four buildings down Greenview Drive.

Proposed car parking: 12 additional car parking spaces are provided for 12 residential units which exceeds the new London Plan standards (includes one disabled space).

Cycle Parking: The proposal provides 22 long-stay cycle parking spaces and 2 short stay cycle parking spaces in accordance with the new London Plan standards.

Servicing and Refuse: The servicing and refuse strategy will remain as existing.

Recommendation: The proposal is unlikely have significant impact on the surrounding highway network. The proposed development is on private land serving off a private drive. Parking allocation and its management is undertaken by a management company and LBM take no responsibility to its allocation of parking or maintenance.

- 5.8 LBM Environmental Health (Contamination) – The proposal seeks to add extra floors on top of an already, four storey approval. Because of the addition at height, over several floors of living-space, from the perspective of contaminated-land no objections are raised.

6. **POLICY CONTEXT**

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

Section 5 – Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

Section 9 – Promoting sustainable transport

Section 11 – Making effective use of land

Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places

Section 14 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

6.2 London Plan (2021)

Relevant policies include:

D1 London’s form, character and capacity for growth

D3 Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach

D4 Delivering good design

D5 Inclusive design

D6 Housing quality and standards

D7 Accessible housing

D11 Safety, security and resilience to emergency

D12 Fire safety

D13 Agent of Change

D14 Noise

H1 Increasing housing supply

H2 Small sites

SI 2 Minimising greenhouse gas emissions

SI 3 Energy infrastructure

SI 4 Managing heat risk

SI 5 Water infrastructure

SI 7 Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy

SI 8 Waste capacity and net waste self-sufficiency

SI 13 Sustainable drainage

T1 Strategic approach to transport

T4 Assessing and mitigating transport impacts

T5 Cycling

T6 Car parking

T6.1 Residential parking

T7 Deliveries, servicing and construction

6.3 Merton Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011)

Relevant policies include:

CS 8 Housing choice

CS 9 Housing provision

CS 14 Design

CS 15 Climate change

CS 17 Waste management

CS 18 Transport
CS 20 Parking servicing and delivery

6.4 Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014)

Relevant policies include:

DM D1 Urban design and the public realm

DM D2 Design considerations

DM D3 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings

DM F2 Sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) and; Wastewater and Water Infrastructure

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 the Road Network

6.5 Supplementary planning considerations

London Housing SPG 2016

Technical Housing standards – nationally described space standards

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 This is an application under The Town and Country Planning (Permitted Development and Miscellaneous Amendments) (England) (Coronavirus) Regulations 2020, Part 20, Class A: Development consisting of works for the construction of up to two additional storeys of new dwellinghouses immediately above the existing topmost residential storey on a building which is a purpose-built, detached block of flats.

7.2 At the time of the application being submitted, the only issues that can form material considerations are as follows:

Conditions

A.2

- (a) transport and highways impacts of the development;
- (b) air traffic and defence asset impacts of the development;
- (c) contamination risks in relation to the building;
- (d) flooding risks in relation to the building;
- (e) the external appearance of the building;
- (f) the provision of adequate natural light in all habitable rooms of the new dwellinghouses;
- (g) impact on the amenity of the existing building and neighbouring premises including overlooking, privacy and the loss of light;
- (h) whether because of the siting of the building, the development will impact on a protected view identified in the Directions Relating to Protected Vistas dated 15 March 2012 issued by the Secretary of State, and
- (i) where the existing building is 18 metres or more in height, the fire safety of the external wall construction of the existing building.

7.3 Key Issues for consideration

7.3.1 Below is an assessment of the considerations against the qualifying criteria in A.1 of Class A, Part 20 of the regulations.

7.3.2 Development is not permitted by A.1 of Class A if –

- (a) the permission to use any building as a dwellinghouse has been granted only by virtue of Class M, N, O, P, PA or Q of Part 3 of this Schedule;
- (b) above ground level, the building is less than 3 storeys in height;
- (c) the building was constructed before 1st July 1948, or after 5th March 2018;
- (d) the additional storeys are constructed other than on the principal part of the building;
- (e) the floor to ceiling height of any additional storey, measured internally, would exceed the lower of –
 - (i) 3 metres; or
 - (ii) the floor to ceiling height, measured internally, of any storey of the principal part of the existing building;
- (f) the new dwellinghouses are not flats;
- (g) the height of the highest part of the roof of the extended building would exceed the height of the highest part of the roof of the existing building by more than 7 metres (not including plant, in each case);
- (h) the height of the highest part of the roof of the extended building (not including plant) would be greater than 30 metres;
- (i) development under Class A.(a) would include the provision of visible support structures on or attached to the exterior of the building upon completion of the development;
- (j) development under Class A.(a) would consist of engineering operations other than works within the existing curtilage of the building to—
 - (i) strengthen existing walls;
 - (ii) strengthen existing foundations; or
 - (iii) install or replace water, drainage, electricity, gas or other services;
- (k) in the case of Class A.(b) development there is no existing plant on the building;
- (l) in the case of Class A.(b) development the height of any replaced or additional plant as measured from the lowest surface of the new roof on the principal part of the extended building would exceed the height of any existing plant as measured from the lowest surface of the existing roof on the principal part of the building;
- (m) development under Class A.(c) would extend beyond the curtilage of the existing building;
- (n) development under Class A.(d) would—
 - (i) extend beyond the curtilage of the existing building;
 - (ii) be situated on land forward of a wall forming the principal elevation of the existing building; or
 - (iii) be situated on land forward of a wall fronting a highway and forming a side elevation of the existing building;
- (o) the land or site on which the building is located, is or forms part of—
 - (i) article 2(3) land;
 - (ii) a site of special scientific interest;
 - (iii) a listed building or land within its curtilage;
 - (iv) a scheduled monument or land within its curtilage;
 - (v) a safety hazard area;
 - (vi) a military explosives storage area; or
 - (vii) land within 3 kilometres of the perimeter of an aerodrome.

7.3.3 Officers can confirm that the site/building is not or does not fall within any of the criteria set out in parts (a) to (o).

- 7.3.4 Section A.2 confirms that development is permitted subject to the condition that before beginning the development, the development must apply to the local planning authority for a determination as to whether the prior approval of the authority will be required as to:
- 7.4 A.2 condition (a) transport and highways impacts of the development:
- 7.4.1 Core Strategy Policy CS 20 considers matters of pedestrian movement, safety, servicing and loading facilities for local businesses and manoeuvring for emergency vehicles as well as refuse storage and collection. Core Strategy promotes active transport and encourages design that provides attractive, safe, covered cycle storage, cycle parking.
- 7.4.2 The application is accompanied by a Transport Technical Note from Vectos, which concludes:

“Overall, the proposed development will result in a minimal number of additional trips on the local transport network. In light of this, the impact of the development proposals is not considered material or severe”.
- 7.4.3 The originally submitted scheme provided a 1 to 1 car parking provision on site (12 new units and 12 new parking spaces). The amendment of the proposal reduces the number of units by 2, the parking provision would remain suitable for this reduced offer.
- 7.4.4 The Councils Transport officer has reviewed the application and considers that the proposal would unlikely have significant impact on the surrounding highway network. Further, as Greenview Drive is a private road, parking allocation and its management is undertaken by a management company rather than the Council.
- 7.4.5 In terms of cycle parking, London Plan Policy T5 requires developments to provide appropriate levels of cycle parking which should be fit for purpose, secure and well-located. Developments should provide cycle parking at least in accordance with the minimum standards set out in Table 10.2. In accordance with Table 10.2, residential dwellings should provide 1 space per studio/1 person 1 bedroom dwelling, 1.5 spaces per 2 person 1 bedroom dwelling and 2 spaces per all other dwellings.
- 7.4.6 The number and mix of units would require 19 cycle spaces. The proposal provides 22 long-stay cycle parking spaces and 2 short stay cycle parking spaces which would comfortably accord with the London Plan standards.
- 7.4.7 The representations have commented that they “do not know anyone in the development who owns a bike so this is a pointless and unnecessary addition”. However, cycle storage is required for all new developments and its provision is supported by officers as it would help to promote the use of a more sustainable mode of transport, helping to alleviate congestion, contribute towards climate change, air quality targets and improve health and wellbeing through increased levels of physical activity.
- 7.4.8 In terms of waste storage, 4x 1100L bins have been provided for refuse and recycling. This is considered an acceptable provision and would be suitably located adjacent to the existing refuse area onsite.

- 7.5 A.2 condition (b) air traffic and defence asset impacts of the development:
- 7.5.1 The site is circa 15km from Heathrow, circa 27km from Gatwick and circa 20km from Biggin Hill Airport. There are no defence assets near to the site that would be impacted by the proposal.
- 7.6 A.2 condition (c) contamination risks in relation to the building:
- 7.6.1 The site is already in residential use and the development does not propose to penetrate the ground.
- 7.6.2 The Council's Environmental Health officer has been consulted and notes that the proposal seeks to add extra floors on top of an existing building. Given the additional storeys are to be provided at roof level over several floors of existing living-space, from the perspective of contaminated-land, no objections were raised.
- 7.7 A.2 condition (d) flooding risks in relation to the building:
- 7.7.1 London Plan policies SI 12 and SI 13, Core Strategy Policy CS16 and SPP policies DM F1 and DM F2 seek to ensure that the flood risk is minimised and mitigated for residents and the environment, and promotes the use of sustainable drainage systems to reduce the overall amount of rainfall being discharged into the drainage system and reduce the borough's susceptibility to surface water flooding.
- 7.7.2 As set out in Procedure (6) for prior approval applications made under Part 20: Where the application relates to prior approval as to the flooding risks on the site, on receipt of the application, the local planning authority must consult the Environment Agency where the development is (a) in an area within Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3.
- 7.7.3 The site lies within Flood Zone 2 and 3.
- 7.7.4 The application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment from Ambiental, which concludes:
- "The proposed development is considered to be suitable assuming appropriate mitigation (including adequate warning procedures) can be maintained for the lifetime of the development".
- 7.7.5 12 car parking spaces are to be created by expanding the eastern parking court resulting in the loss of some grassed area at the centre. The submitted Flood Risk Assessment has recognised this loss but explains:
- "The proposed development is located on a developed site, so there is existing drainage infrastructure on site. Site-specific sewer asset plans provided by Thames Water demonstrate that there is an existing combined sewer which passes through the site and beneath the existing building. Given that there is no watercourse located on or near the site, in line with the SuDS hierarchy, surface water runoff from the additional car parking area will be discharged to the existing combined sewer".
- 7.7.5 The Environment Agency has also been consulted on the proposals, and following review of the scheme raises no objections.
- 7.7.6 Overall, no concerns are raised in relation to flood risk.

- 7.8 A.2 condition (e) the external appearance of the building:
- 7.8.1 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).
- 7.8.2 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 SPP 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.
- 7.8.3 It is noted from the Planning history of the site that an application was refused in 2010 for an additional fifth storey, planning ref 09/P1391. Reason: **The proposed development, by reason of its height, bulk, orientation and design would - (a) be too large for the site and would fail to respect the scale and height of (proposed) surrounding buildings.**
- 7.8.4 The appeal against the Council's refusal was also dismissed, Appeal ref APP/T5720/A/10/2122715, where the Inspector concluded that: "the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area".
- 7.8.5 The Inspector's decision does form a material planning consideration in the assessment of the appearance of the proposed development in this prior approval submission. Acknowledging this refusal, officers have worked with the applicant to revise and reduce the scale of the extension proposal.
- 7.8.6 The originally submitted scheme displayed a two storey roof extension, entirely metal clad, and finishing flush with the existing elevations of the building. This was seen to be unduly prominent and bulky additions which unnecessarily accentuated the height of the building. The amended proposals have provided a significantly recessed fifth floor level. Whilst officers note this is altogether taller than the previously refused scheme, in introducing a recessed design, this helps draw the viewer up to a declining apex rather than simply extruding the existing form straight up to crown the building with top-heavy 'blocks' – like the previously refused scheme.
- 7.8.7 This is not so dissimilar to the design approach of the roof element at Malden Court (further west along Bushey Road) which displays a setback roof level (third floor) with obscure screen balustrade surrounds and a contrasting finishing material to distinguish itself.
- 7.8.8 In relation to the buildings immediately north and south, within the Pavilions, the height increase introduces a more distinct transition of scale within the development but not one which would be viewed as overpowering. With the building being positioned toward the rear/eastern end of the development, facing the main road and open space, its increased height marks it as a suitable 'corner' building. The amended proposals move away from introducing a uniform bulk, and tips the upper level further

from views so when approaching from within the buildings, Greenview Drive and Fairway, the metal clad roof element is predominantly masked.

- 7.8.9 Views of the proposed roof extension would be visible from Bushey Road, but this is positioned on a higher ground level with a number of trees lining its northern boundary. So, the height of the building would not be considered unduly prominent and would be partially screened toward the main road and longer views away.
- 7.8.10 Overall, the amended scheme has suitably reduced the bulk and prominence of the roof level extension. The proposed design, orientation and layout of the roof levels would appropriately respond to the host building. As a matter of judgement officers consider that the proposals can be supported.
- 7.9 A.2 condition (f) the provision of adequate natural light in all habitable rooms of the new dwellinghouses:
- 7.9.1 The application is accompanied by a Daylight and Sunlight Report from eb7, which concludes:
- “...the internal layout has also been informed by our input to ensure good amenity and high quality units. As roof extension proposals the additional units enjoy an open outlook and include the provision of multiple windows across the main living spaces such that internal amenity levels will remain high and will exceed the BRE targets.
- Overall, the scheme proposals respond well to the neighbours maintaining good amenity levels to the neighbouring properties as well as providing high quality homes for future residents. The proposals are therefore wholly in line with the BRE guidelines and relevant planning policy”.
- 7.9.2 The flats on the fourth floor level would be arranged in the same layout as the existing units on the lower levels, the location of windows and balconies would be consistent with those on the floors below.
- 7.9.3 The flats on the fifth floor level would be set back toward the south-eastern elevation, providing 2 less units than the floors below. The units farthest south and east would be provided with a roof terrace and window openings on all three of their elevations. Consequently, it is considered these units would be provided with a suitable level of outlook and light.
- 7.9.4 Overall, the proposed units would be provided with adequate natural light in all habitable rooms.
- 7.10 A.2 condition (g) impact on the amenity of the existing building and neighbouring premises including overlooking, privacy and the loss of light:
- 7.10.1 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.
- 7.10.2 The Inspector’s Report for the Appeal Decision of application 09/P1391 concluded in relation to neighbouring amenity for one additional storey:

“Turning to the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions at neighbouring properties, existing residential properties in Fairway are too far away to be directly affected by this proposal. There is likewise good visual separation in relation to the recently constructed adjacent block of flats to the north. Indeed, I consider that the only properties close enough to be materially affected are the town houses that have already been approved under the previous scheme.

I consider that there would be a limited degree of overlooking from windows in the block of flats down onto the adjacent town houses. However, in my opinion, this would not be materially different to the situation already accepted by the Council under the approved scheme. Indeed, it could be argued that the uppermost storeys of the building would tend to look out over the roofs of the townhouses, such that the greatest degree of overlooking arises from the windows in the middle storeys.

Be that as it may, I find that any limited overlooking that might arise would be within acceptable limits, bearing in mind the urban character of the environment, whereby complete freedom from overlooking and visual intrusion is rarely possible. Moreover, my observations indicate that the standards of privacy and amenity within the development would be broadly consistent with the general standards of the area. The moderate increase in height, compared with the approved development, is not sufficient to lead to any significant harm in relation to light and outlook.

I therefore conclude, on the second issue, that the proposed development would cause no significant harm to the living conditions at neighbouring properties”.

- 7.10.3 The application is also accompanied by a Daylight and Sunlight Report from eb7, which concludes:

“The results of these tests [VSC, NSL, (daylight) and APSH (sunlight)] have shown that, whilst there will be some reductions to individual windows, the amount of daylight received within each of the neighbouring habitable rooms will remain very high and in excess of the BRE criteria.

In terms of sunlight levels, all neighbouring properties retain levels in line with the BRE criteria for APSH [Annual Probable Sunlight Hours]”.

1 to 16 Greenview Drive

- 7.10.4 It is noted that some existing residents within the top floor flats of the adjacent block are able to view over the application building, and this view would be affected by the proposed rooftop extension. This impact has been carefully considered and whilst the loss of outlook is a material planning consideration, the loss of a view is not a material consideration which can be awarded weight in this assessment (other than issues relating to protected views which is addressed in para 7.11.1 of this report).

- 7.10.5 As set out in the Inspector’s assessment, para 7.10.2, there is a good visual separation from the adjacent block of flats to the north. This separation remains the same within this application and it is not considered the addition of a recessed storey, one additional level to that assessed by the Inspector, would be substantially harmful toward flats 1-16’s amenity which to warrant refusal.

17 to 40 Greenview Drive (existing occupiers in the application property)

- 7.10.6 The two storey extension would be sited immediately above the existing units, projecting no further forward of the building’s front and rear elevations. So, it is not considered the roof extension would be highly visible when looking out from the

windows of the lower levels and would unlikely have an undue impact in terms of outlook or loss of privacy.

- 7.10.7 It is noted the existing balconies on the third floor level are currently open and would have a further balcony constructed above which would result in some loss of light and overshadowing. However, the proposed arrangement would replicate the existing layout on the other floors of the building and is not so uncommon in flatted developments. The impact would not result in a materially harmful impact on residential amenity that would warrant a refusal.
- 7.10.8 It is noted that a number of representations identify that the value of their existing top floor flats would decrease and the owners will “no longer be paying the premium for the coveted top floor flat”. However, this is a material planning consideration and cannot be considered in the assessment of this extension proposal.

41-50 Greenview Drive (townhouses)

- 7.10.9 The additional rooftop flats would introduce further windows on its south-eastern elevation, facing toward the townhouses. However, the openings replicate the existing arrangement seen on the lower levels and as concluded by the Inspector: “there would be a limited degree of overlooking from windows in the block of flats down onto the adjacent town houses...this would not be materially different to the situation already accepted by the Council under the approved scheme”. The new roof level flats would likely look onto/ over the roofs of the townhouses and the greatest degree of overlooking would likely be from the existing windows in the middle storeys. Therefore, it is considered the overlooking introduced by the proposals would be limited and within acceptable limits.
- 7.10.10 The height increase is not considered to be overbearing, with the fifth floor level significantly set back from its south-eastern elevation, therefore it is not considered to result in significant harm in relation to light and outlook toward the townhouses.

Fairway

- 7.10.11 The roof extension would not project further forward of the existing building lines and toward the south-east elevations would be sufficiently set back.
- 7.10.12 The Inspector concluded that the residential properties in Fairway are too far away to be directly affected by this proposal. The same conclusion is drawn within this application.
- 7.10.13 Overall, officers consider that whilst the new flats would be visible from the surrounding properties, the height increase would not result in a materially harmful and unacceptable impact in terms of outlook, overlooking, privacy and light.

7.11 A.2 condition (h) whether because of the siting of the building, the development will impact on a protected view identified in the Directions Relating to Protected Vistas dated 15 March 2012 issued by the Secretary of State:

- 7.11.1 These Directions relate protected vistas identified by the Mayor of London within the London View Management Framework SPG. The site does not fall within any of these views, therefore officers raise no concerns in relation to this matter.

7.12 A.2 condition (i) where the existing building is 18 metres or more in height, the fire safety of the external wall construction of the existing building:

7.12.1 As set out in Procedure (2)(i) for prior approval applications made under Part 20: Where the application for prior approval relates to the requirement mentioned in paragraph A.2(1)(i) or AA.2(1)(k), a report from a chartered engineer or other competent professional confirming that the external wall construction of the existing building complies with paragraph B4(1) of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010.

7.12.2 The existing building is not more than 18 metres in height, therefore a report is not required as per Procedure (2)(i) above.

7.12 Response to other issues raised in objection letters

7.12.1 The majority of issues raised by objectors are addressed in the body of this report. However, in addition, the following comments are provided:

- The impact of the construction process itself cannot reasonably form a reason for refusal. However, the impacts can be minimised through the provision of a construction management plan which can be secured by way of condition;
- Property value does not form a criteria for assessment within the GPDO, nor is it a material planning consideration;
- The space standards of the proposed units do not form a criteria for assessment within this Schedule of the GPDO. It is noted that later amendments to the GPDO has included floorspace standards within Schedule 2, whereby permission can be refused if the gross internal floor area is less than 37sqm in size or any new dwellinghouse does not comply with the nationally described space standards. However, this requirement came into effect from 6th April 2021. As the prior approval was submitted and received by the Council well before this date, this development cannot be considered against this criteria.
- 12 additional car parking spaces are to be created by expanding the eastern parking court resulting in some loss of the central grassed area, the submitted Flood Risk Assessment has described the impact of this loss of permeable area (para 7.7.5). In terms of flood risk, no issues are raised. Representations have commented on how the grassed area is regularly used by residents and as a play area for children. Approximately 180sqm of the grassed area would be converted to provide the car parking spaces, retaining a reasonable c.775sqm. The central grassed area does not form a designated Open space – the original permissions 05/P2802 and 07/P3679 has already accepted the loss of part of the Alliance Sports Ground designed Open space for residential development. It is a pleasant grassed area which positively contributes to the green and open environment of the development and surrounding area, but its loss of some 18% in size is not considered to be materially harmful and detrimental to the “play space” enjoyed by residents – further noting all the units within the Pavilions benefit from private balcony areas and gardens

8. CONCLUSION

- 8.1 This type of prior approval application has been introduced by the government as part of a raft of measures to respond to housing needs and is part of the government's reform of the planning system to support and speed up the delivery of new homes.
- 8.2 A fundamental principle to the assessment of planning submissions is that each application must be considered on its merits. While at first sight proposals higher than the scheme refused some 11 years ago might lead an observer to conclude that this scheme too should be refused officers have explained how the massing of the proposals differs from the earlier scheme, that this new submission has itself been the subject of amendment, resulting in a more refined and attractive set of proposals and is now, in their judgement, capable of being supported.
- 8.3 The Council has a limited remit in terms of what elements can be considered in the decision making process for this prior approval type. Officers have assessed the upwards extension scheme strictly against the criteria and conditions set out in A.1 and A.2 of Class A, Part 20. For the reasons set out above in this report, it is concluded that the proposal would comply with conditions (a) to (i). The two storey roof extension would not present an overbearing addition to the existing flatted block nor cause significant harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties.

RECOMMENDATION:

Grant prior approval subject to the attachment of the following conditions:

1. Commencement of Development – The development to which this permission relates shall be commenced not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
2. A7 Development in accordance with Approved plans
3. The facing materials to be used for the development hereby permitted shall be those specified in the approved drawings, and the materials to “match existing” shall match those of the existing building in materials, style, colour, texture and, in the case of brickwork, bonding, coursing and pointing unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
4. C07 Refuse & Recycling – Details to be submitted prior to occupation
5. C08 No Use of Flat Roof – Other than the areas annotated as “Terrace” on the approved plans, access to the flat roof of the development hereby permitted shall be for maintenance or emergency purposes only, and these other flat roof areas shall not be used as a roof garden, terrace, patio or similar amenity area.
6. C09 Balcony/Terrace – Screening details to be provided prior to occupation
7. H07 Cycle Parking – Details to be submitted prior to occupation
8. H09 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.

9. Construction Management Plan – Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a Construction Management Plan, which sets out the proposed development hours of operation and how any adverse impact of noise, dust, vibration and traffic on occupiers of the building and adjoining owners or occupiers will be mitigated, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved measures shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted and shall be so maintained for the duration of the use, unless the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority is first obtained to any variation.
10. Non-standard condition (Thames Water): No piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface sewerage infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement. Reason: The proposed works will be close proximity to underground sewerage utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to significantly impact/cause failure of local underground sewerage utility infrastructure.

Informatives:

1. Thames Water Informative: Please read 'working near our assets' guide to ensure your workings will be in line with necessary processes you need to follow if you're considering above or near our pipes or other structures. Should you require further information please contact Thames Water. Email: developer.services@thameswater.co.uk. Phone: 0800 009 3921 (Monday to Friday, 8am to 5pm). Write to: Thames Water Developer Services, Clearwater Court, Vastern Road, Reading, Berkshire, RG1 8DB.
2. A Groundwater Risk Management Permit from Thames Water will be required for discharging groundwater into a public sewer. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures he will undertake to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Permit enquires should be directed to Thames Water's Risk Management Team by telephoning 020 3577 9483 or by emailing trade.effluent@thameswater.co.uk. Application forms should be completed online via www.thameswater.co.uk. Please refer to the Wholesale; Business customers; Groundwater discharges section.
3. If you are planning on using mains water for construction purposes, it is important you let Thames Water know before you start using it, to avoid potential fines for improper usage. More information and how to apply can be found online at thameswater.co.uk/buildingwater.
4. Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx. 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.