

If you are reading this electronically, the Council has saved **£15.24** on printing. For more information on the Mod.Gov paperless app, please contact Democratic Services.

Merton Council

Planning Applications Committee Agenda

Membership

Councillors:

Dave Ward (Chair)
Stephen Crowe (Vice-Chair)
Stephen Alambritis MBE
Billy Christie
David Dean
Nick Draper
Joan Henry
Simon McGrath
Carl Quilliam
Peter Southgate

Substitute Members:

Eloise Bailey
Ben Butler
Edward Foley
Edward Gretton
Najeeb Latif
Dennis Pearce

Date: Thursday 10 December 2020

Time: 7.15 pm

Venue: This will be a virtual meeting and therefore not held in a physical location, in accordance with s78 of the Coronavirus Act 2020

This is a public meeting and attendance by the public is encouraged and welcomed.

This is a public meeting and can be viewed at www.youtube.com/user/MertonCouncil.

If you wish to speak please contact either planning@merton.gov.uk or the Development Control Admin Section on 020 8545 3445/3448 (9am – 5pm); or the Development Control hotline 020 8545 3777 (open 1pm – 4pm only) to register. All requests to speak should be made by no later than 12 noon on the day before the meeting.

For more information about the agenda and the decision making process contact democratic.services@merton.gov.uk or telephone 020 8545 3616.

Press enquiries: communications@merton.gov.uk or telephone 020 8545 3181.

If you are reading this electronically, the Council has saved **£15.24** on printing. For more information on the Mod.Gov paperless app, please contact Democratic Services.

Electronic Agendas, Reports and Minutes

Copies of agendas, reports and minutes for council meetings can also be found on our website.

To access this, click <https://www.merton.gov.uk/council-andlocaldemocracy> and search for the relevant committee and meeting date.

Agendas can also be viewed online in the Borough's libraries and on the Mod.gov paperless app for iPads, Android and Windows devices.

For more information about the agenda please contact democratic.services@merton.gov.uk or telephone 020 8545 3615

All Press contacts: communications@merton.gov.uk or 020 8545 3181

If you are reading this electronically, the Council has saved **£15.24** on printing. For more information on the Mod.Gov paperless app, please contact Democratic Services.

Planning Applications Committee Agenda

10 December 2020

- 1 Apologies for absence
- 2 Declarations of Pecuniary Interest
- 3 Minutes of the previous meeting 1 - 2
- 4 Town Planning Applications
The Chair will announce the order of Items at the beginning of the Meeting.
A Supplementary Agenda with any modifications will be published on the day of the meeting.
Note: there is no written report for this item
- 5 Garages RO 30-40 Barnes End, KT3 6PB 3 - 18
Application: 20/P0781
Ward: West Barnes
Recommendation: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.
- 6 YMCA, 196-200 The Broadway, SW19 1RY 19 - 150
Application: 20/P1738
Ward: Abbey
Recommendation: Grant Planning Permission subject to any direction from the Mayor of London, conditions and completion of a S.106 legal agreement.
- 7 95 Devonshire Road, Colliers Wood, SW19 2EQ 151 - 166
Application: 20/P1399
Ward: Colliers Wood
Recommendation: Grant planning permission subject to S106 Obligation or any other enabling agreement and conditions.
- 8 30 Lancaster Gardens, Wimbledon. SW19 5DG 167 - 176
Application: 20/P2276
Ward: Village
Recommendation: Grant Planning Permission Subject to Conditions.
- 9 Wimbledon College of Art, 40 Merton Hall Road, SW19 3QA 177 - 196
Application: 20/P1952
Ward: Dundonald
Recommendation: Grant permission subject to conditions and S106 Agreement.
- 10 5 Parkside Avenue, Wimbledon, SW19 5ES 197 - 218
Application: 20/P2610
Ward: Village

If you are reading this electronically, the Council has saved **£15.24** on printing. For more information on the Mod.Gov paperless app, please contact Democratic Services.

Recommendation: Grant Planning permission subject to conditions

- | | | |
|----|---|--------------|
| 11 | Pollards Hill Estate, Mitcham | 219 -
236 |
| | Application: 19/P4032
Ward: Pollards Hill
Recommendation: Grant Permission subject to conditions. | |
| 12 | Land On South Side, Wyke Road, Raynes Park | 237 -
262 |
| | Application: 20/P0945
Ward: Raynes Park
Recommendation: Grant planning permission subject to the completion of a S106 agreement and conditions. | |
| 13 | Planning Appeal Decisions | 263 -
266 |
| | Officer Recommendation:
That Members note the contents of the report. | |
| 14 | Planning Enforcement - Summary of Current Cases | 267 -
272 |
| | Officer Recommendation:
That Members note the contents of the report. | |

Note on declarations of interest

Members are advised to declare any Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter to be considered at the meeting. If a pecuniary interest is declared they should withdraw from the meeting room during the whole of the consideration of that matter and must not participate in any vote on that matter. For further advice please speak with the Managing Director, South London Legal Partnership.

Agenda Item 3

All minutes are draft until agreed at the next meeting of the committee/panel. To find out the date of the next meeting please check the calendar of events at your local library or online at www.merton.gov.uk/committee.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

12 NOVEMBER 2020
(7.15 pm - 7.45 pm)

PRESENT Councillors Councillor Linda Kirby (in the Chair),
Councillor Stephen Crowe, Councillor Billy Christie,
Councillor David Dean, Councillor Joan Henry,
Councillor Rebecca Lanning, Councillor Russell Makin,
Councillor Simon McGrath, Councillor Peter Southgate and
Councillor Dave Ward

Sarath Attanayake (Transport Planning Project Officer), Louise Fleming (Democracy Services Manager), Jonathan Lewis (Development Control Team Leader (South)), Neil Milligan (Development Control Manager, ENVR) and Farzana Karamat-Mughal (Democratic Services Officer

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 1)

There was no apologies for absence.

2 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST (Agenda Item 2)

There were no declarations of interest.

3 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Agenda Item 3)

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 22nd October, 2020 were agreed as an accurate record.

4 TOWN PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Agenda Item 4)

Supplementary Agenda: Amendments and modifications to the officer's report were published in a modification sheet.

5 87 ROBINSON ROAD, TOOTING, SW17 9DN (Agenda Item 5)

Proposal: Proposed Demolition of existing building and outbuilding and erection of a 3 storey building plus lower ground floor lever, to contain 9x self-contained flats with odd street parking spaces, cycle storage and refuse storage.

The Committee noted the report and the plans presented by the Development Control Team Leader (South). The Committee also noted the modification contained in the supplementary agenda.

It was noted that there were no speakers registered to speak on behalf of this application.

Members' were reminded that this proposal had previously been before Committee. The revised proposed application was to knock down an existing dwelling and erect a block of nine flats, therefore the proposed scheme comprised of an additional flat.

Members' raised the following points:

- it was prudent that a waste collection area was located at this development as this was an multitude of flats;
- it was important that the condition with regards to the Waste Disposal Strategy was implemented as Members' felt that this was a major issue around waste, in particular, for residents with multi-storey flats and to ensure a proper refuse collection arrangement was in place;
- there would be more cars parking in spaces which could potentially affect the neighbouring residents.

In the ensuing debate, the Development Control Team Leader (South) provided the following responses:

- Members noted that the first proposal was refused due to inadequate Waste Management Plan, however this had been introduced in the revised scheme. Members' were reinsured that in condition 8, it stated that no development should take place until Waste Management Strategy had been agreed;
- Members were reminded that the previous scheme had been refused due to the proposal was deemed to be too close to the neighbouring properties.

The Chair moved to the vote on the officer's recommendation and it was

RESOLVED: that the application number 20/P2098 be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to s106 agreement and conditions.

6 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - SUMMARY OF CURRENT CASES (Agenda Item 6)

The Committee noted that there were no planning enforcement cases reported.

7 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS (Agenda Item 7)

The Committee noted the Planning Appeal decisions.

8 MODIFICATIONS SHEET (Agenda Item 8)

The Committee noted the Modification sheet.

The Chair announced that this was her last meeting of the Planning Applications Committee. She stated that she had enjoyed being Chair for the last six years. She expressed her gratitude to all the offices' for their support. Furthermore, she wished Councillor Dave Ward success as Chair for the ensuing Committee.

Planning APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

December 2020

	<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>DATE VALID</u>
	20/P0781	18/03/2020
Address/Site:	Garages rear of 30-40 Barnes End New Malden KT3 6PB	
Ward:	West Barnes	
Proposal:	DEMOLITION OF 24 GARAGES AND CONSTRUCTION OF 2 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND LANDSCAPING.	
Drawing No.'s:	Site Location Plan; B-01 Rev G; B-02 Rev G; Flood Risk Assessment Issue 4	
Contact Officer:	Jourdan Alexander (020 8545 3112)	

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- S106: No
- 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: 29
- External consultations: 1
- Conservation area: No
- Listed building: No
- Tree protection orders: No
- Controlled Parking Zone: No
- Flood zone: Yes – Zone 2 (in the area of proposed development)
- Archaeological priority zone: No

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 The site was granted approval by planning committee in March 2018 for the

demolition of 24 garages and the construction 2 new 3 bedroom dwellings with associated parking and landscaping (Ref: 17/P3989). The proposal now before Committee is for a revised scheme, in which the main changes include:

- Barn hip of roof raised by 900mm from existing
- Loft level floor added. This has increased each house's floor area by 25sqm from existing.
- Internal layout altered to provide 4 bedrooms rather than 3 as existing.
- Rooflights added to front roof slope.
- First floor side windows repositioned.
- Front bathroom windows altered.
- Elevations changed from brick and timber to brick only.
- Green roof omitted.

1.3 The changes proposed would increase the designed level of occupancy within each house from 4 to 7 individuals.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The application site is a broadly triangular parcel of land (approximately 793sqm) located to the rear of nos. 38 & 40 Barnes End and is bounded on all sides by the rear gardens of adjacent properties. Access is via a turning head at the end of Barnes End, a cul-de-sac which is separated from the adjacent road, Cobham Avenue by a 2.1m high brick wall.

2.2 The site is entirely surfaced with concrete with no soft landscaping. The existing garages form part of the boundaries of the site. Surrounding properties are generally large two-storey semi-detached dwellings with walls of red brick or render with some tile-hanging and predominately hipped tiled roofs. The site cannot be seen directly from any of the surrounding public roads.

2.3 The site has a PTAL (public transport accessibility level) of 2 which is considered to be poor (1 being very poor and 6 being excellent).

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

3.1 This application seeks planning permission for the demolition of 24 garages and the construction of 2 x dwellings with associated parking and landscaping. The proposed buildings would have a footprint of approximately 150sqm. The semi-detached buildings will be mirror images of each other.

3.2 The site would retain vehicle access from Barnes End with 2 parking spaces being provided for each dwelling onsite. The footprint of the two buildings would be irregular in shape and would be set in from the site boundaries. Landscaping has been proposed within the private rear garden areas and the shared front garden area.

3.3 Plot 1 is located on the southern portion of the subject site. The proposed dwelling would be located approximately 1m from the shared southern boundary at its closest point, increasing to approximately 2.8m; it would be set back from the south-eastern boundary by approximately 10.89m at its closest point and it would be set in from the north-western boundary by approximately 10.9m.

3.4 Plot 2 is located to the north-east of Plot 1. The proposed dwelling would be located approximately 1.2m from the shared north-eastern boundary at its closest point,

increasing to approximately 3.5m; it would be set back from the south-eastern boundary by approximately 10.89m at its closest point and it would be set in from the north-western boundary by approximately 10.8m.

- 3.5 The main building envelope would be irregular in shape with a dual pitched roof. The buildings elevations would be finished in brick. The pitched roof would be tiled in red smooth-faced clay tiles. Projecting from the north-eastern face of Plot 2 and the south-western face of Plot 1 will be a single storey element with a flat roof. The installation of a roof garden would be on the abovementioned flat roofs. The roof will have a catslide to the rear (with 2 large and 4 small roof lights) enabling a reduction in the height of the main roof.
- 3.6 The proposed dwellings will be symmetrical and would have the following key dimensions:
- Main dwelling:
 - 11.6m deep/long;
 - 11.1m wide;
 - 3.0m high to the eaves on the south-eastern face;
 - 6.1m high to the eaves on the south-western and north-eastern faces;
 - 6.1m high to the eaves on the south-western and north-eastern faces;
 - 5.3m high to the eaves on the north-western face;
 - 9.36m maximum height.
 - Single storey projection:
 - 4.65m deep/long;
 - 2.58m wide;
 - 2.87m maximum height.
 - The above measurements match those of the previously approved scheme ref: 17/P3989, albeit the hip of the main roof would be 900mm taller.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 Relevant planning history is summarised as follows:

Land rear of 30-40 Barnes End and land to rear of 49-55 Barnes End – 2 plots of land connected by a driveway comprising 33 lock up garages and located at the northwestern end of Barnes End.

4.2 17/P2185: PRE APPLICATION ADVICE FOR THE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION 3 X NEW DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND LANDSCAPING.

Land rear of 30-40 Barnes End

4.3 17/P3989: DEMOLITION OF 24 LOCK UP GARAGES AND THE ERECTION OF 2 THREE BEDROOM HOUSES WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND LANDSCAPING. Grant permission subject to conditions (PAC decision).

Land rear 49-55 Barnes End,

4.4 17/P3991: DEMOLITION OF 9 GARAGES AND CONSTRUCTION 1 X 2 BEDROOM DWELLING HOUSE WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND LANDSCAPING. Grant permission subject to conditions (PAC decision).

5. CONSULTATION

5.1 Public consultation was undertaken by way of site notice along with letters sent to 29 neighbouring properties. The outcome of the consultation process is summarised as follows:

5.2 8 letters of objection which are summarised as follows:

- The initial planning application rules against a pedestrian / cycle connection between Barnes End and Cobham Avenue. In light of safety and traffic concerns.
- The proposal would alter the pedestrian access to and from the highway.
- The Transport Statement still refers in paragraph 17 to a pedestrian link between the development and Blake's Terrace. This link has been removed from the Plan in Appendix A .
- Concern about the size of the dwellings resulting in harm to privacy.
- The proposal would reduce the sunlight / daylight received to neighbouring houses.
- The developer's motive are to increase profits.
- The larger houses would put increased pressure on local resources and infrastructure. .
- The submitted documents are incorrectly refers to 'existing garages', this is incorrect because they were which were demolished many months ago.
- Security, traffic and parking issues associated with the opening of the party wall between Barnes End and Cobham Avenue;
- The proposal may damage the existing historic wall.

A letter from the Wimbledon Swift Group was also received which provides information concerning swift population health in the UK, and measures that could be employed to safeguard swift health. An informative concerning this letter has been included.

5.3 Planning Officer's comments to the objections:

The objections are noted and discussed where applicable within the relevant sections of the committee report. In terms of a pedestrian link, the proposed plans and drawings for this application do not propose the creation of a pedestrian link. The pedestrian and highways arrangements proposed within this application are exactly the same those within the previously approved application. Granting of this proposed development would not infer Council approval of a pedestrian link.

Internal:

5.4 Environmental Health Officer: No objection subject to conditions. Conditions are recommended relating to noise mitigation and the potential for contamination to be found on-site.

5.5 Flood Risk Engineer: No objection subject to conditions, requiring that the development is built in accordance with the mitigation and recommendations contained within the applicant's flood risk assessment.

5.6 Transport/Highways Officer: No objection subject to conditions. The proposed parking provisions are in line with London Plan standards. Proposed cycle storage in is in line with London Plan standards. Conditions are recommended relating to a construction logistics plan and details of refuse and cycling.

External:

- 5.7 Environment Agency: No objection subject to a condition requiring the development to follow and implement the measures detailed in the Flood Risk Assessment submitted with this application.

6. POLICY CONTEXT

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

- 5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- 9. Promoting sustainable transport
- 11. Making effective use of land
- 12. Achieving well-designed places
- 14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

6.2 London Plan (2016)

Relevant policies include:

- 2.6 Outer London: Vision and strategy
- 2.8 Outer London: Transport
- 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
- 5.1 Climate change mitigation
- 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- 5.17 Waste capacity
- 5.21 Contaminated land
- 6.3 Assessing the effects of development on transport capacity
- 6.9 Cycling
- 6.11 Smoothing traffic flow and easing congestion
- 6.12 Road network capacity
- 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
- 8.3 CIL

6.3 Merton Local Development Framework Core Strategy – 2011 (Core Strategy)

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 19 Public transport
- CS 20 Parking servicing and delivery

6.4 Merton Sites and Policies Plan – 2014 (SPP)

Relevant policies include:

- DM H2 Housing mix
- DM D1 Urban Design
- DM D2 Design considerations
- DM EP2 Reducing and mitigating noise
- DM EP3 Allowable solutions
- DM EP4 Pollutants
- DM T2 Transport impacts of development
- DM T3 Car parking and servicing standards
- DM T4 Transport infrastructure

6.5 Supplementary planning considerations

London Housing SPG – 2016

Merton Design SPG – 2004

Technical Housing Standards – Nationally described space standard 2015

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 Material Considerations

The key issues in the assessment of this planning application are:

- Principle of development.
- Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the area.
- Impact upon neighbouring amenity.
- Standard of accommodation.
- Transport, highway network and parking.
- Refuse storage and collection.
- Sustainable design and construction.
- Flooding and sustainable urban drainage.
- Contamination
- Developer contributions

Principle of development

7.2 Policy 3.3 of the London Plan 2016 states that development plan policies should seek to identify new sources of land for residential development including intensification of housing provision through development at higher Page 16 densities. The emerging London Plan, Policy D6 seeks to optimise density, and states that density should be appropriate for its context and with consideration towards transport accessibility and infrastructure. The principle of a residential development on the site has already been accepted by the Council, albeit a little smaller than now proposed.

7.3 Given the above, it is considered the proposal is acceptable in principle; subject to compliance with the relevant London Plan policies, Merton Local Development Framework Core Strategy, Merton Sites and Policies Plan and supplementary planning documents.

Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the area

7.4 The NPPF, London Plan policies 7.4 and 7.6, Core Strategy policy CS14 and SPP Policy DM D2 require well designed proposals which make a positive contribution to the public realm, are of the highest quality materials and design and which are appropriate in their context, thus they must respect the appearance, materials, scale, bulk, proportions and character of their surroundings.

- 7.5 The main changes externally to the building include raising the hip of the roof by 900mm on each side, the use of brick to provide the finish to all external walls rather than a mix of brick and timber as per the previous scheme, roof light would also be installed at loft level within the front roof slope. Overall these changes entail fairly modest adjustment to the scheme previously approved by committee. Officer's views are that the scheme would be unreasonable to resist given that the proposal would continue to appear visually acceptable within a back land site.
- 7.6 The core design elements of the scheme have already been articulated within the previous committee report (March 2018). For continuity this text has been largely repeated within this committee report, while adjustments have been made where necessary to reflect alterations in design between the previously approved and the subject scheme.
- 7.7 The proposed semi-detached dwelling will be located at the end of a cul-de-sac and down a shared driveway (approximately 20m). The backland nature of the site, along with the distance from the street and the screening provided by the surrounding dwellings, would obstruct the vast majority views towards the proposed dwellings from public areas. While parts of the proposal may be visible when viewed from the gaps between the dwellings along Barnes End, it is considered that such vantage points will be limited and confined to the end of a cul-de-sac with minimal public movement and no through traffic.
- 7.8 One of the clear design features of the proposed semi-detached dwelling is the catslide on the south-eastern face. The catslide to the rear (with 2 large and 4 small roof lights) has been introduced in order to allow a reduction in the height of the main roof, albeit, the hip of the roof has now been raised from that of the previously approved scheme. It is not considered that the profile or scale of the roof would adversely impact on adjacent properties. It is noted that the roof design incorporating a catslide is not an uncommon feature in the area, with the several dwellings along Barnes End having a catslide on the street facing elevations.
- 7.9 The building is set in from all boundaries and it is considered to fit comfortably within the site. Considering the existing built environment, the proposed 2 storey building (with loft level), is considered to be well justified in terms of bulk and height and that it would sit comfortably within its context. In addition, the massing approach, which focuses the bulk toward the centre of the site and away from the shared boundaries, while reducing in bulk toward the rear, is considered to be appropriate. Given the above, the footprint and layout of the building is considered to be well thought out and appropriate for the site.
- 7.10 Viewed holistically, it is considered that the proposed changes to the building from that formerly approved would continue to respond appropriately to the surrounding context in terms of massing, heights, layout, and materials.
- Impact upon neighbouring amenity
- 7.11 London Plan policies 7.14 and 7.15 along with SPP policy DM D2 state 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 light spill/pollution, loss of light, quality of living conditions, privacy, visual intrusion and noise.
- 7.12 The applicant has updated their sunlight and daylight report for the revised proposal. The revised scheme does not seek to introduce any additional windows to the rear or sides of the buildings. Side facing windows similar to the previously approved scheme

would be obscure glazed at first floor level. As per previously stated, the roof hip would be increased in height and roof lights installed to the front roof slope.

Light spill:

- 7.13 Light spill from the proposal is not expected to be significant given the scheme is entirely residential, and officers consider and spillage onto adjoining land would not be harmful.

Privacy:

- 7.14 The primary outlook would be provided to the front (north-west) and rear (south-east) of the subject site.
- 7.15 With regards potential overlooking impacts on adjacent properties to the north-west (15, 11, 9, 7, 5, 3 and 1 Blakes Terrace) it is noted that the proposed dwellings would be located approximately 26m from the closest adjacent building which is considered to be more than enough separation distance to maintain appropriate levels of privacy. The proposed front roof lights to the scheme would not create any new views towards neighbouring houses that could not already be attained from the front windows of the property. These front windows have already been considered acceptable and approved within the previous scheme. The impacts to privacy caused by the new front roof lights would therefore be neutral and not harmful.
- 7.16 With regards potential overlooking impacts on adjacent properties to the south-west and north-east (447, 449, 451, 453, 455 West Barnes Lane and 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38 and 40 Barnes End), the scheme proposes minimal glazing and a combination of obscure glazed and fixed shut windows at the first floor level on the south-western and north-eastern faces. It is noted that the irregular shape of the site, the orientation of the proposed dwellings and the orientation of the adjacent dwellings have allowed the applicant to provide the rear with directional outlook, to avoid directing overlooking the adjacent dwellings. While the proposal may increase the level of potential overlooking on adjacent rear gardens, it is noted that the only windows at first floor level will be associated with roof lights. It is acknowledged that due to the low ceiling height caused by the catslide, some of the roof lights will allow a certain level of overlooking when viewed from the bedrooms. However, given the separation distances from the shared boundaries and the existing level of overlooking from adjacent properties, any perception of an increase in overlooking/loss of privacy not would be warrant refusal.

Visual intrusion:

- 7.17 Given the proposed buildings would be 2 storey in height (with loft level) and would be replacing single storey garages, visual intrusion should be closely scrutinised. The proposed increase of the roof hip would have a less than minor impact on the outlook of neighbours or their sense of spaciousness when compared to that of the previously approved scheme. This change to the building from that previously approved is therefore not considered to cause any material harm that would justify refusal of the application.
- 7.18 With regard to 34 to 36 Barnes End and 38 to 40 Barnes End (dwellings to the north-east): it is noted that the primary outlook is directed toward the street front and the rear of the property. The rear outlook will generally face the proposed accessway and parking space of Plot 2; in addition, the two storey section of the building is setback from the adjacent building by approximately 12m.

- 7.19 With regard to 32 to 30 Barnes End and 28 to 26 Barnes End (dwellings to the east): it is noted that the primary outlook is directed toward the street front and the rear of the property. The rear outlook will be orientated towards the proposed rear garden of Plot 2; in addition, the two storey section of the building is setback from the adjacent building by approximately 9m.
- 7.20 With regard to 447, 449, 451, 453, 455 West Barnes Lane (dwellings to the south and south-west): it is noted that the primary outlook is directed toward the street front and the rear. The rear outlook will be orientated towards the proposed building, however the two storey section of the building will be located approximately 24m away from the closest adjacent building in addition.
- 7.21 To further mitigate the impact of visual intrusion, the proposed building would utilise a dual pitched roof, that will reduce in height the closer it gets to the shared boundaries and trees would be planted along the southern, south-eastern, eastern and western boundaries in order to reduce the visual impact of the proposal.

Daylight and sunlight:

- 7.22 The developer has provided an updated daylight and sunlight assessment to support the revised proposal. This report has been undertaken in accordance with BRE guidelines; the methodology used is the vertical sky component (VSC) and annual probable sunlight hours (APSH) for sunlight. The habitable rooms of surrounding dwellings have also been assessed.
- 7.23 As confirmed by the developer's submitted daylight and sunlight assessment, all windows, rooms, and gardens of the tested properties, fully satisfy the BRE guidelines for daylight and sunlight, showing no noticeable reduction in light. Neighbouring properties will maintain good levels of daylight and sunlight after the proposed development is completed.

Standard of accommodation

- 7.24 Policies 3.5 and 3.8 of the London Plan 2016 state that housing developments are to be suitably accessible and should be of the highest quality internally and externally and should ensure that new development reflects the minimum internal space standards (specified as Gross Internal Areas) as set out in table 3.3 of the London Plan. Policy DM D2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan (2014) states that developments should provide for suitable levels of privacy, sunlight and daylight and quality of living conditions for future occupants.

Plot No.	Unit Type	Size/	Required Area	Proposed Area	Compliant
1	4b7p		121	133	Yes
2	4b7p		121	133	Yes

Where b = beds (no. of bedrooms) and p = persons (maximum occupancy)

- 7.25 As demonstrated by the table above, both dwellings exceed London Plan standards. All habitable rooms are serviced by windows which offer suitable natural light, ventilation and outlook to prospective occupants. In addition, both units are considered to be suitably private.

- 7.26 In accordance with the London Housing SPG, policy DMD2 of the SPP states that for all new houses, the council will seek a minimum garden area of 50sqm as a single usable regular shaped amenity space. Both dwellings will provide at least 56.5sqm to the rear of the site which would be supplemented by at least 60sqm of garden to the front and side. Given the proposal will provide well in excess of the minimum private amenity space, it is considered that the level of amenity space proposed would be acceptable.

Transport, highway network, parking and sustainable travel

- 7.27 London Plan policies 6.3 and 6.12, CS policies CS20 and CS18 and SPP policy DM T2 seek to reduce congestion of road networks, reduce conflict between walking and cycling, and other modes of transport, to increase safety and to not adversely effect on street parking or traffic management. London Plan policies 6.9, 6.10 6.13, CS policy CS20 and SPP policies DM T1 and DM T3 seek to promote sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, electric charging points and to provide parking spaces on a restraint basis (maximum standards).
- 7.28 No changes are proposed to the transport arrangements of the scheme from that previously approved.
- 7.29 The site has a PTAL of 2 which is considered to be poor, thus onsite parking is considered necessary. The proposal would provide 2 parking spaces per dwelling which is considered to be adequate and in line with London Plan standards. The submitted Transport Statement advises that the development would not have a severe impact on the local highway network, including on-street parking. The findings of the Transport Statement are considered to be fair and reasonable; it is not considered that the proposal would have an undue impact upon the highway network in terms of parking, performance or safety.

Refuse storage

- 7.30 Appropriate refuse storage must be provided for developments in accordance with policy 5.17 of the London Plan and policy CS 17 of the CS.
- 7.31 There is sufficient space on site for refuse facilities to be installed that meet Merton requirements. Details of the refuse facilities has been conditioned. The collection location for refuse is considered to be appropriate.

Sustainability

- 7.32 London Plan policy 5.3 and CS policy CS15 seek to ensure the highest standards of sustainability are achieved for developments which includes minimising carbon dioxide emissions, maximising recycling, sourcing materials with a low carbon footprint, ensuring urban greening and minimising the usage of resources such as water.
- 7.33 As per CS policy CS15, minor residential developments are required to achieve a 19% improvement on Part L of the Building Regulations 2013 and water consumption should not exceed 105 litres/person/day. It has been recommended to include a condition which will require evidence to be submitted that a policy compliant scheme has been delivered prior to occupation.

Site contamination

- 7.34 London Plan Policy 5.21 and SPP policy DM EP4 state that developments should seek to minimise pollutants, reduce concentrations to levels that have minimal adverse effects on human or environment health and to ensure contamination is not spread.

- 7.35 When the previously approved application ref:17/P3989 was submitted to the Council, there were concerns about potential for ground contamination on site. Planning conditions requiring site investigation work and if necessary remediation were therefore conditioned. The applicant has since submitted a site contamination assessment to discharge these conditions under Council ref:19/P0667. The assessment found no soil contamination risks, and therefore no remediation was necessary. The assessment recommended that a discovery strategy should be employed on site, so that unexpected ground conditions may be dealt with on site as demolition and groundworks are carried out.
- 7.36 Given that above findings an 'unexpected contamination' condition is now considered appropriate to deal with site contamination.

Flooding and Drainage

- 7.37 The applicant has submitted a flood risk assessment to support their proposal. The assessment recommends a series of mitigation measures to be installed, methods to delay and control the rate of surface water discharged from the site, and surface water drainage strategies. The recommendations provided within the assessment are acceptable in ensuring that the development appropriately mitigates flood and drainage risk, and effectively manages surface water drainage. Conditions have been recommended to ensure that the flood risk mitigation and surface water drainage measures detailed within the assessment are completed.

Developer contributions

- 7.38 The proposed development would be subject to payment of the Merton Community Infrastructure Levy and the Mayor of London's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

8. CONCLUSION

- 8.1 The principle of re-development of the site to provide two residential houses has already been accepted, which would deliver two homes that contribute towards Merton Housing Targets. The access road, and level of parking have also already been accepted, and the proposed changes to the previously approved scheme would not change these arrangements.
- 8.2 The main change to the scheme from that formerly approved is the introduction of loft level accommodation to the building, which has been achieved by increasing the height of the roof hip and introducing roof lights into the front roof slope. The timber cladding formerly approved at first floor level would also be changed to brick. However, the scale and design of these changes are considered acceptable and would not have a material impact to neighbour's living conditions when compared to the previously approved scheme. The proposal would also provide a good standard of accommodation for future occupants.
- 8.3 The proposal is considered to accord with the relevant National, Strategic and Local Planning policies and guidance and approval could reasonably be granted in this case.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to the following conditions.

Conditions:

1. Standard condition [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.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 (as amended) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.

2. Standard condition [Approved plans]: The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: [Refer to the schedule on page 1 of this report].

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. Standard condition [materials to be approved]: No works above foundation level shall take place until details of particulars and materials to be used on all external faces of the development hereby permitted, including window frames and doors (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 2015, policy CS14 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and D3 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

4. [Working method statement]: Prior to the commencement of development [including demolition] a working method statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority that shall include measures to accommodate: the parking of vehicles of site workers and visitors; loading and unloading of plant and materials; storage of construction plant and materials; wheel cleaning facilities; control of dust, smell and other effluvia; control of surface water run-off. No development shall be take place that is not in full accordance with the approved method statement.

Reason: It is necessary for the condition to be discharged prior to the commencement of development ensure vehicle and pedestrian safety and to protect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and to comply with policy CS20 of the Adopted Merton Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM D2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan.

5. [Construction Method Statement] No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, 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 construction period. The Statement shall provide for:

- the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- 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 during construction;
- measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;

- a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;

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

6. [Sustainability]: No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until evidence has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority confirming that the development has achieved CO2 reductions not less than a 19% improvement on Part L of the Building Regulations 2013 and internal water usage of not more 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.

7. [Landscaping]: No development shall take place until full details of a landscaping and planting scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved before the commencement of the use or the occupation of any building hereby approved. The details shall include on a plan, full details of the size, species, spacing, quantities and location of proposed plants, together with any hard surfacing, means of enclosure, and indications of all existing trees, hedges and any other features to be retained, and measures for their protection during the course of development.

Reason: To enhance the appearance of the development in the interest of the amenities of the area, to ensure the provision sustainable drainage surfaces and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies 5.1, 7.5 and 7.21 of the London Plan 2015, policies CS13 and CS16 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2, F2 and O2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

8. [Cycle storage]: No development shall commence until details of secure cycle parking facilities for the occupants of, and visitors, to the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved facilities shall be fully implemented and made available for use prior to the first occupation of the development and thereafter retained for use at all times.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory facilities for cycle parking are provided and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 6.13 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS18 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM T1 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

9. [Refuse]: The development shall not commence until detail of the refuse and recycling facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved refuse and recycling facilities shall be fully implemented and made available for use prior to the first occupation of the development and thereafter retained for use at all times.

Reason: To ensure the provision of satisfactory facilities for the storage of refuse and recycling material and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 5.17 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS17 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM D2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

10. The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) October 2020 / 5825 Rev 4 / Cole Easdon Consultants Ltd and the following mitigation measures detailed within the FRA:

- Finished floor levels are set no lower than 15.25m above Ordnance Datum (AOD).
- No sleeping below the first floor.
- Mitigation measures as detailed in paragraph 4.

The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants in line with paragraphs 155 to 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

11. [Sustainable Urban Drainage]: During construction of the development hereby permitted the Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SuDS) detailed within the submitted Flood Risk Assessment - October 2020 / 5825 Rev 4, shall be fully implemented and maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To reduce flood risk and to contribute to sustainability in accordance with policy CE2 of the Consolidated Local Plan.

Reason: To reduce the risk of surface and foul water flooding and to ensure the scheme is in accordance with the drainage hierarchy of London Plan policies 5.12 & 5.13 and the National SuDS standards and in accordance with policies CS16 of the Core Strategy and DMF2 of the Sites and Policies Plan.

12. The vehicle parking area shown on the approved plans shall be provided before the occupation of the buildings hereby permitted and shall be retained for parking purposes for 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. [Use of flat roof]: Access to the flat roof of the development hereby permitted, shall be for maintenance or emergency purposes only, and these areas shall not be used as a roof garden, terrace, patio or similar amenity area.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities and privacy of the occupiers of adjoining properties and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS14 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and D3 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

14. [Unexpected contamination]: If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not contribute to, or is not put at unacceptable risk from, or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution from previously unidentified contamination sources at the development site in line with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative

1. Demolition of buildings and tree felling should avoid the bird nesting and bat roosting seasons. Anyone who takes, damages or destroys the nest of any wild bird whilst that nest is in use, or who kills, injures or disturbs bats, obstructs access to bat roosts or damages or disturbs bat roosts, even when unoccupied by bats, is guilty of an offence under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Buildings and trees should be inspected for bird nests and bat roosts prior to demolition or felling by an appropriately qualified person. If bats are found, Natural England should be contacted for advice.
2. No surface water runoff should discharge onto the public highway including the public footway or highway. When it is proposed to connect to a public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required (contact no. 0845 850 2777).
3. The applicant should be aware that the site may provide a useful habitat for swifts. Swifts are currently in decline in the UK and in order to encourage and improve the conservation of swifts the applicant is advised to consider the installation of a swift nesting box/bricks on the site.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 6

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
10th December 2020

<u>UPRN</u>	<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>Item No:</u> <u>DATE VALID</u>
	20/P1738	01/06/2020
Address/Site	196-200 The Broadway, Wimbledon, SW19 1RY	
Ward	Abbey	
Proposal:	<p>Demolition of buildings and a 2 phased redevelopment comprising a mixed use development with the erection of part basement, part single, part five, part 6, part 7, part 8 and part 9 storey buildings.</p> <p>Phase 1 comprising demolition of Olympic house and part of YMCA and erection of a 121 room homeless hostel (sui generis) with ancillary gym and café.</p> <p>Phase 2 comprising demolition of remainder of site and erection of 135 flats and 333sqm of flexible class A1 (excluding supermarkets) /A2/A3/B1(a)/D1 floor space with vehicle access from trinity road, ancillary car and cycle parking, landscaping and associated works.</p>	
Drawing Nos	200-Rev A, 201-Rev A, 202-Rev A, 203-Rev A, 204-Rev A, 205-Rev A, 206-Rev A, 207-Rev A, 208-Rev A, 209-Rev A, 210, 211-Rev A, 220-Rev A, 221-Rev A, 222-Rev A, 230-Rev A, 231-Rev A, 240a-Rev A, 240b-Rev A, 241-Rev A, 242-Rev A, 243-Rev A, 244-Rev A, 245-Rev A, - 246-Rev A, 247-Rev A, 248-Rev A, 249-Rev A, 250, 260-Rev A, 261-Rev A, 262-Rev A and 263-Rev A.	
Contact Officer:	Stuart Adams (0208 545 3147)	

RECOMMENDATION

Grant Planning Permission subject to any direction from the Mayor of London, conditions and completion of a S.106 legal agreement.

CHECKLIST INFORMATION.

Heads of agreement: Permit Free, Zero Carbon (TBA contribution), Car Club Membership, Implementation of loading Restrictions (TBA contribution), Travel Plan, Affordable Housing (zero percentage but early and late stage viability reviews required), hostel must remain for that use in perpetuity and Phases of development.

Is a screening opinion required: No

Is an Environmental Statement required: No

Has an Environmental Impact Assessment been submitted – No

Press notice – Yes

Site notice – Yes

Design Review Panel consulted – Yes (pre-application stage)

Number of neighbours consulted – 677

External consultations – Greater London Authority, Environment Agency, Secure By Design officer, Thames Water, Historic England (GLAAS), Historic England (Parks & Gardens) and Garden History Society.

PTAL score – 6b (Best)

Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) – W3

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application has been brought before the Planning Applications Committee for consideration in light of the number and nature of objections received.
- 1.2 The scheme is referable to the GLA under the Mayor of London Order (2008), Part 1 (Large Scale Development), Category 1B (Development (other than development which only comprises the provision of houses, flats, or houses and flats) which comprises or includes the erection of a building or buildings) -
 - (c) outside Central London and with a total floorspace of more than 15,000 square metres.
- 1.3 The GLA referral process gives the Mayor six weeks to provide comments on the application, assessing whether it complies with the London Plan policies. This is a consultation response known as stage one. The application is then considered by the local planning authority at its planning committee, where it decides whether to grant or refuse permission. Following its consideration, the local planning authority is then required to refer the application to the Mayor for his final decision, known as a Stage 2 referral. The Mayor has 14 days to make a decision to allow

the local planning authority decision to stand, to direct refusal, or to take over the application, thus becoming the local planning authority.

2. **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 The application site (196-200 The Broadway) comprises a plot on the corner of The Broadway and Trinity Road. The site comprises a mix of buildings ranging in height from 2 to 8 storeys including plant equipment, with the prominent structures being the existing YMCA building (8 storeys), Olympic House (6 storeys) and Tower Lodge (3 storeys).
- 2.2 The site is currently occupied by a mix of uses. The existing YMCA facility is an occupied 111-bed hostel facility for the homeless (*Sui Generis*), whilst Olympic House is a purpose built 1970s office building lawfully in Class B1(a) use other than part of two floors which are leased to a D1 education provider. Tower Lodge is also used by the YMCA as ancillary office and meeting space associated with the main YMCA hostel building (*Sui Generis*).
- 2.3 The site has an existing car park to the rear providing approximately 50 parking spaces, accessed via a private entrance off Trinity Road to the east, in between the YMCA building and Tower Lodge.
- 2.4 The surrounding area is mixed in terms of both use and character. Typically, The Broadway is characterised by commercial uses including offices, retail, restaurants and hotels, often with residential to the upper floors.
- 2.5 Trinity Road and South Park Road are principally residential in character, comprising a mix of detached and semi-detached 2 and 3 storey houses along with some blocks of apartments on Trinity Road reaching up to 5 storeys.
- 2.6 In terms of height, buildings achieve up to 10 storeys along this part of The Broadway, namely the Premier Inn hotel located opposite to the west. To the immediate west of the application site lies 188-194 The Broadway comprising a 2-storey commercial unit and one half of a pair of semi-detached properties. A planning appeal was recently allowed at this site for the demolition of the existing building and erection of a 7 storey office building.
- 2.7 The site benefits from a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 6 (a & b), on a scale ranging from 0 to 6b, where 6b represents the highest level of access to public transport facilities. This is reflective of the excellent local rail, tube and bus services which serve the site.

- 2.8 The site has access to a number of high frequency bus services, from close to the site on The Broadway, as well as adjacent to Trinity Church, and on Sir Cyril Black Way, all within a seven-minute walk from the site. The site is also within a short walk to Wimbledon Station providing access to National Rail and the London Underground, and South Wimbledon Underground Station south-east of the site.
- 2.9 The site is located within Wimbledon Major Town Centre and within the Future Wimbledon Masterplan Area.
- 2.10 The site is allocated within the adopted Merton's Sites and Policies Plan (2014) as Site Allocation 62, being for a suitable mix of retail (A1 Use Class), financial and professional services (A2 Use Class), restaurants and cafes (A3 Use Class), drinking establishments (A4 Use Class), offices (B1a Use Class), community (D1 Use Class), leisure/sporting uses (D2 Use Class), hostel (Sui Generis Use Class) and residential (including hotel, C3 and C1 Use Class).
- 2.11 The site is also allocated within Merton's Draft New Local Plan under site 'Wi15'. The allocation continues to identify the site as being suitable for a mixed-use redevelopment comprising the same mix of commercial, retail and residential uses.
- 2.12 The site is not located within a Conservation Area and does not contain any listed buildings or structures. The closest Conservation Areas are the South Park Gardens Conservation Area which is located approximately 140m to the north, and the Pelham Road Conservation Area which is located approximately 160m to the south.

3. **PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 Demolition of buildings and a 2 phased redevelopment comprising a mixed use development with the erection of part basement, part single, part five, part 6, part 7, part 8 and part 9 storey buildings. Phase 1 comprising demolition of Olympic house and part of YMCA and erection of a 121 room homeless hostel (sui generis) with ancillary gym and café. Phase 2 comprising demolition of remainder of site and erection of 135 flats and 333sqm of flexible Class A1 (excluding supermarkets) /A2/A3/B1(a)/D1 floor space with vehicle access from trinity road, ancillary car and cycle parking, landscaping and associated works.
- 3.2 The proposed redevelopment of the site in two phases will allow the YMCA to continue to operate throughout the build process and phase 2 will ensure that the homeless hostel can be viably delivered. This means the existing YMCA use is not ceased at any point during the construction works.

- 3.3 Phase 1 comprises the demolition of Olympic house and part of YMCA and erection of a 121 room homeless hostel (sui generis) with ancillary gym and café.
- 3.4 Phase 2 comprises demolition of remainder of site and erection of 135 flats and 333sqm of flexible Class A1 (excluding supermarkets) /A2/A3/B1(a)/D1 floor space with vehicle access from trinity road, ancillary car and cycle parking, landscaping and associated works.
- 3.5 The proposed building has been split into three different building blocks, 1 (YMCA), 2 Residential – in the centre) and 3 (Residential – corner element on The Broadway and along Trinity Road). The building is further subdivided into Blocks. The YMCA, Block A (central), B (corner) and C, D and E which included the staggered lowering of building heights on Trinity Road.
- 3.6 The YMCA facility will provide a range of ancillary uses including re-provision of the existing gym and café, which will also both be available for public use. Its re-provision within Phase 1 will also ensure that there is minimal disruption to the existing facility. The café will provide a wider benefit to the local community too and will be directly accessed from the piazza to the front of the site.
- 3.7 The scheme will deliver 135 residential units in the second phase. The proposed housing mix comprises 1 x studio unit, 108 x 1-bed units, 25 x 2-bed units and 1 x 3-bed unit. At ground floor of the residential building will be two commercial units and it is proposed their use is a flexible A1/A2/A3/B1/D1 use. Following pre-application discussions with LB Merton highways officers, it was agreed that this use will exclude a supermarket due to potential conflicts with servicing and deliveries.
- 3.8 The scheme proposes a mix of public and private amenity spaces and courtyards for benefit of future residents and the wider public. To the front of the site, a public piazza is proposed with direct pedestrian access from The Broadway. The proposed double height colonnade on both The Broadway and partly on Trinity Road will push the ground and first floor level of the proposed building between 1.4m and 3.9m (approx) into the site, creating an enlarged width public footpath.
- 3.9 Communal amenity space for the residents of the scheme will be provided to the upper floors, whilst internal courtyard spaces are an additional benefit for the YMCA at first floor and residents of the eastern block at third floor.

- 3.10 Cycle parking is provided at first floor level of the residential part of the scheme for future residents via two dedicated lifts. YMCA staff cycle parking is provided within the YMCA element at ground floor. Short-stay visitor cycle parking is provided within the public realm at the front of the site.
- 3.11 The scheme is car-free other than four disabled parking bays for the residential element of the scheme, which are located within the rear courtyard to be accessed via Trinity Road. This courtyard also brings servicing and deliveries into the site.

Amendments

- 3.12 Several minor changes have been made to the plans and elevations as a result of comments received during the statutory consultation period. These are discussed in turn below:

Reduction in size of bedrooms in some units

- 3.13 Following comments raised by Officers in respect of the bedroom sizes in the 1b1p units, the size of these bedrooms has been reduced. Officers noted that in some instances the bedrooms exceeded 11.4 sqm which meant that they would be large enough to accommodate a double bed in line with adopted standards. In these relevant instances, the size of these bedrooms has been reduced to 11.4 sqm or below to provide comfort that they are genuinely 1b1p units.

Ground floor duplexes

- 3.14 Comments were received from the Council's Urban Design Officer that there were unresolved issues within the front gardens of the duplex units along Trinity Road. To accommodate these concerns, the applicants have reconfigured the front gardens and bin stores to provide a more functional front garden, whilst the boundary treatment has been reduced from 1.5m to 1.2m to provide a more active frontage and more natural surveillance of the street.

Door added to commercial unit

- 3.15 A new side door has been to the central commercial unit directly from the servicing corridor providing a more direct route for the future commercial operator and avoid goods passing through the public open space.

Amendments to the enlarged cycle parking spaces

- 3.16 Comments were received from the Met Police Officer and the GLA that the enlarged cycle parking spaces should be within a secured and lockable store. This has been incorporated at ground floor and would be controlled by fob access.

Relocation of short stay cycle parking

- 3.17 The original plans showed short stay cycle parking along Trinity Road. These spaces have been relocated to the central piazza following discussions with the Met Police Officer and will now benefit from more direct natural surveillance.

Clarification over fenestration in upper floors of YMCA

- 3.18 The GLA queried the YMCA bedrooms that potentially suffer from overlooking across the internal courtyard to the upper floors. The plans have been updated to show in greater detail the approach to the fenestration to avoid the direct overlooking. Alternate, perforated panels will be installed to the inward facing windows to ensure there will be no direct overlooking between opposing units.

Link from service yard to residential concierge lobby

- 3.19 The ground floor has been reconfigured slightly to provide a more direct link from the service yard to the residential concierge lobby which will provide a better user experience.

Zone around the 1b2p central block units

- 3.20 At the request of the Urban Design Officer, the scheme includes a 750mm zone around the beds in the 1b2p central block units to assist with circulation.

Aligning screen with vertical mullions

- 3.21 The balcony screens have been aligned with the vertical mullions in the central block façade facing the Broadway.

4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

200 The Broadway (YMCA)

- 4.1 19/P1271 - Telecoms licence notification in respect of the replacement of 3 x antennas and ancillary equipment – No further action - 16/04/2019

- 4.2 18/P3313 - Licence notification in respect of the replacement of 6 x antennas plus installation of new antennas comprising 1 x gps and 3 x rrus plus ancillary equipment – No further action - 17/10/2018
- 4.3 17/P0024 - Telecoms licence notification in respect of the replacement of 6 x antennas – No further action - 25/01/2017
- 4.4 14/P2972 - Licence notification in respect of the removal of 3 x existing antennas to be replaced with 3 x new antennas on the existing 5 high tower on the roof of the YMCA building – No further action - 22/06/2015
- 4.5 13/P0892 - Licence notification in respect of the upgrading of the existing telecommunications equipment that form part of the Vodafone mobile phone network with the replacement of the existing rooftop antennas – No further action - 04/04/2014
- 4.6 12/P2100 - Licence notification in respect of the installation of a 0.3 metre microwave dish at 26 metres on the existing rooftop poles – No further action - 18/07/2014
- 4.7 05/P0887 - Installation of new illuminated and non illuminated advertisements on building and in rear car park – Grant - 11/08/2005
- 4.8 99/P0236 - Installation of microwave antenna and equipment cabin on roof of building – Not required - 10/02/1999
- 4.9 98/P0442 - Replacement of three dual polar antennae on existing rooftop tower with three dual band dual power antennae – Not required - 29/04/1998
- 4.10 95/P0550 - Installation of 6 unidirectional telecommunication aerials and associated equipment upon roof of eight storey tower – Granted - 03/07/1995
- 4.11 94/P0764 - Erection of roof level extensions above first floor level to provide ancillary office and hostel accommodation and enclosed fire escape facilities to first and second floor levels – Grant - 25/05/1995.
- 4.12 90/P0153 - Installation of internally illuminated fascia sign beneath projecting canopy of building – Grant - 22/05/1990
- 4.13 MER406/83 - Retrospective application for the erection of an open topped brick built dustbin enclosure – Grant - 21/07/1983
- 4.14 MER517/73 - Change of use of previously approved ground floor shop units to offices – Grant - 15/06/1973

- 4.15 MER144/73 - Illuminated lettering to read ymca – Grant - 29/03/1973
- 4.16 MER73/72 - Display of 7 non illuminated advertisement panels for the duration of building operations or one year – Grant - 14/03/1972
- 4.17 MER659/71 - Erection of a building to provide shops, offices and YMCA hostel containing 100 bedrooms and ancillary accommodation for YMCA use – Grant - 07/10/1971
- 4.18 MER600/71 - Use for 3 months for storage and workshop – Grant - 10/08/1971
- 4.19 MER977/71 - Erection of building to provide shops, offices and YMCA hostel containing 100 bedroom and ancillary accommodation for YMCA use – Grant - 16/03/1972
- 4.20 MER70/69 - Illuminated box sign – Grant - 13/02/1969.
- Olympic House - 196 The Broadway
- 4.21 06/P2685 - Alterations to and re-cladding of existing six storey building including erection of one additional floor. Change of use from (class d1) to (class b1) to the first and second floor and erection of a six storey front extension – Grant - 11/06/2007
- 4.22 MER517/73 - Change of use of previously approved ground floor shop units to offices – Grant - 15/06/1973
- 4.23 MER73/72 - Display of 7 non illuminated advertisement panels for the duration of building operations or one year – Grant - 14/03/1972.
- 4.24 MER977/71 - Erection of building to provide shops, offices and YMCA hostel containing 100 bedroom and ancillary accommodation for YMCA use – Grant - 16/03/1972
- 4.25 MER659/71 - Erection of a building to provide shops, offices and YMCA hostel containing 100 bedrooms and ancillary accommodation for YMCA use – Grant - 07/10/1971
- 4.26 MER8/71 - Erection of building to provide shops offices and YMCA hostel containing 100 bedrooms, and ancillary accommodation for YMCA use – Deferred - 14/01/1971
- 4.27 WIM5981 - Outline erection of a 4 storey building including 2 shops, entrance lounge, dining room, kitchen etc and a total of 102 hostel

bedrooms and 2 three room flat on the 1st, 2nd and 3rd floors – Grant - 05/11/1961

4.28 WIM262 - Use of forecourt for the sale of flowers (determination under section 17) – permission not required - 07/03/1949

4.29 WIM248 - Erection of additional hostel accommodation – Grant - 11/02/1949.

196 The Broadway - 1st & 2nd Floors

4.30 03/P0079 - Change of use of first and second floors from offices (Class B1) to educational use (Class D1) – Grant - 07/03/2003

Permission reference 03/P0079 secured the change of use of the first and second floors of Olympic House from B1 to D1 to allow an educational use on the site. Whilst planning permission was secured latterly in 2006 and 2007 for a reversion to Class B1, along with a six storey front extension in 2007, these applications (06/P1921 and 06/P2685) were never implemented. Accordingly, the lawful planning use of Olympic House is Class B1 other than the first and second floors which is D1

4.31 06/P1921 - Change of use of first and second floors from educational use (class D1) to offices (class B1) (reversion to former use) – Grant - 04/10/2006

Corner Plot – formerly 222 – 224 The Broadway

4.32 07/P0055 - Redevelopment of the site. Erection of a building ranging in height from 3 – 6 storeys to provide 14 x 2-bedroom flats, Use (Class C3) financial / professional services (Class A2) and offices (Class B1). – Grant - 26/08/2010

Permission reference 07/P0055 secured the redevelopment of the corner plot adjacent to the YMCA to the immediate east for a 6 storey mixed-use scheme. This followed several similar applications on this parcel of land however none were implemented, and the permissions have now lapsed.

4.33 03/P2846 - Redevelopment of the site. Erection of a building ranging in height from 3 – 5 storeys to provide 14 x 2-bedroom flats with balconies and roof terraces, a food a drink use (Class A3) and offices (Class B1) with parking for four cars at the rear off Trinity Road – Grant - 06/10/2006

- 4.34 99/P1636 - Erection of a building ranging in height from 3 – 5 storeys to provide 12 x 2-bedroom flats and 2 x 1-bedroom flats. A retail or food and drink use (Class A1/A3) at basement and ground floor levels, a communal roof garden at the rear at third floor level and 4 off-street car parking spaces off Trinity Road, involving demolition of existing buildings on the site – Grant - 25/07/2002
- 4.35 92/P0823 - Erection of new storage room on Trinity Road frontage of property involving increasing height of part of boundary wall by 600mm together with insertion of new window to first floor office – Grant - 30/12/1992

Other relevant planning history

188 – 194 The Broadway, Wimbledon

- 4.36 20/P2166 - Demolition of existing building and erection of seven storey office building – Pending decision
- 4.37 18/P2918 – ‘Demolition of existing building and erection of six storey office building’. Appeal Allowed 23/01/2020. This application secured planning permission for a six storey building with plant equipment equivalent to a further storey above.

153-161 The Broadway, Wimbledon

- 4.38 16/P1149 – ‘Demolition of the existing buildings and erection of a 9 storey 176-bedroom hotel (Use Class C1) and ground floor restaurant (Use Class A3) facility and car parking and associated landscaping and access. Granted 10/11/2016.

5. **CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 The application has been advertised by major site notice procedure and letters of notification sent to the occupiers of immediate neighbouring properties and to wider neighbouring properties in the locality.

- 5.1.1 In response to the consultation, 107 letters of objection (including one from the Wimbledon Society), 101 letters of support and 36 letters of comment (including one from Right of Light Consultant and Swift Conservation) received.

5.1.2 **Letters of Objection**

The individual letters of objection raise the following points:

Safety

- History of anti-social behavior (ASB) on surrounding residential properties from the existing YMCA facility
- Neighbours need some comfort that the safety and wellbeing of their homes is protected.
- Nothing in the application documentation to show how the population of the hostel will be managed in terms of security for both local residents and residents at the YMCA. We were assured at the consultation there would be provision for 24 hour security at the premises and CCTV to monitor the open space and ensure it is safe at all times and this should be a planning condition for any final development proposal for the site.
- There is likely to be an increase in ASB from the YMCA with the additional rooms proposed.
- Management of the open space - The open space needs to have high visibility from the public highway, or it will encourage night time street drinking, drug taking and loitering. Ancillary to this will be the use of any screening such as plant boxes as toilets, hidden from public view.
- Will inevitably devalue the properties in the immediate vicinity.
- To prevent further illegal activity, gates and entrances should be locked/secured in the evenings and the YMCA should provide 24 hour security with a telephone/email contact for local residents.. This will also apply to any public areas

Noise, Dust & Pollution

- The proposed 2.4m high hoarding will not be sufficient and needs to be raised to a higher level to prevent impact on pedestrians and residential properties.
- Negative impact to the environment in this area, which has been already affected due to be located so close to restaurants, pubs, leisure centre, shops, schools and bus and train stations. This used to be a residential area which is no longer the case, with a substantial amount of traffic.
- Neighbours have already endured the works of the Polka Theatre which has included working on Saturdays and Sundays affecting the resting and relaxing time of the neighbours.
- Restricting lorries & skips to main roads & restricting building hours.

Design

- Height and massing too excessive and out of keeping
- Loss of light and overshadowing
- Overlooking

- Overdevelopment
- Adverse impact on the South Park Gardens Conservation Area
- The building should be set back further and have a steeper "stepping-down" shape to the North.
- No adequate bin and cycle storage
- Restrictions on bikes/junk being placed on balconies. There should be a planning condition that the Management Company enforce restrictions. There should be a large internal storage area for bikes and large prams to avoid clutter on balconies
- The high density of the proposed development.
- Lack of gardens.
- The height of this building will set a precedent
- The total volume of the proposed buildings is alarming and inappropriate for a development on the outer edge of the recognised business district of Wimbledon town centre.
- Too many single aspect flats.
- The height of the proposed building is 7m or 2 storeys higher than the existing building over a much greater footprint and the mass and bulk will be overbearing to the Victorian residential properties in South Park Road.
- To avoid a repeat of the existing YMCA building (only built in the 60s but already looks derelict) it is essential that long lasting, good quality materials are used. No cladding. It should be brick, stone, concrete and glass. This will ensure the building looks "new" for decades.
- The overhang (from second floor up) and height puts the proposed development closer to roads and will make both The Broadway and especially Trinity Road feel narrower.
- The development along the Trinity Road side is much higher, bigger and closer to the road than before - no other buildings on the road are as substantial or built so near the boundary/pavement/road.
- The proposed bulk/mass of the development and the lack of green space within it is not in line with the character of the conservation area.

Landscaping

- The contemplated green space and trees outside don't seem to have gotten much attention to ensure they will be successfully planted and able to grow in close proximity of the building's significant pipe works and drainage. The green space deserves a significant review and upgrade, and the viability of the trees ought to be formally, and independently, confirmed.

- Trees included in this development should be drought resistant and watered regularly.

Housing Mix

- Provision of new housing is always welcome, but it is surprising to see the high density of 1 bedroom flats for the proposed development. Wimbledon /South Wimbledon is an area with a well-balanced mix of several generations, and the proposal to develop such a high number of one bedroom flats does not reflect the diversity or needs of the local population.
- It's more likely that those flats will be bought by investors and rented out which will mean a high turn over of residents and a less cohesive community. A more transient population will result in a less cohesive community as the residents' will not have long term plans or interest in the local area resulting in little or no social and financial investment in the area.
- While the proposal is for the development an A3 commercial units on the ground, I would ask for measures to be put in place (such covenants agreement attached to the title deed) to ensure that no A4 units can be set up (pubs, bars etc). This is probably due to the nature of the likely tenants of the hostel.
- The developer has focused on the backlog need in The Mayor of London's 2017 London Strategic Housing Impact Assessment (LSHIA) to justify the density of one-bedroom flats in the design proposal but this cannot be used to reflect development balance for a single scheme of this type as it fails to address the overall impact on the surrounding community.
- According to the LSHIA, projected housing tenure needs (net annualised requirement) over the short term overall (2016 - 2045) showed a need for 55% of new housing to comprise 2, 3 and 4 bedroom accommodation across market rented, intermediate and low cost rent sectors while long term projections for the same types of accommodation overall at just over 45%. 80% of 1 bedroom flats proposed brings no benefits to the local area.
- Risk that the units will be turned into Airbnb lets.
- The high number of 1 bedroom flats unfairly prejudices the younger generation who would like to stay in the area but are unable to find a flat suitable for their needs when they wish to start a family as 2/3/4 bedroom flats of reasonable sizes and quality are few and far between in Wimbledon.
- Given the ethos of the YMCA in supporting local communities, this aspect of the design is both surprising and disappointing.
- The design proposal for residential flats suggest the proposal is geared to generate maximum profit and value at the expense of longer term social cohesion.

- The drawings indicate a large number of minuscule residential flats to be squeezed at the detriment of the living quality of future residents.

Highway/Transport

- The number of one bedroom flats will flood the area with an increase in population numbers increasing pressure on an already busy public transport system.
- Noted all traffic will approach via The Broadway and Merton Road. There needs to be clear signage on these routes to ensure construction traffic will adhere to the traffic route and not take short cuts through residential areas south of The Broadway.
- The provision of 135 flats raises issue regarding the adequacy of parking. The lack of any parking, apart from a paltry 4 disabled bays, is of concern. CPZ W3 is already oversubscribed. Underground car park required.
- Vehicle access from Trinity Road would have a dangerous impact raising issues of highway safety. The Trinity Road, Broadway junction is currently a busy junction and a development of 135 flats would increase massively this busy and congested area of Trinity Road.
- The current road system would not support the need for parking, loading, turning, waste collection and the ubiquitous delivery vans.
- If the development of 135 flats is allowed to go ahead the area of Trinity Road from South Park Road to The Broadway would lead to the need for dangerous manoeuvres onto an increasingly busy and congested Trinity Road.
- There has been no proper consideration given to the logistics and traffic flow associated with the servicing of such a huge building, let alone relying on Trinity road that is relatively narrow, busy, and lined with parked cars and speed-reducing landscaping.
- The new building will be closer to the pavement edges than the existing building. This is likely to cause severe disruption and safety issues to the area, as well as road closures.
- The two commercial units don't appear to have proper access for goods, and the minimal parking space at the back of the building would not be suitable for this purpose.
- Steps need to be taken to prohibit the use of the nearby parking facilities.
- Trinity Road is a 20mph Road and is a direct fire engine route to service Hayden's road / Plough lane areas of the town from the Kingston Road fire station and needs to be kept as clear as possible.
- A safe construction entrance should be provided to avoid congestion on both the Broadway and Trinity Road

- Use of residential roads for skips and trucks should be banned (or rather the ban which is already in place should be enforced).
- Inappropriate cycle storage. The two tiered cycle parking layout does not conform to the London Cycling Design Standards. Both in terms of the dimensions of the actual aisle width, and in terms of not following the guidance for two-sided double stacking on the same aisle. The aisle should be wider than for one-sided double stacking. The widths proposed will make this cycle parking very awkward and at peak times unworkable.
- Providing two lifts accommodates the frequent coming and going from a 188 bike store. It must be assumed that several bikes could be waiting to use the 2 lifts and the lift lobbies do not allow for this when bikes are also existing the lifts. The ground floor and first floor bicycle lift lobbies are too tight and this is exacerbated by the access ways to them.

Neighbour Amenity

- Residents don't want to look out of their windows or down the road to see such high towers blocking the sky, the light, the view and overlooking their gardens.
- Loss of privacy and overlooking
- Disruption during construction
- The building should be set back to the current building line of Olympic House.
- A larger / wider open space will encourage night time street drinking, drug taking and loitering.
- The proposal is clearly overbearing, with a larger bulk and mass than the neighbouring buildings. Its scale and bulk are not appropriate to the streetscene.
- The hours of construction should be limited to 8 am to 5 pm Monday to Friday. Residents need a break from the constant noise and pollution.
- Windows of the hostel rooms directly facing our block exposing our homes directly to residents of the hostel rooms. We would ask that the design of the windows to the hostel either be changed so it faces away from residential properties to The Broadway or some tinting of the windows be considered to obscure and reduce visual incursion into flats opposite so they do not have a clear view into flats opposite.
- Loss of light and overshadowing

Daylight/Sunlight Report commissioned by third parties:

The report assesses impact on Oadtrin Lodge (5 Trinity Road) on pages 15 and 16. It finds that there are 28 VSC daylight shortfalls to windows to

this property, 15 NSC/DD shortfalls and 11 ASPH shortfalls. This is clearly unacceptable and will result in significant adverse impact to the residents of Oadtrin Lodge.

As residents of Oadtrin Lodge, we have commissioned another Daylight & Sunlight Survey (July 2020, Model Environments). This finds that (Executive Summary): "The impact of this proposal upon Oadtrin Lodge, on the opposite side of Trinity Road, is classified as severe. Two versions of the proposal have been tested, neither of which complies with good practice, which suggests that impacts to natural light at Oadtrin Lodge have been overlooked unintentionally or otherwise."

The report assesses a total of nine windows at Oadtrin Lodge. It finds that the impact to daylight for all the windows tested breaches good practice and is therefore classified as severe. Sunlight reception is also adversely affected, to a degree likely to be noticeable by occupants,

The proposal will cast a shadow across the road and the entire Oadtrin Lodge / Nairn Court from midday. This will affect the amenity of neighbours and also the safety and security of pedestrians.

The report assesses impact on Viscount Point on pages 17 and 18. It finds that there are 30 VSC shortfalls to windows to this property, and 41 NSC/DD shortfalls. This is clearly unacceptable and will result in significant adverse impact to the residents of Viscount Point. There is a need for independent review of the applicant's Daylight & Sunlight Assessment.

Commercial Uses

- Needs to be a permanent covenant against the use of the premises for A4 uses (public houses, wine bars or other drinking establishments).
- The Broadway is well served by A1 retail spaces and would encourage use of the second commercial unit as affordable workspace for entrepreneurs and flexible use office spaces to attract tech companies should be encouraged.
- Given the number of new residents, it would perhaps have made sense to consider making one of these units some form of health or community facility.
- Concern with the viable layout (dividing doors) of the proposed YMCA studios. The folding doors are not a good choice for the studios; noise will travel very easily which will be really difficult when multiple classes are happening alongside the gym.
- A balcony on the back of the building is not a good idea; it is north facing and overlooks a car park,

- Concerns about natural light in the studio shared by children.
- Concern that the commercial units will remain empty.

Air Quality

- The residential blocks are also located at the corner of the site facing standing traffic at the lights which surely is detrimental for those living in the residential flats. Air pollution and noise levels would surely be higher with the presence of constant standstill traffic at the traffic lights leading to occupants suffering longer term exposure to air pollution and noise.

Other

- Proposed density will add significant stress to the underground sewage and water system.
- Lack of school & surgery places and no NHS practices within walking distance.
- Lack of green/climate change measures, like solar panels and green walls and maintenance of trees.
- The Planning Statement also implies that the hostel accommodation will comprise the affordable housing component. However, Policy CS8 of the Merton Core Strategy aims for a 40% provision of affordable housing. In our view, hostel accommodation is a separate use and as temporary accommodation does not conform with what is considered 'affordable housing'. Therefore, 40% of the proposed new flats should be affordable.
- There will need to be barriers for scaffolding, and a site access; it is likely that this will cut off at least one lane of the two that Trinity Road has now for the whole period of the works.
- Trinity Road is a very busy access for traffic and services to this whole area and needs to be kept fully open. It is one of only two traffic-light controlled access roads to the whole of the Broadway.
- The large construction, including a larger basement will inevitably have an effect on the local water table.
- After Covid 19 it is essential to create wider pavements to allow social distancing.
- Inadequate bin storage for 300 or more people plus 3 commercial units. Little information regarding refuse strategy. The bin store needs to be expanded by at least 50% that proposed and location for commercial waste disposal needs to be clearly defined in their plans which currently isn't shown.

Supporting comments within objections

- The prospect to redevelop the YMCA is a welcome news. I am also pleased that the council has listened to the objections and concerns raised by the residents and owners to its previous redevelopment proposals notably reducing the height and density.
- I am supportive of a redevelopment of the site, as the existing building is aged and an eye sore. If approved, the planning application would result in a new and relatively attractively designed building.
- This is a much more pleasant and reasonable project now and it looks like should the residents and the YMCA agree to some additional compromises, we might end up with very much needed improvement that will respect the current environment and the community.
- Materials seem to be of good quality and appealing to the eye

5.1.3 **Wimbledon Society**

This proposed development is for a 121 bedroom Hostel with its ancillary facilities, and for a Housing development of 135 flats, together with two commercial units/shops, and gym facilities at street level.

The site is within the designated town centre. The South Park Gardens Conservation Area and open space is to the north, from where the site is 'particularly visible' (LBM Local Plan page 320).

A c26m x c16m south-facing paved space is created beside the Broadway. The intention is to build a new hostel as a first phase, then demolish the present hostel, and utilise its site for housing.

HEIGHT AND BUILDING LINE: what is proposed is not considered acceptable.

The two existing tall buildings are 19m high to the eaves (22.5m to the setback storey), and 24m to the eaves (27.5m to the setback storey), the taller slab being 'end-on' to the Broadway. Today's frontage to The Broadway is set back some 4m. On the Trinity Road frontage the new flats opposite are set back some 5 - 6m from the highway.

The proposal is for a Broadway façade height of between c27.5m and c28.8m throughout, and a façade to Trinity Road that is mostly 28.8m, then stepping down.

A very significant increase in height compared to what now exists. The other three buildings at the corner of The Broadway and Trinity Road, are only some 16m high.

Additionally, the proposed upper floor facades are projected further forwards, so that they are aligned with the back edge of the public footway in places. This would unreasonably affect both the street scale, and the outlook from the three new blocks of flats around this intersection.

It is clear that the general public view on building height in the town centre, expressed at many meetings and Council-run workshops, is that no new building should exceed the coping height of the CIPD building, being some 22m.

Accordingly, the future development fronting the Broadway should not exceed a 22m coping height, compared with the 19m and 24m heights now existing. As the proposed building façade is projected much further forward, it is going to appear even more dominant in the street views. The new facades should therefore be set well back from the site edge.

The elevation facing Trinity Road is also far too dominant in the street scene, being too high and too far forward, and does not respect the natural building line. It dominates the new flats opposite. It should reflect the existing 5m building line and be significantly stepped down in height.

As an illustration, the daylight angle from the street centre line to the properties on the east of Trinity Road is around 50 degrees, whilst to the YMCA site is 75 degrees, a street scale that is more often seen in central London. 50 degrees should be seen as the maximum.

HOUSING DESIGN: Of the 135 proposed flats, 52 are designed as single aspect. This is considered to be totally unacceptable, and not the kind of housing that one should be relying on.

With no natural cross ventilation this approach would inevitably lead to the installation of mechanical air handling, a wasteful use of energy. With only a single outside façade, some flats will be highly susceptible to excesses of the climate, and their occupants will have no opportunity to move to another part of their flat to seek comfort. All new flats should be dual aspect.

The use of an 'internal' light well, to provide some dual aspect flats is noted. Being 6 storeys deep, mostly sunless, and only some 9m x 14m on plan, this could need a special design approach.

If the tree as shown is to be accommodated, one presumes that it would require substantial root depth to be provided, impacting on the storey below.

The use of maisonettes, with their front doors directly approached from

Trinity Road gives interest to the street and is welcomed.

FIRE: The Society is not able to technically assess the adequacy of the arrangements made for Fire Safety, but the reliance on single staircases as a means of escape, without alternatives, seems highly problematic for buildings of this height.

Whilst the Hostel block has two stair cores, safe emergency access along the long corridors also appears problematic. How would Brigade rescue to the individual rooms be possible externally?

ENERGY AND CLIMATE EMERGENCY: The project is said to achieve the BREEAM level of “very good”, but not the “outstanding” level. The current proposals utilise roof-mounted heat pumps (significant acoustic mitigation measures (7.2) should be provided) and 166 PV panels on the roof.

As a major new-build project, this development should clearly set its sights on meeting the ‘outstanding’ level. The proposed payment of only £57k of “amelioration funding” to the Council to compensate for the energy/sustainability shortfall should be seen as a missed opportunity.

CYCLE STORAGE: Provision for cycle storage is welcomed, but the access needs to be more user-friendly. Passing around to the back of the service yard, past the windows of flats, then through a corridor, then up a lift, before getting to the cycle store, is far from ideal.

Could not this be improved by simply eliminating the two ground floor flats (which have a poor outlook directly onto the service yard anyway), and locating the cycle store at ground level, beside the bins?

SOUTH-FACING SQUARE: This space is very much to be welcomed and bringing it to the front of the site (rather than being enclosed by building) is a welcome result of earlier public involvement in the design process. Its detailed design needs to facilitate creative use by local people and workers.

It would be important to ensure that this space is formally dedicated for public use rather than kept private. It could host exhibitions, market stalls and outdoor events, much as the ‘Piazza’ now does. There should be no access for vehicles.

As there is no basement beneath this outdoor space, there is the opportunity to see significant tree planting in what could be quality root space, free of underground services. The drawings also show tree planting in the public footway, and this should be progressed.

It has to be remembered that, as the midday mid-winter sun is only some 16 degrees above the horizon, most of the northern footway along The Broadway gets no sun for several winter months.

WATER: An attenuation tank to arrest flooding is said to be proposed but needs to be recorded on the drawings. The reported indication from Thames Water that there may be insufficient water supply and/or waste water resources needs to be resolved.

The design of this development has progressed following public involvement, but as shown above, some major issues need to be resolved before the scheme should be accepted.

5.1.4 **Letters of support**

The individual letters of support raise the following points:

- It will provide a better quality of accommodation for residents of YMCA Wimbledon.
- It will enable the YMCA to secure its future in Wimbledon and to provide improved facilities for its residents and the wider community.
- It will deliver high-quality new homes alongside the YMCA, to help meet Merton's housing need, in particular for 1-bedroom homes.
- It will provide commercial units at ground floor, which will activate the street frontage along The Broadway and provide high-quality space for businesses.
- It will offer a flexible, landscaped public open space at the front of the site, creating a safe and welcoming place for the community to enjoy.
- It will deliver a building of much higher architectural quality, worthy of being in this town centre location and a future asset to the borough.
- It offers attractive and sustainable design, including extra tree planting on site, green roofs and energy efficient measures.
- The developer has undertaken thorough consultation with the local community and has shaped the plans in response to feedback from residents.
- The second design is attractive and much better than the first in terms of materials, decoration etc. There has been a real effort to make the street area attractive with an arcade, café etc.
- The YMCA have played a fantastic role in helping the needy and I think the Council should support them by giving approval to their latest proposal.
- I think it's important to maintain the current purpose of the block in terms of housing homeless residents and am pleased to see that they'll be getting an upgrade in their facilities with better communal spaces

and ensuite rooms. In addition, I'm delighted to see that there are to be new, high-quality flats built, particularly one bedrooms which are generally in shortage in London.

5.1.5 Comments

The individual letters of comment raise the following points:

Swift Conservation

The Ecology By Design "*Preliminary Ecological Appraisal*" (August 2019) recommends hollow bricks for nesting birds (page 12), plus a green/brown roof and wildlife-friendly planting (pages 12-13), and we request that these are included in the planning conditions.

We welcome the inclusion of swift bricks in the public design on display during January 2020.

To achieve a net gain for biodiversity in accordance with the NPPF 2019, integrated swifts bricks have the advantage of lasting the lifetime of the building, as well as being zero maintenance, and aesthetically integrated with the building design.

Swifts bricks are specifically mentioned in the NPPG July 2019 guidance on the Natural Swift Conservation

Environment: "*Relatively small features can often achieve important benefits for wildlife, such as incorporating 'swift bricks' and bat boxes in developments,*" (NPPG Natural Environment 2019, Paragraph: 023 Reference ID: 8-023-20190721 - <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/naturalenvironment>).

This development is close to areas where swifts (on the RSPB amber list due to rapidly declining numbers) are currently nesting, with swifts known to nest on nearby Alverstone Avenue SW19 (recorded on the RSPB swift survey database website).

Therefore we request that swifts bricks are installed near roof level. An ecologist in consultation with the architects could identify the best locations in the building, or this service can be provided free through Swift Conservation (mail@swift-conservation.org).

Right of Light Consultant

We are appointed by the residents noted below who own properties within South Park Road and Trinity Road. Our clients are concerned that the

proposed development at 196 to 200 The Broadway will impact upon the light receivable by their properties.

- Flat 2, 77 South Park Road,
- 75 South Park Road,
- 73 South Park Road,
- 71 South Park Road,
- 69 South Park Road,
- 63 South Park Road,
- 61 South Park Road,
- 59 South Park Road,
- 55 South Park Road,
- Flat 1, 32 South Park Road,
- Flat 3, 32 South Park Road,
- Flat 4, 32 South Park Road,
- 30 South Park Road,
- 26 South Park Road,
- Flat 19 Nairn Court 7 Trinity Road
- Flat 2 Nairn Court 7 Trinity Road

Our clients' properties are sited to the north and east of the proposal site. The proposal, to erect buildings, a mixture of part single, part five, part six, part 7, part 8 and part 9 storeys, will have an adverse impact upon the levels of daylight and sunlight currently enjoyed by our clients.

The Building Research Establishment (BRE) "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: a good practice guide" 2011 by PJ Littlefair provides guidance for the planning department to consider.

The introduction to the BRE guide at 1.1 suggests that "people expect good natural lighting in their homes and in a wide range of non-domestic buildings. Daylight makes an interior look more attractive and interesting as well as providing light to work or read by. Access to skylight or sunlight helps make a building energy efficient; effective daylighting will reduce the need for electric light, while winter solar gain can meet some of the heating requirements.

The BRE provides numerical guidance in order to avoid developments impacting upon neighbouring properties. We understand that the applicant has instructed Robinsons surveyors to undertake a daylight and sunlight study, the results of which indicate that the proposal causes extensive breaches of the BRE Guide for daylight and sunlight.

It is well recognised in practice that the reduction in light is defined as set out below. A reduction in light which falls within the moderate adverse or

major adverse heading is considered by surveyors as a significant reduction to the existing level of light.

Negligible No alteration or a small alteration from the existing scenario which is within the numerical levels suggested in the BRE Guidelines
Minor Adverse Marginal infringements (20.1-30%) of the numerical values suggested in the BRE Guidelines, which should be viewed in context
Moderate Adverse Moderate infringements (30.1-40%) of the numerical values suggested in the BRE Guidelines, which should be viewed in context
Major Adverse Major infringements (40%+) of the numerical values suggested within the BRE Guidelines, which should be viewed in context

From a review of the results produced by Robinsons Surveyors (Applicants Daylight/Sunlight Report), the losses of daylight and sunlight can be summarised to include those which result in a Moderate and Major Adverse Impact to residents' properties.

We also understand that the Robinsons' daylight and sunlight study has been prepared without a site visit to inspect the internal arrangements of our clients' properties, nor have plans for the buildings been obtained. You will therefore appreciate we are unable to confirm to our clients that the daylight and sunlight results are an accurate interpretation of the anticipated light loss. The BRE Guide at para 2.2.5 recommends that *"Both the total amount of skylight and its distribution within the building are important"*. A site visit to our clients' properties is therefore required in order to obtain the layout and measurements of the rooms in order to accurately determine the results.

In light of the above, we would request that no decision in favour of the application is made until the applicant instructs Robinson's surveyors to liaise with us to visit our clients' properties to obtain the internal layout and measurements, amends their computer model where necessary, re-runs the BRE daylight and sunlight tests and produces a proposal which satisfies the BRE recommendations. We would also request that a copy of the computer model and analysis be forwarded to us so that we can advise our clients accordingly on the accuracy of the results.

In addition to planning considerations, it is useful to assess the risk of any potential civil action from the outset and mitigate any future costs which could be incurred defending a claim.

Therefore, we strongly advocate that the issue is resolved during the planning stage – in particular, to avoid planning permission being granted for a development that may not be built due to legal rights of light restrictions.

In summary, we request that no decision is made in favour of the application until we are satisfied that the proposal complies with both the BRE guidelines and the civil legal rights of light criteria.

5.2 **Consultation responses and Councillor Comments/Objections**

5.2.1 Councillor Paul Kohler - Trinity Ward

I have been asked by my constituent to make the following points on behalf of him and his wife who lives on South Park Road and whose garden abuts the proposed development.

a) We remain alarmed by the overshadowing drawings that have now been made available. All the houses that are adjacent to the YMCA car-park will be very seriously affected (more than 3 hours expected loss of light in the morning in March).

b) The total volume of the proposed buildings exceeds the stated needs, and is inappropriate for an area which is at the border between commercial and residential areas (with the latter part being a Conservation Area).

c) The plan will bring tall buildings much closer to - and therefore will overshadow - houses and gardens than the current set up (see in particular the extension of where Olympic House is now).

d) The plan will include more commercial space, of which there is no need: see how Centre Court is becoming increasingly empty of successful commercial premises.

5.2.2 Cllr Stringer (Abbey Ward)

As councillors of the neighbouring Abbey ward, the YMCA proposal will have a substantial impact on our residents, and indeed on the whole of Wimbledon. Therefore we have stayed closely involved in reviewing the proposals and encouraging residents to share their feedback.

We welcome the current proposal. We believe that redevelopment of the site is crucial, firstly to ensure that the people housed by the charity in the hostel accommodation have an environment that supports them in their personal development towards independent living, and secondly because the current site is a local eyesore. This came through strongly in last year's consultation feedback on the Future Wimbledon Masterplan.

But we, and other residents, were nervous about one large unloved building being replaced with another. Thankfully, following substantial input from local residents, we believe that this proposal offers a development that will benefit the local community as a whole. We particularly appreciate:

- The height being in line with the current building and no higher
- The creation of new public space, which will encourage people to walk along the Broadway and benefit other local businesses.
- The aesthetics of the layout of the three blocks.
- The stepping down of the height (from 9 to 5 blocks) towards the more residential areas on Trinity Road.

We recognise that nearby residents may have some ongoing reservations, despite the changes made to address concerns about the impact of the density of the building.

However, overall, we believe that the proposal would be a positive development for the area, directly benefitting some of our most vulnerable residents by providing them higher quality accommodation, as well as the wider community through services such as the updated gym, commercial space (and we welcome the exclusion of a supermarket as a consideration for that space), and the public space.

5.3 Councils Tree Officer – No objection subject to conditions

5.4 Greater London Authority (GLA)

Strategic issues: - **See Appendix 1.0** for the GLA full response to Stage 1 referral.

Principle of development: The reprovision and uplift of the bed spaces within the homeless persons' hostel, and the optimisation of the site and contribution towards housing delivery, is supported in principle. Clarification is however required in respect of the reprovision of the existing social infrastructure facilities within this town centre location. There are no strategic concerns raised in respect of the loss of office land use from this site (paragraphs 18-29).

Affordable housing: The scheme is proposing 0% affordable housing. The residential element of the scheme is proposed to cross-subsidise the reprovision of new YMCA hostel and facilities. A financial viability appraisal is currently being scrutinised by GLA officers to establish the need for, and the nature of, the cross-subsidy proposed. Through the assessment of the viability information, any surplus should be used for additional bed spaces within the homeless persons hostel or for affordable

housing. The bed spaces within the homeless persons hostel must remain for that use in perpetuity; this must be secured within a Section 106 agreement. Early and late stage viability review mechanisms should be secured (paragraphs 31-35).

Design: The layout of the scheme seeks to optimise the site, and there are no strategic concerns raised in respect of height and massing of the proposals. The provision of new public realm and activation of the high street in this town centre location is supported. The play strategy should be reviewed (paragraphs 40-54).

Transport: Further information is required to demonstrate that the quantum of cycle parking is sufficient and is designed in accordance LCDS including at least 5% being Sheffield Stands, and that the development contributes towards Healthy Streets indicators, both within the site and the wider area. A travel plan, deliveries and servicing plan and construction logistics plan should be secured (paragraphs 76-85).

Strategic issues relating to equalities, fire safety, energy, air quality and urban greening need to be resolved.

Recommendation:

That Merton Council be advised that the application does not yet fully comply with the London Plan and the Mayor's Intend to Publish London Plan, for the reasons set out in paragraph 89 of this report; but that the possible remedies set out in that paragraph could address these deficiencies.

Post Stage 1 comments:

Loss of education floorspace:

Notwithstanding the information provided below in relation to the education space provided below, Policy S3 of the Mayor's Intend to Publish London Plan remains outstanding in terms of addressing the proposed loss in the context of ongoing or future need. Subject to the LPA's acceptance in respect of the loss of education floorspace associated with the proposals, and provision of confirmation that there is no identified local need for such infrastructure, the GLA has no further comment to make.

Play:

Evidence should be provided to demonstrate that the proposed off-site play provision fully satisfies the needs of the development whilst

continuing to meet the needs to existing residents. Subject to addressing this requirement of the SPG, Merton Council should secure the off-site play provision of the 5-11 and 12+ age brackets (creation of new provision, improvements to existing play facilities and/or an appropriate financial contribution) within a legal agreement, accordance with the Policy S4, 3.16 and the Play and Informal Recreation SPG.

Urban greening:

The applicant has calculated the UGF of the proposed development as 0.38, which is close to meeting the target of 0.4 set by Policy G5 of the ItP London Plan. The urban greening design appears to be maximised, and there are clear constraints in that the site area includes a large area of public realm adjoining the highway. The UGF of 0.38 is therefore accepted in this instance.

Air quality:

The applicant's air quality consultant has addressed all comments submitted during Stage 1 consultation. The revised assessment continues to predict a 'moderate adverse' air quality impact at one existing location. However, given that the development results in a reduction in vehicle traffic and is also considered to be air quality neutral, it is likely that this impact is over-estimated due to the use of a street canyon tool in the air quality dispersion model. Moreover, the adverse impact is limited to a very small area, and concentrations remain below the relevant air quality objectives. Therefore, the air quality impacts are considered acceptable - the development complies with London Plan Policy 7.14 (B) and Intend to Publish London Plan Policy SI 1 (B). There are no further outstanding items relating to London Plan air quality policy.

Energy:

A bit more information is needed on energy costs and overheating.

Other strategic issues:

Note there are outstanding comments from the GLA Stage 1 in respect of inclusive access, equalities and the circular economy, to be addressed.

- 5.5 Future Merton (Waste) – Waste services will work with developers at every stage to ensure the waste arrangements are satisfied. The clearance height of the overcroft would allow a refuse track to be able to enter and exit the site for onsite refuse collection.
- 5.6 Environment Agency – We have assessed this application as having a low

environmental risk. We therefore have no comments to make.

5.7 Councils Highways Officer

Whilst the Construction Logistics Plan provides basic details this must be conditioned to ensure a full detailed CLP is submitted and approved by the Council.

Please note that the left turn show in yellow routing on the vehicles delivery plans at South Wimbledon junction approach is very tight and should be assessed.

All standard conditions need to be applied to this site, including reinstatement of existing crossovers, and the requirement that they must contact highways before any works commence on site to ensure all required highway licences are in place

5.8 Councils Urban Design Officer

There are a number of high-level elements of the design which mark this proposal out as fitting in well with its surroundings and being of well thought out, high quality design. Separating the development into three elements and the creation of a new public open space are good. The landmark corner with its curve works well and is subtle. The height and massing are appropriate. The open colonnade creates a good and wide pedestrian space. The materials and detailing are also good with a logic and local relevance to them. The way the design has evolved to increase the number of dual aspect units is also welcomed. In contrast there are a range of issues at the more detailed level which it is considered require further development, and these are listed below.

1. There remain issues with the quality of the residential units within the rear service yard. Their aspect is poor and light levels will be poor. They site either side of the refuse access and the larger unit is accessed from the service yard access. This is not a good approach from street to front door.
2. The tracking shown in the DAS is only shown for vehicles entering and should show how vehicles exit as well. The service bay is narrow and requires unloading onto the clear zone for the disabled parking.
3. The route from the concierge lobby to the service yard required people to walk across the disabled bay clear zone and through a very cramped space. This is also the access for larger cycles.
4. Lifts appear to be separate from the stairwells. This is not good in terms of orientation around the building and providing a clear, comfortable and easily navigable way to individual flats.

5. The duplex flats facing Trinity Road have upper balconies (the main amenity spaces) accessed via bedrooms, which is not convenient nor does it respect individual privacy. The ground floor external space presents a difficulty balancing the need for privacy with the need for natural surveillance and a pleasing aspect to the building. Currently the frontage has high fencing/planting which gives the frontage a dead and unattractive feel. The useable area of this space is sub-standard as half of it is for bins and access – is this being counted towards the required amenity space? Doors open directly into living spaces which is not a good arrangement – a lobby or corridor would be better.
6. The internal arrangement for the YMCA bike store is very tight to manoeuvre bikes within. The way out is not very clear and has awkward turns through three doors to get to the street.
7. The YMCA first floor rooms to the north will have a very close and poor aspect to a generator compound – visual and noise issues?
8. There remains a number of very irregular shaped units which make for poor internal layouts, especially when they are already at or very close to the minimum standards. London Plan policy D4 stated that internal layouts should be efficient. No dimensions are given for internal rooms and not all furniture is shown as required by the Mayor's Housing SPG. The clear zone around beds in the middle block 1b2p units is fouled by the internal wall. No dual aspect units attempt to provide separate or self-contained kitchen areas. Bedrooms accessed directly off living spaces is not good internal design, nor is bathrooms opening directly next to kitchens. The plans need to demonstrate that all relevant standards in the NTS, London Plan, building Regulations and housing SPG are all adhered to and exceeded where possible.
9. The housing mix relies heavily on 1b1p units. These one-person units should not be able to accommodate double beds – in some cases this may be possible. Some configurations could work better as studios – having a separate kitchen rather than separate bedroom.
10. The corner block does not share the same building line on The Broadway – projecting forward. This should relate to the YMCA building better.
11. The YMCA end units (to the north) have large obscure glazing when unnecessary – high level windows might be better.
12. There is only one access to the large gym area and this is through the already cramped café. Would it not be better to have an additional internal access to these areas (eg. take out one of the consulting rooms)? The café is already small and it is

set in the busy entrance lobby. It is questionable as to how attractive and viable a place this will be.

13. On the middle block the balcony partitions do not align with the party walls and the external frame. Surely this is a drafting error as this is a very odd arrangement. Thus the elevation shown in the CGI would appear to be inaccurate and will not appear as regular in form as suggested. This needs re-appraising.
14. The office layout for the YMCA appears cramped and may not work as shown – is it designed to any particular standards?
15. Does the Laundry Room need to be accessed directly off the lounge rather than from a corridor?
16. Do the YMCA kitchens have sufficient seating for residents – notably in relation to the large number of base units provided?
17. The proposed 'concrete blocks' for the public footway and new open space is unacceptable and must be of a high quality. The materials for the footway should be York stone and the open space should be granite. A more detailed landscape design is required for this. This is considered acceptable by other developments in Wimbledon and there should be no exception for this.
18. At the north end of the residential block there are large private patios – about half the size of the flats they belong to – but which appear to have no direct access from the flats, requiring the owners to leave their flats and access them via the communal corridor. This is not a satisfactory arrangement.
19. The servicing for the commercial unit in the centre could easily be accessed from the adjacent internal corridor, rather than requiring goods to pass into the public open space.

5.9 Councils Climate Change Officer - (No objection subject to conditions)

Subject to final comments from the GLA, I am content that the proposed energy approach is policy compliant, achieving a 76% improvement against Building Regulations for the domestic elements and a 71% improvement for the non-domestic elements (based on the latest modelling provided on 18th November), which exceeds the minimum sustainability requirements of Merton's Core Planning Strategy CS15 (2011) and Policy 5.2 of the London Plan. The energy statement, and updated energy modelling, submitted for the development indicate that it will achieve a 10% and 11% saving in CO₂ emissions through fabric performance for the domestic and non-domestic elements respectively, with the remainder secured through the use of communal Air Source Heat Pump systems in each of the blocks and 61.4 kWp of Photovoltaic (PV) panels as a biosolar roof with high efficiency panels. This will need to be secured by condition.

I am satisfied that, in the absence of an existing heat network, this approach is compliant with the Mayor's energy hierarchy approach outlined in Policy 5.2 of the London Plan (2016) and Policy CS15 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy (2011). However, the applicant has provided a commitment that the development is designed to allow future connection to a district heating network in line with the GLA's Guidance. This will need to be secured by condition.

The GLA has indicated that the application should be conditioned to review the potential for further passive measures prior to the commencement of above ground works given that the applicant has not achieved the GLA's 15% target for the non-domestic elements using SAP 10 carbon emissions factors. This is still to be confirmed following the applicant's latest comments to the GLA. I have provided some draft wording below, subject to the outcome of the Applicant's discussion with the GLA.

The internal water consumption calculations submitted for the development indicate that internal water consumption in the residential units should be less than 105 litres per person per day in line with Merton's requirements. This will need to be secured by condition.

The BREEAM design stage assessments provided by the applicant indicate that both the proposed retail unit and hostel will achieve a BREEAM standard of 'Very Good' which meets the minimum requirements in Merton's Core Planning Strategy Policy CS15. This will need to be secured via condition.

The final carbon offset contribution of £51,428 (based on the latest energy modelling provided on 18th November) will need to be secured via the S106.

5.10 Future Merton (Planning Policy)

Overall, the proposal is supported concerning the contribution it will make to meeting Merton's strategic housing target and creating mixed sustainable communities that reflects the diversity of the population.

Housing mix:

Core Strategy Policy DM H2 (Housing mix) and Draft Local Plan policy H4.3 (Housing Mix) both set out a preferred bed unit size mix of roughly 33% even split for 1, 2 and 3+ bed units. However this requirement must be applied having regard to a number of relevant factors including site circumstances, site location, identified local needs and economics of provision such as financial viability or other planning contributions.

Having assessed the planning arguments put forward by the applicant and taking account the individual circumstances of this proposal, it is considered on balance that the justification for the proposed housing mix in this case is justified. The site is in an area of high PTAL accessibility making it appropriate for flatted housing development. Wimbledon has a high existing prevalence of family sized accommodation compared to the rest of the borough. Hence the proposal contributes to providing greater choice in housing size mix in Wimbledon. Whilst it would be preferable, in this case for the provision of a greater number of 2 bed units than proposed, the applicant has provided a supporting viability justification for the mix proposed.

Affordable housing:

It is noted that the applicant's viability assessment indicates that in planning terms whilst the new hostel units will be considered *sui generis* in reality the units will be let at sub-market rents at £124 per week "covered by the benefits system."

Merton's SHMA (table23) states that the lower quartile market rent for room only is £500. Therefore, Planning Policy supports the applicant's position.

5.11 Council Transport Planning - (No objection subject to conditions and S106 agreement)

The site is currently occupied principally by the YMCA including ancillary gym and café uses, as well as Olympic House which is a six-storey commercial building to the west of the YMCA. The existing YMCA facility contains 111 bedrooms.

Surrounding Road Network

The Broadway:

The Broadway is a two-way single carriageway road and forms part of the A219, which links the A24 in South Wimbledon with the A4 in Hammersmith. In the immediate vicinity of the site, The Broadway is approximately 9m wide and subject to a speed limit of 30mph.

In immediate vicinity of the site, single-yellow lines restrict parking along either side of the carriageway from Monday to Saturday between 07:00 – 23:00 and Sunday between 14:00 – 18:00. No loading is permitted along this road section between Monday and Saturday from 07:00 – 10:00 and 16:00 – 19:00.

Pay & Display' on-street parking bays are present along the northern side of the carriageway at the south-western edge of the site, which are operational between Monday – Saturday from 08:30 – 23:00 and Sundays from 14:00 – 16:00 and are restricted to a maximum stay of 2 hours. Outside of these hours, parking is free for 20 min and stays restricted to maximum of two hours. Double-yellow lines are present at junctions with minor roads, prohibiting parking at all times.

Trinity Road

Trinity Road is a two-way single carriageway that runs in a north-south alignment from Queen's Road to The Broadway. The road is subject to a speed limit of 20mph and serves mainly residential properties as well as the car park of the existing YMCA building and ancillary facilities. Speed humps and traffic calming features in the form of road narrowing are present in regular intervals to calm traffic within this residential area. In the immediate vicinity of the site, single-yellow lines are present on either side of the road that restrict parking from Monday to Saturday between 08:30 – 23:00 and Sunday between 14:00 – 18:00.

At its northern extent, Trinity Road adjoins Queen's Road via a staggered junction, with a Zebra crossing provided on the eastern approach of the junction. At its southern extent, Trinity Road forms the northern arm of a signalised junction with The Broadway and Montague Road.

PTAL

The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of '6(b)' with a portion of the site rated as '6(a)' which is excellent and is well located for all the facilities and services.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposed development comprises the following elements:

Phase 1

Demolition of Olympic house and part of YMCA and erection of a 121 room homeless hostel (sui generis) with ancillary gym and café.

Phase 2

Demolition of remainder of site and erection of 135 residential units including 1 x studio, 108 x 1-beds, 25 2-beds, 1 x 3-bed; flats and 333sqm of flexible class A1 (excluding supermarkets).

Access

The existing vehicle access to the site and car park is from Trinity Road. The access to the proposed development will be retained from Trinity Road although, following the demolition works on the site, the access will be located on the northern boundary of the site approximately 10 metres to the north of the current position. The access will be gated but the gate will be set back 14m from the edge of the carriageway so that any vehicles entering the site do not obstruct either the carriageway or the footway on Trinity Road whilst waiting for the gates to open.

Alongside the vehicle access there will be a delineated path for pedestrians and cyclists to access the cycle parking and two of the ground floor residential units. This footway along the access will be over-runnable to allow for servicing vehicles to pass other vehicles entering and exiting the car park at the same time.

Additional pedestrian accesses into the development will be provided on both Trinity Road and The Broadway.

Car Parking

No car parking is provided within the development, apart from a total of four parking spaces for disabled users which will be provided within the site. All parking spaces will be equipped with active provision for the charging of electric vehicles.

Permit free option would be acceptable subject to the applicant enters 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 Parking

A total of 224 cycle parking spaces will be provided on-site. This will comprise the following:

188 residential cycle parking spaces located within a cycle store on the first floor of the development; two spaces for enlarged cycles on the ground floor; and

10 cycle parking spaces for the proposed YMCA development;

24 short stay cycle spaces will be provided for visitors and will be located within the public realm at the front of the development.

Cycle parking provision satisfies the 'London Plan' standards and is acceptable.

Servicing

All servicing at the site will be undertaken from within the development and not from The Broadway or Trinity Road.

Tracking has been undertaken to demonstrate that the refuse vehicle can access and turn within the site to allow for egress in a forward gear.

Deliveries to the commercial units will also be undertaken from within the development. A dedicated LGV bay has been provided within the rear parking courtyard to allow deliveries to be undertaken without obstructing the remainder of users of the parking area. This bay will also accommodate LGV deliveries to the residential units.

A separate Delivery and Servicing Plan has been prepared in support of the application which provides further details of the servicing and delivery arrangements and management of the space.

Travel Plan

Framework Travel Plan (FTP) document has been prepared by the applicant.

The initiatives contained within the FTP will be supported by the developer for a five-year period from first occupation of the development.

Trip Generation

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

The removal of the existing car park on the site will reduce vehicle trips to and from the development.

The Transport Assessment determines the number of additional trips that would arise as a result of the additional units and I would concur with its conclusions that the increase will be insignificant.

Construction Vehicle Routing

Full details regarding the programming and phasing of the works should be provided upon appointment of a contractor to undertake the works. The details to be provided within the full CLP prior to works be undertaken.

Construction Logistics Plan

The submitted Construction Logistics Plan outlines the strategy for managing and monitoring the impacts of the construction of the proposed development on the site, neighbours and the surrounding highway network.

A full CLP for each phase of development should be submitted prior to construction commencing, upon appointment of a contractor.

For future safety and movement in close proximity to the signalised junction at Trinity Road the Council will look to introduce all day waiting and loading restrictions (24hr) on the Broadway and into Trinity Road via a S106 contribution. This level of restriction has not been in the past deemed necessary as the existing site has more extensive rear servicing and hence on-street demand for loading is low.

Subject to the above, the proposal is unlikely to have a significant impact on the adjoining highway.

5.12 Metropolitan Police (MET)

The section 8.4 of the design and access statement mentions the Designing Out Crime and Secured by Design listing some of the items discussed at the meeting.

Having given due consideration to the details of the security and safety features from the information provided, I have a few comments and recommendation.

I have concerns regarding the back of house links and the use of the rear courtyard between the residential, YMCA and the commercial units. Residential communal areas including the car parking area should be clearly defined with no linkage between the other uses to reduce anonymity and casual intrusive crime.

Vehicle access to the residential car park area should be restricted by fob controlled roller shutters, unrestricted vehicle and non-resident access is not acceptable within SBD.

The residential block on numerous levels shows corridors and doors providing links between the cores, via the bin store, the cycle store or communal amenity. Buildings of this design can suffer adversely from anti-social behaviour due to unrestricted access to all areas and floors. If unable to change the design to prevent unlawful free movement throughout the building the use of a programmable encrypted access control system is required for internal doors leading to cross core areas. The access control system must incorporate an electronic release to allow the fire service free access to all of the communal areas of the building.

The wide overhang soffit of 2.3m may offer the chance for groups to loiter or provide an area for rough sleeping which is a common occurrence in locality. The overhang should be reduced, a management plan in place to dissuade groups and support provide to the rough sleepers.

Mailbox provision needs to be considered in the entrance lobby, preferably externally delivered and internally collected. This will mitigate the theft opportunities of post, a prevalent offence in London which often leads to identity and financial fraud offences.

A zoned fob controlled system should be installed to control access throughout the block. This can assist with the management of the development and allow access to residents to specific designated areas only. Any trades persons buttons must be disconnected. The fobs should always be encrypted to reduce the risk of them being copied by a third party.

CCTV should be installed to cover the entire development, particularly the external elevations, rear courtyard and its access, and residential communal areas. Any lighting fixtures and the landscaping should not be in conflict with the CCTV cameras field of view. All CCTV systems should have a simple Operational Requirement (OR) detailed to ensure that the equipment fitted meets that standard, without an OR it is hard to assess a system as being effective or proportionate as its targeted purpose has not been defined. The OR will also set out a minimum performance specification for the system. The system should be capable of generating evidential quality images day or night 24/7. For SBD CCTV systems there is a requirement that the system is operated in accordance with the best practice guidelines of the Surveillance and Data Protection Commissioners and the Human Rights Act.

The cycle stores must be part of the developments access control system, and have appropriate CCTV coverage to provide identity images of those who enter and activity images within the space; this may mean multiple cameras depending on the design and size of the each storage area.

Due to bicycles being so attractive to thieves, the cycle storage lockable doors should only be accessible to residents. The locking system must be operable from the inner face by use of a thumb turn to ensure that residents are not accidentally locked in by another person. The cycle storage should incorporate stands or 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.

The enlarged cycle parking should be a lockable store rather than a space. The short stay cycle spaces in Trinity Road should be relocated within the public realm at the front of the development to benefit from greater surveillance.

From experience the shared amenity roof space easily suffer residential conflict due to antisocial behaviour and out of hours use. Complaints are often made due to noise nuisance, damage, unauthorised access issues and inappropriate use of the amenity. The roof terraces will require a robust management strategy and residential compliance in order to establish regulations of use in order to mitigate residential disquiet, including a 'cut off' time to prevent unwanted noise nuisance in the early hours.

The design of the community amenity roof terrace must have high perimeter screens to prevent items being thrown, or person falling or jumping off. Any plant containers must eliminate the chance to climb over any balustrades.

Play-areas must be designed with due regard for natural surveillance which does not appear to be the case in this proposal as the area is not overlooked.

Play-areas should have adequate resources for its satisfactory future management and that they can be secured at night to reduce the amount of damage and graffiti that occurs after dark. The equipment should be secured in place so cannot be thrown off the roof.

Any landscaping in the planters and the communal roof garden should allow opportunity for natural surveillance by shrubs being selected to have a mature growth height no higher than 1 metre, and trees should have no foliage, or lower branches below 2 metres thereby allowing a 1 metre clear field of vision. Planting should not compromise lighting or the CCTV field of view.

I am concerned that the only proposed lighting for the proposed public space is four bollard lights within the planted area, this needs to be reconsidered. All lighting across the entire development should be to the required British Standards and local council requirements, avoiding the various forms of light pollution (vertical and horizontal glare). The lighting should be as sustainable as possible with good uniformity. Lighting can contribute to discouraging crime and vandalism making people feel secure and so encourage increase pedestrian activity. SBD asks for white light as this aids good CCTV colour rendition and gives a feeling of security to residents and visitors.

Bollard lights, illuminated benches, architectural and tree up lighting are not considered as good lighting sources for SBD purposes, so should be avoided. The public space lighting should also meet the current council requirements.

Crime Prevention and community safety are material considerations. If London Borough of Merton are to consider granting consent, I would seek that the following conditions details below be attached. This is to mitigate the impact and deliver a safer development in line with Merton Core Strategy, London Plan, Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act 1988 and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Recommended two-part condition wording:-

A. The development hereby permitted shall incorporate security measures to minimise the risk of crime and to meet the specific security needs of the development in accordance with the principles and objectives of Secured by Design. Details of these measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to commencement of the development and shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation.

Reason: In order to achieve the principles and objectives of Secured by Design to improve community safety and crime prevention in accordance with Policy 14 (22.17) of Merton Core Strategy: Design, and Strategic Objectives 2 (b) and 5 (f); and Policy 7.3 Designing out Crime of the London Plan.

B. Prior to occupation a Secured by Design final certificate shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to achieve the principles and objectives of Secured by Design to improve community safety and crime prevention in accordance with Policy 14 (22.17) of Merton Core Strategy: Design, and Strategic

Objectives 2 (b) and 5 (f); and Policy 7.3 Designing out Crime of the London Plan.

The appropriate Secured by Design (SBD) requirements can be found in the design guides on the SBD web site www.SecuredbyDesign.com.

5.13 Councils Flood Officer - (No objection subject to conditions)

I've reviewed this application and have noted that the impermeable area on site is increasing from 3090m² to 3500m² on a site of size 3650m². I understand that the site lies predominantly on clay which makes infiltration near impossible as clay was reached at 1m b.g.l from the site investigation tests carried out. They are proposing green roof and tanked attenuation storage. I think more could have been done with the site in terms of having more open space and incorporate this with the attenuation planned. The development is planned to be built in two phases and the attenuation tank is situated within phase two. You will note that the condition requires that there must be an agreed scheme before commencement of any phase of development.

5.14 Greenspaces – No response received.

5.15 Councils Structural Engineer

The basement which is approx. 4.5m deep below ground level is at a distance of 9.5m from The Broadway and greater from Trinity Road. Therefore, from a highway perspective, the basement works do not require any conditions.

However, there are piling works adjacent to the highway boundary. For this reason, should you be minded to recommend approval, we would advise that the following condition is placed on the decision notice:

No works will commence on site until the below documents have been submitted and agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

- a) Detailed Demolition Method Statement produced by the Contractor appointed for demolishing the existing buildings.
- b) Detailed piling methodology produced by the Contractors appointed for the piling.
- c) Structural drawings of the piles adjacent to the highway boundary.
- d) Movement monitoring report produced by specialist surveyors appointed to install monitoring gauges to detect any movement of

the highway/neighbouring properties from pre-construction to completion of the project works as recommended by the Construction Method Statement. The report should include the proposed locations of the horizontal and vertical movement monitoring, frequency of monitoring, trigger levels, and the contingency measures for different trigger alarms.

- 5.16 Historic England (GLAAS) – Do not wish to offer any comments.
- 5.17 Historic England (Parks) - No response received.
- 5.18 Garden History Society – No response received.
- 5.19 Council's Environmental Health Officer (Air quality) - (No objections subject to conditions).

The applicant has submitted an Air Quality Assessment report Ref: No. 443781/AQ/01 (03) dated May 2020 and completed by RSK.

The assessment shows that the building emissions are within the air quality neutral benchmarks and that the transport emissions are also within air quality neutral emissions benchmarks for transport, therefore the development is considered to be air quality neutral. Predicted impacts on NO₂ PM₁₀ PM_{2.5} concentrations as a result of operational phase exhaust emissions were predicted at various sensitive receptor location within the vicinity of the site and was predicted to be not significant at all locations. During 2025, when the development is expected to be fully operational, the AQS objectives for NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} are predicted to be met at all existing receptor locations considered in the assessment.

- 5.20 Environmental Health (Contamination) – No objection subject to conditions.
- 5.21 Transport For London (TFL)

Original Comments

I write to provide detailed strategic transport comments on this application reference 20/P1738. These provide more detail on the matters raised in the GLA Stage 1 Planning Report 2020/6363/S1. Please note that these are additional also to any response you may have received from my colleagues in infrastructure or asset protection and from TfL as a party with a property interest.

Please note that these comments represent an officer level view from Transport for London and are consistent with the Mayor's initial response to the application at Stage 1.

The 'Intend to Publish' (ItP) London Plan was submitted to Government in December 2019, and sets out an integrated economic, environmental, transport and social framework for the development of London over the next 20-25 years.

TfL expects all current planning proposals to consider the policies set out within this document, noting that the decision-maker is to determine the balance of weight to be given to adopted and draft policies.

Proposed Development

The proposal consists of redeveloping the site to provide a mixed-use development comprising a 121 room homeless hostel, 135 residential units and 333sqm of flexible commercial floorspace.

Location

The site is located in Wimbledon Town Centre and is bound by the A219 The Broadway to the south, Trinity Road to the east, commercial uses to the west and residential properties to the north. The closest section of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) is the A24 Merantun Way approximately 1km southeast of the site. Whereas, the closest section of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) is the A238 Kingston road located approximately 450m to the south of the site. The Wimbledon to Raynes Park Quietway route starts at the Francis Grove / St George's Road junction.

Wimbledon Station which provides access to rail, underground and tram services is located approximately 700m north west of the site. Bus stops are located on The Broadway, Sir Cyril Black Way and at Wimbledon Fire Station providing access to nine routes (131, 57, 152, 163, 164, 219, 200, 93 and 156).

The site has a Public Transport Access Level (PTAL) of 6b, on a scale of 0 to 6b where 6b is the most accessible.

The site is also located within the Future Wimbledon Masterplan area.

Crossrail 2

TfL and Network Rail are jointly promoting Crossrail 2 and a business case has been submitted to Government. The central safeguarded route

(Tottenham to Wimbledon) was consulted upon in 2014/15 would include higher frequency services to Wimbledon Station. If committed, the route could be operational from 2031 and works could commence between 2021 and 2031.

The proposed development site sits outside the limits of land subject to consultation by the Crossrail 2 Safeguarding Direction.

Vehicular Site Access

There will be no direct vehicle access to the site from the TLRN. Vehicular access to the site is via Trinity Road.

Healthy Streets

The proposed development will see an increase in pedestrian and cycle trips to/from the site and the local area. Whilst the redevelopment will provide some public realm improvement along The Broadway, there is no information contained within the TA to demonstrate how the development will deliver improvements that support the ten Healthy Streets Indicators throughout the site and within the local area. The TA should identify opportunities to improve provisions for cyclists and pedestrians in the area and encourage the use of public transport.

Vision Zero

The Mayor's Vision Zero ambition is the elimination of all deaths and serious injuries from London's streets by 2041. The Vision Zero approach requires reducing the dominance of motor vehicles and creating streets safe for active travel.

Accident analysis has been provided and whilst it doesn't identify measures which can be used to eliminate any of these accidents, the car free nature of this development will contribute towards the Vision Zero approach.

Car parking

The development is car free with the exception of 4 disabled person's car parking spaces which is in accordance with Intend to Publish (ItP) London Plan standards. The ItP London Plan requires that disabled person's parking should be provided for 3% of dwellings, at the onset. All car parking spaces will include active electric charging facilities. A Car Parking Management Plan, detailing how the disabled car parking spaces will be managed and monitored and where additional spaces could be provided

should demand arise, including confirmation that the spaces will be leased and not sold, should be secured through the section 106 agreement.

Trip generation and modal split

The trip generation assessment is acceptable and has been undertaken using the industry standard TRICS database and Census data for mode share.

Public Transport

The proposed development is predicted to generate 63 two-way public transport trips within the AM peak hour and 71 in the PM peak hour. Given the number of public transport services in close proximity of the site, the uplift in public transport trips will not result in capacity issues on these services.

Cycle Parking

The TA states that 224 cycle parking spaces are proposed for all uses on site. Of these 188 long-stay cycle parking spaces are provided for the residential element of the development on the first floor accessed via two bike lifts. In order to determine if the long-stay provision accords with ItP London Plan standards, further information is required on the gross internal floor area of the 1 bed residential units to clarify if they are 1 or 2 person units.

All cycle parking is required to be designed and laid out in accordance with the guidance contained in Chapter 8 of the London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS). Further, information is required on the type of long-stay cycle parking proposed. At least 5% should be Sheffield Stands at wider (1.8m recommended) spacing for larger / wider cycles. LCDS states they should be used in conjunction with accessible stands. Two tier racks need a 3.0m aisle width (2.5m in front of the lower top tier rack. Applicant to highlight route to the cycle store located in the YMCA element of the development to ensure it is well located and avoids obstacles such as multiple doors, narrow doorways (less than 1.2 metres wide) and tight corners. Further work is required to demonstrate that the cycle parking proposed accords with the LCDS. TfL would also recommend that the residential storage area is broken down into smaller areas for security.

TfL would also advise that shower and locker facilities are also provided for the commercial uses for those members of staff wishing to cycle to work.

Travel Plan, Servicing and Construction

A Framework 'p'Travel Plan has been provided. The full Travel Plan should be secured, enforced, monitored and reviewed as part of the s106 A Framework Delivery and Servicing Plan (DSP) has been provided. It is proposed to undertake all servicing off-street.

A Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) has been provided. This needs to be produced in line with TfL's latest guidance and the requirement for a full CLP should be secured by condition.

Mayoral CIL2

Mayoral CIL2 within the London Borough of Merton is payable at a rate of £60 per sqm.

Summary

In summary, TfL requests that further information is provided before we can fully assess and be supportive of the proposed development. Specific mitigation measures and further work is summarised below:

- Further work required to demonstrate how the development contributes towards the 10 Healthy Streets indicators both within the site and the wider area.
- Car Parking Management Plan to be secured.
- The applicant should provide clarification on the gross internal floor area of the 1 bed residential units to determine if they are 1 or 2 person units, so that we can determine if the cycle parking provision is in accordance with the ItP London Plan.
- Further work to demonstrate cycle parking is designed and laid out in accordance with the guidance contained in Chapter 8 of the London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS).
- Further, information is required on the type of long-stay cycle parking proposed - at least 5% should be Sheffield Stands.
- Highlight route to the cycle store located in the YMCA element of the development to ensure it is well located and avoids obstacles.
- Residential storage area to be broken down into smaller areas for security.
- Shower and locker facilities should be provided for those members of staff wishing to cycle to work
- Travel Plan to be secured, monitored, reviewed, and enforced through the s106.
- A Delivery and Servicing Plan to be secured by condition
- A Construction Management Plan (CMP) to be secured by condition.

Comments following further information submitted by the applicant:

The Technical Note (TN) includes a Healthy Streets Check for Designers. The Healthy Streets check for designers should only be used where there are physical works to the public highway that are likely to cost in excess of £200k and should not be applied to the site as a whole. This is because the check for designers has to be audited by TfL to make sure it has been undertaken correctly and does not overestimate the scheme's Healthy Streets benefits.

Further work has been undertaken in terms of assessing the quality of the key routes surrounding the sites and recommendations for improvements have been made. However, the TN states that the applicant is not proposing to deliver any of the pedestrian and cycle improvements identified. Given the improvements are all on borough roads it is for Merton to decide if a contribution towards these improvements are secured.

Further information has now been provided on the size of the 1-bedroom units and the long stay cycle parking provision accords with the ItP London Plan.

The TN states that cycle parking has been designed with reference to the London Cycle Design Standards, however a compromised approach has had to be taken. TfL have concerns that the majority of long-stay cycle parking proposed (with the exception of 2 enlarge spaces) is shown as two-tier, and that these would not meet minimum aisle widths. This type of cycle parking is not user friendly, takes longer to use, and promotes the wrong type of crammed cycle parking stores. Furthermore, two tiered racks are not accessible to all. Not everybody can lift a cycle or bend down under a rack to lock their cycle and some cycles won't fit on it.

The TN states with regards to the enlarged cycle parking provision, the amount of enlarged cycle parking is a recommendation only and is not a policy requirement. The TN also states that there is no requirement set out within either the ItP London Plan or LCDS requiring the cycle parking to split up into smaller areas. This is a disappointing approach from the applicant. Poor quality cycle parking will significantly undermine the cycling strategy for the site and will not be well used.

The applicant has confirmed that shower and locker facilities will be provided in all commercial units and the leisure and community centre.

5.22 Thames Water

Waste Comments

Thames Water would advise that with regard to FOUL WATER sewerage network infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided.

With the information provided Thames Water has been unable to determine the waste water infrastructure needs of this application. Thames Water has contacted the developer in an attempt to obtain this information and agree a position for SURFACE WATER drainage, but have been unable to do so in the time available and as such Thames Water request that the following condition be added to any planning permission.

“No properties shall be occupied until confirmation has been provided that either:- 1. Capacity exists off site to serve the development or 2. A housing and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed with Thames Water. Where a housing and infrastructure phasing plan is agreed, no occupation shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed housing and infrastructure phasing plan. Or 3. All wastewater network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows from the development have been completed.

Reason - Network reinforcement works may be required to accommodate the proposed development. Any reinforcement works identified will be necessary in order to avoid flooding and/or potential pollution incidents.

The developer can request information to support the discharge of this condition by visiting the Thames Water website at thameswater.co.uk/preplanning. Should the Local Planning Authority consider the above recommendation inappropriate or are unable to include it in the decision notice, it is important that the Local Planning Authority liaises with Thames Water Development Planning Department (telephone 0203 577 9998) prior to the planning application approval.

A Trade Effluent Consent will be required for any Effluent discharge other than a 'Domestic Discharge'. Any discharge without this consent is illegal and may result in prosecution. (Domestic usage for example includes - toilets, showers, washbasins, baths, private swimming pools and canteens). Typical Trade Effluent processes include: - Laundrette/Laundry, PCB manufacture, commercial swimming pools, photographic/printing, food preparation, abattoir, farm wastes, vehicle washing, metal plating/finishing, cattle market wash down, chemical manufacture, treated cooling water and any other process which produces

contaminated water. Pre-treatment, separate metering, sampling access etc may be required before the Company can give its consent.

Applications should be made at

<https://wholesale.thameswater.co.uk/Wholesale-services/Business-customers/Trade-effluent> or alternatively to Waste Water Quality, Crossness STW, Belvedere Road, Abbeywood, London. SE2 9AQ. Telephone: 020 3577 9200.

As per Building regulations part H paragraph 2.21, Drainage serving kitchens in commercial hot food premises should be fitted with a grease separator complying with BS EN 1825-:2004 and designed in accordance with BS EN 1825-2:2002 or other effective means of grease removal. Thames Water further recommend, in line with best practice for the disposal of Fats, Oils and Grease, the collection of waste oil by a contractor, particularly to recycle for the production of bio diesel. Failure to implement these recommendations may result in this and other properties suffering blocked drains, sewage flooding and pollution to local watercourses. Please refer to our website for further information : www.thameswater.co.uk/advice

There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes. <https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>.

As you are redeveloping a site, there may be public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you discover a sewer, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes. <https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>.

Water Comments

Following initial investigations, Thames Water has identified an inability of the existing water network infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this development proposal. Thames Water have contacted the developer in an attempt to agree a position on water networks but have been unable to do so in the time available and as such Thames Water request that the following condition be added to any planning permission.

No properties shall be occupied until confirmation has been provided that either:- all water network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows to serve the development have been completed; or - a housing and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed with Thames Water to allow additional properties to be occupied. Where a housing and infrastructure phasing plan is agreed no occupation shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed housing and infrastructure phasing plan.

Reason - The development may lead to no / low water pressure and network reinforcement works are anticipated to be necessary to ensure that sufficient capacity is made available to accommodate additional demand anticipated from the new development”

The developer can request information to support the discharge of this condition by visiting the Thames Water website at thameswater.co.uk/preplanning. Should the Local Planning Authority consider the above recommendation inappropriate or are unable to include it in the decision notice, it is important that the Local Planning Authority liaises with Thames Water Development Planning Department (telephone 0203 577 9998) prior to the planning application approval.

The proposed development is located within 15m of a strategic water main. Thames Water request that the following condition be added to any planning permission.

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 water 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 in close proximity to underground water utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground water utility infrastructure.

Please read our guide ‘working near our assets’ to ensure your workings will be in line with the necessary processes you need to follow if you’re considering working above or near our pipes or other structures. <https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>. Should you

require further information please contact Thames Water.
Email: developer.services@thameswater.co.uk

There are water mains crossing or close to your development. Thames Water do NOT permit the building over or construction within 3m of water mains. If you're planning significant works near our mains (within 3m) we'll need to check that your development doesn't reduce capacity, limit repair or maintenance activities during and after construction, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes.

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>

The proposed development is located within 15m of our underground water assets and as such we would like the following informative attached to any approval granted. The proposed development is located within 15m of Thames Waters underground assets, as such the development could cause the assets to fail if appropriate measures are not taken. Please read our guide 'working near our assets' to ensure your workings are in line with the necessary processes you need to follow if you're considering working above or near our pipes or other structures.

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>. Should you require further information please contact Thames Water. Email: developer.services@thameswater.co.uk

Supplementary Comments

Foul water is to reuse the existing connection in the Broadway between 4402 and 5403 - Foul Discharge is within sewer threshold hence capacity exists. Letter 2 can be sent Surface water will be limited to 5l/s and will use the existing connection into the sewer in The Broad Way. Between chambers 4401 to 5402. - Developed Land is roughly 0.4ha hence the proposed 5l/s is high and needs to be reduced to be in line with London Policy 5.13 (5l/s/ha). A Surface Water discharge between 2-3l/s will be acceptable.

5.23 Environmental Health Officer (noise) – No objection subject to conditions.

5.24 Design and Review Panel (November 2019)

Firstly, the Panel welcomed the changes made since the previous review and felt the proposals were a significant improvement on the previous tower-based scheme. It was considered by the Panel that this was the closest they had seen to a workable proposal for the site, which could be acceptable in design terms, and also be commercially viable. The Panel

encouraged the applicant to further develop and refine the proposals based on their comments.

The scale, height and massing were considered generally appropriate and the quality of the architecture was developing well but needed further work, though the proportions and stratification of the façade worked much better. On Trinity Road, it was felt that the stepping down of the massing provided a coherent façade but could benefit from some finessing to reduce the height impact on this street. The inclusion of the internal courtyard was welcomed and felt had the potential to work well. The ground level soffit overhanging the widened footway was welcomed and well liked – as was the proposed organic detailing. It was felt that this could be at risk of succumbing to value engineering and that, if proposed, then the applicant should see it through to completion, and include detailed design proposals in the planning application.

The public open space was welcomed and liked, but it was felt that care needed to be taken to design it well, to be effective with different building uses at ground floor, and acknowledge that it was next to a busy road. It was felt that there was a balance to be had between ensuring a good sized and workable space and ensuring the rear of the building was not too overbearing to the housing to the north. This issue was one of the main concerns of the Panel and it was felt that this needed further testing with verified views from the rear and sun/daylight analysis to better inform the impact of the building.

The Panel noted the design was proposing three building elements but felt that there were currently weaknesses in the design in this respect. It was not sufficiently clear whether the building was three or two elements and the applicant needed to decide which way to go. If the form was to be three elements then there needed to be more differences in the architectural approach, rather than primarily a change in brick colour. The Panel also felt that the interface between the YMCA and the immediately adjacent residential building was not sufficiently clear, nor working well architecturally. This needed further work.

Related to this was the use of curved corners. The Panel acknowledged that the applicant was responding to the 'Wimbledon DNA' as previously advised. However, it was suggested that there were a range of reasons to explain the existing curved corners in Wimbledon and the applicant should not necessarily have too simplistic interpretation of this. Nevertheless, whilst the Panel were not particularly advocating removal of the curved corner at the Trinity Road junction, they did note that the other three corners did not have curves and the building did need to relate positively to these other buildings.

The Panel felt that the other curved element – at the YMCA entrance – was not on a prominent corner so there was less justification for this. It was felt that this corner defined one side of the open space so had to relate well to the opposite corner. It was suggested that each corner needed to be treated in the same manner to help unify the space, whether curved or otherwise. Further thought was also required to ensure the uses surrounding the space supported its success, and how these could define its character. The potential for it to fail in this respect needed to be guarded against, the successful space at the Aga Khan building in Kings Cross was cited as a good precedent in this respect.

It was felt that the sustainability credentials of the building were currently weak and had not been fully developed. The roof spaces needed to be put to full use, whether for open space or green/brown roofs, wildlife and ecology promoted and the general environmental performance of the building improved. It was felt that many flats could suffer from overheating and the dual aspect units were too long and thin to achieve proper cross ventilation

The Panel had a range of comments and concerns on the quality of the residential accommodation. The increase in dual aspect units was welcomed, as was the introduction of the internal lightwell. However, the overall quality of the accommodation was probably the most singular and unanimous concern the Panel had about the proposal. This included the quality of the ground floor units and their single aspect outlook – either onto a street with amenity space facing the road or at the rear with the amenity space part of the service yard and secluded by the bulk of the building to the south and east.

Dual aspect flats were considered too deep and unlikely to ventilate properly. There were a very high number of studio flats and this was questioned, and whether it related to housing need or demand at all. There were no 3-bed units yet there were opportunities for larger units at upper levels in relation to the larger terrace spaces. Some of the flat layouts internally also did not look well resolved. Single aspect south facing flats were likely to overheat and this could be addressed in part by having smaller windows and more opening windows. The Panel felt that one should be happy to live in any one of the proposed flats, yet this was far from the case at present.

Whilst the Panel liked the general efficiency of the centre of the building and the third level start to the internal courtyard, there was some concern that having one central bin, bike and general storage area was impersonal and having 140 units serviced by only three cores was an symptom of over development.

The YMCA building was more well resolved externally but the Panel still had some queries about the internal layout. It was felt that one needed to make the most out of creating a new YMCA and this was a rare opportunity. The building should be a friendly and exciting place and be dignified, therapeutic and nourishing – being particularly important for vulnerable people. It was felt that the long corridors and position of consulting rooms did not help with this, and there was some disconnect with the YMCA bedrooms and the main public space. The YMCA also needed to stand out and not be overpowered by the adjacent residential building. There also seemed to be a significant lack of cycle parking for the YMCA.

The Panel considered the proposal a potentially a very elegant building. The general direction of travel good and significant progress had been made on the design and layout. However, many of the issues raised were felt to be symptomatic of overdevelopment and the Panel felt that there was a case for some reconfiguration to ease this, notably by removing the residential units from the ground floor and possibly a marginal loss of units. An acceptable relationship to the housing to the rear needed to be demonstrated.

VERDICT: AMBER

6. **POLICY CONTEXT**

6.1 Merton Sites and Policies Plan – 2014 (SPP)

- DM C1 Community facilities
- DM C2 Education for children and young people
- DM E1 Employment areas in Merton
- DM E2 Offices in town centres
- DM E3 Protection of scattered employment sites
- DM E4 Local employment opportunities
- DM H2 Housing mix
- DM H3 Support for affordable housing
- DM O2 Nature Conservation, trees, hedges and landscape features
- DM D1 Urban design and the public realm
- DM D2 Design considerations in all developments
- DM D4 Managing Heritage Assets
- DM EP2 Reducing and mitigating noise
- DM EP3 Allowable solutions
- DM EP4 Pollutants
- DM F1 Support for flood risk management
- DM F2 Sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) and; Wastewater and Water Infrastructure
- 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 the road network

6.2 Merton Core Strategy – 2011 (Core Strategy)

CS1 Colliers Wood and South Wimbledon
CS6 Wimbledon Town Centre
CS7 Centres
CS8 Housing Choice
CS9 Housing Provision
CS11 Infrastructure
CS12 Economic Development
CS13 Open Space, Nature Conservation, Leisure and Culture
CS14 Design
CS15 Climate Change
CS16 Flood Risk Management
CS17 Waste Management
CS18 Active Transport
CS19 Public Transport
CS20 Parking, Servicing and Delivery

6.3 London Plan (2016)

3.3 Increasing housing supply
3.4 Optimising housing potential
3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
3.6 Children and young people's play and informal recreation facilities
3.8 Housing choice
3.9 Mixed and balanced communities
3.10 Definition of affordable housing
3.11 Affordable housing targets
3.12 Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed use schemes.
3.13 Affordable housing thresholds
4.1 Developing London's economy
4.7 Retail and town centre development
4.8 Supporting a successful and diverse retail sector and related facilities and services
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
- 5.15 Water use and supplies
- 5.17 waste capacity
- 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
- 6.9 Cycling
- 6.10 Walking
- 6.13 Parking
- 7.2 An inclusive environment
- 7.3 Designing out crime
- 7.4 Local character
- 7.5 Public realm
- 7.6 Architecture
- 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology
- 7.14 Improving air quality
- 7.15 Reducing and managing noise, improving and enhancing the acoustic environment and promoting appropriate soundscapes.
- 7.21 Trees and woodland
- 8.2 Planning obligations
- 8.3 Community Infrastructure Levy

6.4 **Other**

- National Planning Policy Framework 2019
- National Planning Practice Guidance 2014
- London Plan 2016 - Housing SPG 2016
- Draft London Plan 2020
- Draft Local Plan 2020
- Merton's Viability SPD 2018
- Homes for Londoners - Affordable Housing and Viability SPG 2017
- National Design Guide (2019)
- LB Merton - Local Development Framework - Tall buildings Background Paper 2010.
- Future Wimbledon SPD 2020

7. **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 7.1 The principal planning considerations relate to the principle of development, design, visual amenity and heritage assets, impact on neighbour amenity, standard of residential accommodation, flooding and drainage, transport and parking, biodiversity, contamination, sustainability, air quality, trees and affordable housing.

7.2 **Amendments**

7.2.1 Following discussions with officers, the applicant has made the following changes (reasons for changes can be seen in sections 3.11 – 3.20 of this committee report):

- Reduction in bedroom size of the 1b1p units so that bedrooms are smaller than the minimum space standard of a double bedroom (11.5sqm).
- Addition of 750mm zone around beds in 1b2p central block units
- Boundary treatment to ground floor duplexes on Trinity Road reduced from 1.5m height to 1.2m.
- Ground floor duplex gardens/bins store reconfiguration.
- Additional side door from servicing corridor to central commercial unit.
- Amendments to the enlarged cycle parking spaces to provide a secured and lockable store.
- Short stay cycle parking relocated from Trinity Road to central piazza).
- Provision of clear link from service yard to residential concierge lobby.
- Windows in YMCA amended to show perforated panels to avoid overlooking.
- Screen aligned with vertical mullions in central block façade facing The Broadway.

7.3 **Principle of development**

7.3.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that when determining a planning application, regard is to be had to the development plan, and the determination shall be made in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

7.3.2 Policy 3.3 of the London Plan 2016 states that development plan policies should seek to identify new sources of land for residential development including intensification of housing provision through development at higher densities. Core Strategy policies CS8 & CS9 seek to encourage proposals for well designed and conveniently located new housing that will create socially mixed and sustainable neighbourhoods through physical regeneration and effective use of space. The National Planning Policy Framework 2019 and London Plan policies 3.3 & 3.5 promote sustainable development that encourages the development of additional dwellings at locations with good public transport accessibility.

7.3.3 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019 - Paragraph 122 explains planning decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account the identified need for different

types of housing and other forms of development, and the availability of land suitable for accommodating it; the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting, and the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places.

- 7.3.4 The site is an underutilised brownfield site which is considered to present opportunities for a more intensive mixed use development. The proposals would meet NPPF and London Plan objectives by contributing towards London Plan housing targets and the redevelopment of brownfield sites.
- 7.3.5 NPPF Paragraph 123 states that it is especially important that planning decisions avoid homes being built at low densities, and ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site.

Site Allocation

- 7.3.4 The application site is an adopted site allocation within Merton's Sites and Policies Plan as Site Allocation 62. Site allocation 62 is adopted as identifying the site as being suitable for a mix of retail (A1 Use Class), financial and professional services (A2 Use Class), restaurants and cafes (A3 Use Class), drinking establishments (A4 Use Class), offices (B1a Use Class), community (D1 Use Class), leisure/sporting uses (D2 Use Class), hostel (Sui Generis Use Class) and residential (including hotel, C3 and C1 Use Class).
- 7.3.5 It is important to note for the sake of the principle of development that the site allocation does not set minimum space standards for any of the potential uses. The principle uses on the application site have therefore already been through public consultation and adopted by the Council following a public hearing. The principle uses on the site have therefore already been established and are a strong planning consideration in the assessment of any planning application on the site.
- 7.3.6 As part of the site allocation, Merton's Sites and Policies Plan document sets out a number of issues relating to the allocated site, these will be discussed in the report below and include:
- This site is a corner site with an active frontage facing onto The Broadway and also acts as the eastern gateway to Wimbledon town centre, therefore redevelopment of exemplary design quality is a must. The ground floor should have an active frontage, respecting the dual aspect and corner site.
 - Public space would be welcomed.
 - Proposals should consider the amenity of neighbouring residential uses to the north of the site.
 - Servicing facilities should be provided on site to minimise impacts

- on traffic movement, congestion and road safety.
- Mitigating and managing the impacts of parking on neighbourhood and local amenity will need to be addressed.
- Development proposals will need to incorporate suitable mitigation measures to address the issues associated with the critical drainage area.
- Thames Water have assessed the water/wastewater capacity locally and has identified that there may be insufficient water supply and/or wastewater capacity to service new development on this site. In accordance with Policy DM F2, applicants should discuss with Thames Water how capacity will be provided.

7.3.7 Merton's Draft Local Plan 2020 (still at consultation stage) sets out the strategic planning framework for Merton for the next 15 years from adoption to 2035. The YMCA site is still identified as an allocated site, Wi15 (YMCA Wimbledon). The Councils proposed site allocation remains the same as the existing site allocation:

A suitable mix of retail (A1 Use Class), financial & professional services (A2 Use Class), restaurants & cafes (A3 Use Class), drinking establishments (A4 Use Class), offices (B1[a] Use Class), community (D1 Use Class) and residential (including Hostel or Hotel) (C3 & C1 Use Class).

7.3.8 The allocation highlights both issues and opportunities for redevelopment, these include:

Issues

- Proposals should consider the amenity of neighbouring residential uses to the north of the site.
- Servicing facilities should be provided on site to minimise impacts on traffic movement, congestion and road safety.
- Mitigating and managing the impacts of parking on neighbourhood and local amenity will need to be addressed.

Opportunities

- The site is a prominent corner site with an active frontage facing onto The Broadway and also acts as the eastern gateway to Wimbledon town centre. Therefore, redevelopment of exemplary design quality is a must.
- Opportunity to provide modern, well-designed hostel type accommodation and support services for vulnerable people in an accessible location

- This site is a corner site with an active frontage facing onto the Broadway so redevelopment of exemplary design would be welcomed. The ground floor should have an active frontage, respecting the dual aspect and corner site.
- Public space would also be welcomed

Commercial

7.3.9 The site is currently occupied by a mix of uses. The existing YMCA facility is an occupied 111-bed hostel facility for the homeless (*Sui Generis*), whilst Olympic House is a purpose built 1970s office building lawfully in Class B1(a) use, other than part of two floors which are leased to a D1 education provider. Tower Lodge is also used by the YMCA as ancillary office and meeting space associated with the main YMCA hostel building (*Sui Generis*).

Hostel (YMCA)

7.3.10 YMCA St Paul's Group are bringing the redevelopment of the site forward alongside Thornsett Wimbledon Ltd with the residential and commercial development required to both optimise the redevelopment potential of this brownfield, town centre site, but also ensure that the homeless hostel can be viably delivered. The re-provision of a hostel with ancillary gym and café are all in line with the adopted site allocation above. The inclusion of the hostel as part of the redevelopment of the site is particularly welcomed by officers given its important role in providing an invaluable function to the local area, accommodating vulnerable and homeless residents. The YMCA provides on-site support on a 24-hour basis and in addition to providing crucial accommodation for vulnerable residents, they also deliver a programme of activities and workshops alongside a personal development plan for each resident to ensure that they have enough support and assistance required.

Education/Office

7.3.11 The proposed would result in the loss office and education facilities on the application site which would be contrary to planning policies DM C1 (Community facilities) and DM E2 (Offices in town centres) of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan. However, it must be noted that the formal allocation of the application site in Merton's Sites and Policies Plan did not require a minimum re-provision of any of the existing uses on the site. Nevertheless the application does make direct provision for the potential use of the ground floor commercial units with a flexible use which includes both Class B1a (Office) or Class D1 (Non-residential institutions).

Office

7.3.12 As existing, Olympic House accommodates 1,124 sq.m. of office floorspace. The proposed development makes capacity to re-provide office floorspace through the provision of 333 sqm of flexible commercial floorspace within two units at ground floor level if required or desirable. However it should also be noted that the adjoining site, 188 – 194 The Broadway, which forms part of the site allocation (but not included within this application) has recently been granted planning permission for demolition of existing building and erection of seven storey office building (LBM Ref 18/P2918). This would include 1,420 sqm of office floor space. In the context of this approved application, noting that this site provides for office land use as stipulated within the site allocation and accordingly offsets the loss resulting from the proposals.

Education

7.3.13 The proposals will result in the loss of the existing education facility (562 sq.m.) used by the language school provided within Olympic House. The proposed development makes capacity to re-provide education facilities with Class D1(Non-residential institutions) through the provision of 333 sqm of flexible commercial floorspace within two units at ground floor level if required or desirable. There is however no guarantee that the units would be used for Class D1 purposes given the flexible uses proposed. In addition, other uses proposed could be considered better suited in this context which have a more interactive relationship with the proposed public square, however the market will likely dictate how the units could be used.

7.3.14 There could potentially be a loss of educational facilities on the application site. However there is no requirement to re-provide educational facilities on the site as part of the site allocation. Officers have limited information before them to indicate that there is a high demand/need and a lack of capacity for language school places in the Borough. There are at least 3 other language schools (Wimbledon School of English, Englishhouse - School of English and Summer School of English for Foreign Children), currently operating in the Wimbledon area which can meet need if required. The applicant also confirms that they have been in discussion with Love Wimbledon BID with a view to relocating the existing tenants (including the language school) elsewhere within the Town Centre should they so wish.

7.3.15 Officers consider that a balanced view must be taken on the merits of the proposed development. In this instance the loss of a language school facility would not outweigh the public benefits the scheme would deliver with an enhanced YMCA facility, new commercial units, much needed residential units and a vast improvement of the visual amenities of The

Broadway and Trinity Road street scenes, including a new public square. For the reasons above, it is considered that there is no objection to the loss of the existing uses on site.

Residential

- 7.3.16 The National Planning Policy Framework 2019 – Paragraph 59 states to support the Government’s objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The proposed 135 residential flats are a key financial driver for the redevelopment of the site and its ability of creating a new YMCA hostel on the site. The provision of private housing, like the re-provision of the hostel is particularly welcomed by officers given the high need for all housing types in London.
- 7.3.17 The National Planning Policy Framework 2019 and London Plan policies 3.3 & 3.5 promote sustainable development that encourages the construction of additional dwellings at locations with good public transport accessibility.
- 7.3.18 Policy 3.3 of the London Plan states that development plan policies should seek to identify new sources of land for residential development including intensification of housing provision through development at higher densities.
- 7.3.19 Core Strategy policies CS8 & CS9 seek to encourage proposals for well-designed and conveniently located new housing that will create socially mixed and sustainable neighbourhoods through physical regeneration and effective use of space.
- 7.3.20 Merton’s overall housing target between 2011 and 2026 is 5,801 dwellings (Authority’s Monitoring Report Draft 2017/19, p12). The latest (draft) Monitoring report confirms:
- All the main housing targets have been met for 2017/18.
 - 665 additional new homes were built during the monitoring period, 254 above Merton’s target of 411 new homes per year (London Plan 2015).
 - 2013-18 provision: 2,686 net units (813 homes above target)
 - For all the home completions between 2004 and 2017, Merton always met the London Plan target apart from 2009/10. In total Merton has exceeded the target by over 2,000 homes since 2004.
- 7.3.21 While a robust five years supply has been achieved in Merton, the housing

need is increasing in London. The borough's Core Planning Strategy states that that it is expected that the delivery of new residential accommodation in the borough will be achieved in various ways including development in 'sustainable brownfield locations' and "ensuring that it is used efficiently" (supporting text to Policy CS9). Policy H1 of the emerging London Plan sets out that boroughs should optimise the potential for housing delivery on all suitable and available brownfield sites through their Development Plans and planning decisions. The application site is on brownfield land and is in a sustainable location adjacent to other existing residential properties.

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

7.3.23 The application seeks to create 135 residential units which will make a good contribution to meeting housing targets and would provide a mix of unit sizes that will assist in the delivery of a mixed and balanced community in a sustainable location. New housing is considered to be in accordance with the objectives of the NPPF, London Plan targets, and LBM policies.

7.4 **Design, visual amenity and heritage assets**

7.4.1 The National Planning Policy Framework sets out that achieving high quality places and buildings is fundamental to the planning and development process. It also leads to improvements in the quality of existing environments. It states that planning should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

7.4.2 The regional planning policy advice in relation to design is found in the London Plan (2016), in Policy 7.4 - Local Character and 7.6 - Architecture. These policies state that Local Authorities should seek to ensure that developments promote high quality inclusive design, enhance the public realm, and seek to ensure that development promotes world class architecture and design.

7.4.3 Planning policy DM D2 (Design considerations in all development) of Merton's Site and Polices Plan 2014 seeks to achieve high quality design and protection of amenity within the Borough. Proposals are required to relate positively and appropriately to the siting, rhythm, scale, density,

proportions, height, materials and massing of the surrounding buildings and existing street patterns, historic context, urban layout and landscape features of the surrounding area.

Future Wimbledon Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

- 7.3.4 The Future Wimbledon Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was adopted at full Council on 18th November 2020, therefore for this planning application weight can be given to this document. The document is guidance, however, the SPD is a material consideration in assessing planning applications and should be used to help shape proposals at the pre-application stage and to support the determination of planning applications in Wimbledon town centre.
- 7.3.5 The Future Wimbledon SPD helps to guide investment decisions and promote economic growth for the town centre; offering greater clarity to land owners and investors as well as the local community over the type, form and quality of development and public spaces the council would support for the town centre.
- 7.3.6 The document gives a good insight of how the Council seeks to create a long-term vision for the future of development in Wimbledon town centre well into the 2040's.
- 7.3.7 The document includes much guidance on matters relating to sustainably, design, public realm and urban greening. In regards to the YMCA site, the following extracts from the SPD are considered useful:
- The YMCA public space as part of the redevelopment will provide a new space for the local community and those using the building.
 - Towards the eastern end of The Broadway around the CIPD building and YMCA there are already a number of taller buildings of residential, office and community use. This area would also be appropriate for some increase in height, where the context allows. Proposals must demonstrate that they will not negatively impact surrounding character, residential amenity and rights of light etc.
 - Building guidance height - Up to 10 Storeys and up to 8 storeys on the end section of the site on the Trinity Road frontage.

Local Development framework Tall buildings background paper 2010

- 7.3.8 The Tall Buildings Background Paper forms part of Merton's Local Development Framework, as an evidence base in support of the Design Policy outlined in the Core Strategy. The following extracts are

considered relevant for the proposed development:

Paragraph 1.4.2

Considering the London Plan definition, any building that has a significant impact on the existing scale and character of an area through height can be considered a tall building. In the context of Merton, where most of the borough is characterised by 2 storey suburban houses, any building of 4 storeys or higher could be considered a tall building in these locations. In the centres however, and in central London, this height may well be considered average, and have little presence in its surrounding environment. This highlights the importance of treating every site and every proposal for a tall building individually, and basing the assessment on its merits and context.

Paragraph 1.4.2

The Council is encouraging the redevelopment of key sites centrally located within the town centre. These sites include (but are not limited to) the Sir Cyril Black Car Park, Wimbledon Station, YMCA Site and Wimbledon Theatre Car Park, and others that will come forward over the life of the LDF. These key sites are generally located centrally in the town centre and therefore are amongst fairly large scale built form, and have the ability to enhance the retail, leisure, commercial and residential offer in Wimbledon Town Centre and build on the physical character of the Major Centre.

Paragraph 3.5.9.

Wimbledon Town Centre is the most significant location in the borough in terms of building height, with two distinct clusters of tall buildings to the east along The Broadway and to the west around St Georges Road. The Core Strategy is proposing to strengthen and enhance Wimbledon as a Major Centre, encouraging major development including office development. Additional tall buildings may assist in achieving this, and will provide the opportunity to consolidate and strengthen the town centre skyline.

Paragraph 3.8.6.

It is noted that the key clusters of tall building in the borough are located in Wimbledon and Colliers Wood centres, where existing development assists in framing the views across an otherwise low rise suburban borough. It is suggested that tall

buildings could be used to contribute to these existing clusters and add to the precedent, so as to enhance the status of the centres and protect low rise areas of the borough from inappropriate development. New tall buildings will be expected to be of an exceptional design quality that will facilitate improvements to other existing large scale buildings in these centres, and overall reinforce and enhance the built form quality in the borough. This approach is consistent with the general policy direction for Wimbledon and Colliers Wood in the Core Strategy.

Paragraph 4.2.17.

There are two distinct clusters of mid-rise and high-rise buildings in the town centre, located at the western end around St Georges Road, and along the linear eastern end of The Broadway. These existing tall buildings in Wimbledon are primarily for commercial/office based uses.

Paragraph 4.2.18.

The linear structure of the eastern Broadway end of the town centre has allowed for an emerging taller building rhythm and scale east of Wimbledon Theatre. Some buildings at this location reach heights of between 6 and 8 storeys, including the recent redevelopment of Broadway House, and the existing YMCA Building. There are however a number of low-rise buildings at this end of The Broadway that will face development pressure over the life of the LDF in line with neighbouring sites.

Paragraph 4.2.26.

Based on the analysis within this detailed area study, tall buildings may be appropriate where of exceptional design and architectural quality and where justified in terms of their impact on the townscape and historic environment, and the benefits towards regeneration and public realm.

Paragraph 4.2.27.

In Wimbledon Town Centre, tall buildings should contribute to creating a consistent scale of development based on a range of similar but not uniform building heights. These should be determined by reference to surrounding building heights and townscape characteristics.

Paragraph 4.7.2.

Tall buildings of exceptional design and architectural quality may therefore be appropriate in the town centres of Colliers Wood, Morden and Wimbledon where justified in terms of their impact on the townscape and the historic environment, and the benefits towards regeneration and the public realm.

Paragraph 4.7.5.

In Wimbledon Town Centre, tall buildings should contribute to creating a consistent scale of development based on a range of similar but not uniform building heights. These should be determined by reference to surrounding building heights and townscape characteristics. Regard will need to be given to the Conservation Areas and the setting of Listed Buildings within and adjoining the centre where an individual design approach will be required to ensure that large scale development respects the historic character of these areas. Other locations that may be sensitive to tall buildings include those areas near to the edge of the town centre boundary due to the close proximity of low scale high quality residential development, and those locations where tall buildings may impact on the Wimbledon Hill ridgeline, including long range views into the borough from Richmond Park.

Design and Review Panel

7.4.9 The redevelopment of the site had been subject of three submissions to DRP, May 2018, July 2019 and November 2019.

May 2018 – Verdict: Amber

(Replacement of existing hostel and office buildings with a new hostel, and new residential accommodation in building up to 13 storeys in height, including rear amenity space and ancillary facilities.)

- Schemes in early stages of design, with indicative facades and floor plans.
- The DRP supported the scheme in principle subject to further design development.
- Merton council officers supportive of 13 storey scheme in principle subject to high quality architecture.
- Concerns about the height.
- Concerns about the public space use and daylight due to location at the rear of the proposal.
- Concerns about the YMCA element not standing out within the development.

July 2019 – Verdict: Red

(Demolition of existing buildings and replacement with new YMCA hostel, new public spaces and 15 storey residential building.)

- Support for design changes to public space and splitting the building in 3 blocks.
- Support for the emerging architectural treatment in the YMCA building.
- Support for uses in ground floor.
- Objection about materiality, form, bulk, height and detailing of the Tower element.
- Concerns about the quality of the front public space use and daylight in the back public space of the proposal.

November 2019 – Verdict: Amber

(Demolition of existing buildings and replacement with new YMCA hostel, new public space and 9 storey private residential building)

- Support for the proposed massing and heights.
- Support for the architectural style.
- Support for the public space provision to the front of The Broadway.
- Support for the residential layouts and the introduction of a courtyard to increase the number of dual aspects.
- Support for the organic soffit overhang inspired in Wimbledon nature.
- Further refinements are needed in the design of The Broadway elevation to make the 3 blocks more different and also decide the rationale on the use of curve.
- Further refinements are needed in the design of Trinity Road elevation to make it less overbearing to the street.
- Concern about ground floor units directly facing Trinity Road.
- Concern about light in YMCA corridors, long corridors in the gym.
- Concern about the quality of some of the residential apartments.

Current application

7.4.10 In response to comments by the DRP at the November meeting, the applicant has made the following changes:

- Changes to the architecture of the 3 block elements facing The Broadway to differentiate them;

- Introduction of a curved corner to the residential block facing the proposed public space to mirror the curve of the YMCA block and add coherence to the blocks' relationship and proposed public space architectural treatment. Curved corners to both the YMCA block and residential block facing the proposed public space will enhance the flow of people towards the piazza.
- Development of curved corner to Trinity Road and The Broadway junction to make it more expressive and different to the other two curved corners. This acts as a gateway landmark and breaks the linearity of the taller residential block façade facing Trinity Road.
- Trinity Road residential block's façade set back from DRP proposals to increase width of footpath and avoid appearing overbearing to the residential block opposite.
- Residential top floors set back to reduce massing and height onto Trinity Road and make it a transitional element between South Park Road low-rise and The Broadway mid-rise. The set back top floors will have a lighter treatment as well so the façade feels well balanced in relation to Trinity Road.
- Residential top floor has been set back to reduce massing and height onto The Broadway. The top floor set back will have a lighter treatment as well so the façade feels well balanced in relation to The Broadway.
- Change all ground floor units facing Trinity Road to Duplex units with individual entrances from the street. This will keep the residential character of Trinity Road but will improve the quality of the units.
- All YMCA corridors now have a window to provide natural light. The gym has been rationalized so there is only one central corridor instead of the previous long L corridor. Gym studios will have rooflights and natural light from the gym's courtyard.
- Residential apartments' quality improved through detailed design. Concerns about excessive depth of the central block dual aspect flats amended by reducing the depth from 13.5m to 12m and increasing the width.

- Further development with the introduction of set-backs and greenery to the back façade of the YMCA to minimise the impact and improve South Park Road properties' outlook.
- Further refinements in the architectural treatment to improve the design quality of the elevations.
- Collaboration with local artist Fiona Grady (appointed through a public competition) to create 2d patterns inspired by YMCA's ethos and Wimbledon's history to add further refinement and detail to facades.
- Servicing of the development is now from the internal courtyard and off the public highway.
- High quality landscape detailed design

Demolition

7.4.11 The existing buildings on the site have little architectural merit and are in a somewhat rundown condition. The public feedback from the Councils recent Wimbledon Master Plan indicates that the existing buildings are disliked. Officers consider the existing building on site to be dated and in a rundown condition. Therefore the demolition is welcomed, with no objection to their demolition subject to a suitable replacement.

Layout

7.4.12 A welcomed feature of the site layout is the setback siting of the buildings with the double height colonnade and new public square at front. The existing buildings on the site are set back into the site. However, large planters in front of the buildings prevent ease of movement, create a poor environment due to the bleak condition of the planters and a lack of acknowledgment if this is public or private space. At present, the end plot of the application site is a hoarded site at which point the footpath at the junction between The Broadway and Trinity Road is reduced in width. This creates a pedestrian pinch point at this busy junction. The proposed double height colonnade will be set back from the site boundary by between 1.4m and 3.9m (approx) and will be free from street furniture and planters (other than in the proposed new public square). This will create an unobstructed footpath for the benefit of public use in front of the buildings along The Broadway and partly along Trinity Road. The double height colonnade which includes attractive design features will have the benefit at street level of giving the building a more domestic scale and providing a sense of openness/breathing space from the higher floors above.

7.4.13 The new public square at the front of the site will be setback 15.4m (approx) into the site which will create a good size space and welcoming environment for all. The space will be further enhanced by a high quality landscaping scheme (details to be secured via planning condition). The new public square will create a high quality setting for the new YMCA facility and an interactive environment for the commercial ground floor uses. The redevelopment of the site has the potential of creating a positive change to the character of this section of The Broadway with exceptional designed new buildings and public spaces.

7.4.14 The overall layout and form of the buildings has been subject of much design evolution by the applicant prior to submission of the full planning application. The application site has many constraints due to the proximity of neighbouring residential properties and the desirability of providing a public space as part of the development of the site (as set out in the site allocation). The applicant has worked with officers, DRP and the general public to now be in a position where the layout of the development responds positively to the constraints and opportunities of the site. It is acknowledged that the proposed height and mass of the buildings would be an uplift beyond the current situation, however through the use of the good site layout and design features such as the double height colonnades, increased width footpaths, a south facing front public square and active ground floor commercial uses will create a considerably more positive setting at street level for pedestrians than the current situation.

Balconies

7.4.15 In response to officer's comments at pre-application stage regarding potential visual clutter detracting from the design quality of the building as a result of residents adding screening and or storing equipment on balconies, the applicant has responded by choosing flattened uprights for the balconies balustrade. The design choice is considered to add interest to the design of the building and has the advantage of that in a flat elevation you would read the balustrade as a component of single objects that lets the light penetrate, but from any other angle the repetition of this geometry, creates a compact surface. This provides the relevant privacy to the residents and partly obscuring views of equipment that may be stored on the balconies.

Height/Massing

7.4.16 Consideration of matters of massing and height may reasonably be informed by the application of both London Plan and local planning policies and supplemented by the Council's Tall Building Background paper which helped shape core strategy design policy and its justification,

and the Councils recent Wimbledon Master Plan consultation.

7.4.17 The London Plan defines tall and large buildings as those buildings that are 'substantially taller than their surroundings, cause a significant change on the skyline or are larger than the threshold sizes set for the referral of planning applications to the Mayor'.

7.4.18 The London Plan requires that 'tall buildings should always be of the highest architectural quality, (especially prominent features such as roof tops) and should not have a negative impact on the amenity of surrounding uses'.

7.4.19 The LBM Tall Buildings paper states that "Based on the analysis within this detailed area study, tall buildings may be appropriate where of exceptional design and architectural quality and where justified in terms of their impact on the townscape and historic environment, and the benefits towards regeneration and public realm".

7.4.20 Officers acknowledge that the proposed height and mass of the proposed buildings would be an uplift beyond the current situation. The height of the proposed buildings would range between a part single, part five, part 6, part 7, part 8 and part 9 storey building. The largest element, block B (residential block on corner of The Broadway and Trinity Road) would be a total of 9 floors, with the top floor set back. The main elevation would be 26.2m in height and 29.2m to the top of the setback top floor. The applicant has confirmed that there is no requirement for additional plant at roof level as this is provided within the basement area.

7.4.21 The height of the development has been raised by objectors, however the planning assessment of the development must take into consideration number of factors including relevant policy, existing site context, quality of design and what benefits a dense development can deliver.

Policy

7.4.22 At the heart of all planning policy is a requirement to maximize the potential of sites. This is particularly relevant in London where there is growing pressure to provide more housing. More housing needs to be delivered and creating more dense developments in town centre locations (where existing denser development already exist) will take some pressure off more domestic environments for taller buildings.

7.4.23 The application site is identified as an allocated site in the Local Plan and both the Future Wimbledon SPD and Tall Building Paper identify the site as being potentially capable of delivering taller buildings. The Wimbledon Master Plan has identified the site as being able to accommodate

buildings up to 10 storeys (8 storeys at rear part of the site along Trinity Road). It is noted that the Future Wimbledon Master Plan is not an adopted document and is only guidance, however the proposed scheme would be within the height guidance of both The Broadway and Trinity Road street frontages. In fact the proposed buildings would be at least one storey lower than the max and at least 2 storeys lower at the rear section of the site along the Trinity Road.

7.4.24 The Future Wimbledon Master Plan identifies design guidelines for the YMCA that any redevelopment should aim to achieve. As set out within this committee report, the proposed development is considered to fully meet these design guidelines.

Design guidelines for the YMCA:

- A new public space on the YMCA site as part of the redevelopment of that site.
- A space that provides an asset and usable space for the local community and those using the new building.
- A space that is integral to the building design and is of appropriate shape and size to create a positive setting for the building.
- A space and building design that works as a landmark feature to mark the transition away from the Broadway Corner area towards the main town centre.
- A landscape design that uses high quality materials and landscaping inspired by the local context.
- A building design that fits in with the Wimbledon DNA in terms of materials and mid-rise urban form.

Context

7.4.25 The application site located within the boundary of Wimbledon Town Centre. The site is therefore considered to be a dense urban environment. The application site fronts onto two streets, The Broadway and Trinity Road. Each street scene differ in character with The Broadway being a hub for larger buildings fronting onto the main thoroughfare through the town centre and Trinity Road being more domestic in scale away from The Broadway.

Existing Buildings

7.4.26 The height, massing and condition of the existing buildings on the site set a good benchmark for redevelopment of the site which should seek to maximize the potential of the site. The taller elements of the existing buildings on the site range between 6 and 7/8 storeys. The current YMCA

building stands at 7 storeys plus roof plant (19.7m (22.6m plant)). The form of the building is considered to be poorly detailed and somewhat of a slab that creates a blot on the landscape. The overall appearance of the site is considered to be a current negative feature within the street scenes. Therefore the redevelopment of the site is therefore welcomed and long overdue.

The Broadway

7.4.27 This section of The Broadway is already considered to have an established character of larger and taller buildings. This includes the application site, as stated above. Other taller buildings within vicinity of the application create a denser urban environment, these include:

Note commercial internal floor heights are generally higher than residential.

- 188 – 194 The Broadway - Permission for a 7 storey office building (23.125m high).
- 153 – 161 The Broadway (Primer Inn) - A 8 storey hotel (27.025m in height (28.826m with plant)).
- 165 The Broadway - A 8 storey commercial building.
- 143 – 151 The Broadway (CIPD) – A 5 storey office building.
- 150 The Broadway (Communication Workers Union) - A 5 storey commercial building with high floor to ceiling heights.
- 120 The Broadway - A 7 storey commercial/residential building at the junction of The Broadway and Stanley Road.

7.4.28 The proposed building heights are similar to existing building heights in the vicinity of The Broadway street scene and would not be significantly more bulkier or taller within this context to cause harm to the visual amenities of the area. The staggered building height within the development itself, recessed top floors, double height colonnades and splitting the building into three different blocks will significantly help reduce the massing and height of the buildings from street level. The new public square, double height colonnades and wider pedestrian footway will all assist in providing some breathing space at street level. Due to the design of the recessed top floors and the width of The Broadway itself, at street level the top floors would not be clearly noticeable. Hence at street level the height would be viewed more like 7/8 storeys. It's only from longer views in the street that the top floors would be noticeable. When travelling from an eastern direction along The Broadway, the increased bulk, height and curved corner element of the design will create a well designed and high quality landmark gateway building to the Town Centre from the east.

7.4.29 For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposed increase

in bulk and height would sit appropriately within the established building heights along this section of The Broadway (5 – 9 storeys). The proposal would be at the upper end of the building heights and bulk, however this would be in line with planning policy and the tall building paper that seeks to contribute to creating a consistent scale of development based on a range of similar but not uniform building heights.

Trinity Road

7.4.30 The Trinity Road section of the proposal has been designed to respond to the more domestic scale and residential nature of this road. Whilst residential buildings further to the north of the application site are two storey housing, it should be noted buildings directly to the east of the application site include 3 and 5 storey blocks of flats. The character of this part of Trinity Road is therefore considered to be low to modest raised buildings.

7.4.31 The height of the building responds to the change in building heights and character of the Trinity Road street scene by lowering in height with a staggered building form. Lowering in height from the 8 floors, plus top floor corner element down to 4 floors, plus top floor. This staggered building height is an effective approach that makes a good transition from the larger element along the Broadway to the more domestic scaled buildings in Trinity Road and towards South Park Gardens. The further splitting up of the staggered selections with different shades of brickwork will help reduce the perceptive height and bulk of the building to a more domestic scale.

7.4.32 For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposed increase in bulk and height would sit appropriately within the established building heights along this section of Trinity Road (3 – 5 storeys). The proposal would be at the upper end of the building heights and bulk, however The proposed building heights are similar to existing building heights in the vicinity of Trinity Road and would not be significantly more bulkier or taller within this context to cause harm to the visual amenities of the area.

Design approach

7.4.33 The overall design approach and detailing is considered to be of a exceptional standard. As set out above, the form of the buildings has been spilt into three sections along The Broadway. The 3 buildings will have the same materials, share similar window rhythm, similar corner treatments and classical orders. Despite the similarities the 3 buildings will have different character:

Element 1 (YMCA) This building is dynamic and horizontal due to the movement between the windows positions in the upper floors. The application outlines that this would make use of a strong red brick as in Wimbledon DNA group 2 to stand out.

Element 2 (Residential) This building is a background building, set in between 2 urban strong buildings, the whole facade is a large balcony with thin profiles that make it very light and transparent.

Element 3 (Residential) Strong, vertical, gateway building to mark the junction of The Broadway with Trinity Road, in a creamy brick to not compete with the YMCA block.

7.4.34 The predominate use of brickwork is welcomed by officers as it will give the buildings a strong and long lasting high quality appearance that responds to Wimbledon's DNA. The use of colour in the proposed scheme is inspired in the tones and colours of Wimbledon. The residential blocks will have soft tone variations making the YMCA building stand out with its distinctive red colour. All these elements take their tonal colours from the surrounding context, which is predominantly a yellow stock with a warmer red tone used on the key historic buildings. The northern blocks are warmer tones to act as a transition to the existing. Neighbouring schemes are generally of brick with white framed timber windows and limited amounts of light stone detailing to courses and pediments. These white accents are used throughout the buildings in the window and balcony cills to add consistency to the scheme and reflect the local character.

7.4.35 An important element to the success of the design will be the finer details, such as the perforated metal panels, textured cast concrete, green bricks, flower and the organic shaped forms of the overhang soffits. The applicant has taken inspiration from a number of projects in the Wimbledon area, including Wellington House, Wimbledon Hill Road which has been well received by the public due to the quality of its detailing and character. The level of detailing and quality of materials proposed can be controlled via planning condition to ensure that the development delivers its expected standard. A separate design code condition relating to signage of the ground floor commercial units is also important to ensure that signage responds to the quality and detailing of the building.

7.4.36 As set out above, the proposed building heights are considered to maximize the potential of the site and respect the character of the two street scenes. In that assessment, consideration has been given to the design of the buildings and various design features which greatly assist in reducing the overall height and massing of the buildings. These include well-proportioned layers to the building (bottom, middle and top), with well-considered double height colonnades, affective use of differing materials

(and colors) and suitably recessed top floors. Splitting the design into three interlinking blocks with various horizontal/vertical banding proportions and a slight curve to the Trinity Road elevation create interest to the design and again helps reduce the perceived bulk and height. On balance, the proposed height is not considered to be excessive in the context of the site and its setting whereby it would cause adverse harm to the visual amenities of the area.

Public Benefits

7.4.37 The proposal would provide an enhanced YMCA facility, which includes not only valuable facilities for some of the most vulnerable people in society but also access to facilities for the wider public, increased public footpath, new public square with supporting commercial uses, a vast improvement to the visual amenities of the site with the creation of exceptional designed buildings and much needed new housing. The redevelopment of the site has achieved many of the redevelopment aspirations set by Merton Council. It must be noted that the provision of a new public square at the front of the site sets considerable challenges in optimizing the redevelopment potential of the site. Therefore increased massing and height is logical and can therefore be considered as maximising the potential of the site and the delivering many public benefits.

Impact upon heritage assets

7.4.38 Merton's Site and Policies Plan policy DMD4 (Managing Heritage Assets) seeks to conserve and where appropriate enhance Merton's heritage assets and distinctive character. The policy states that proposals affecting a heritage asset or its setting should conserve and enhance the significance of the asset as well as its surroundings.

7.4.39 The application site is south of the South Park Gardens Conservation Area. However South Park Road and the south side of Princes Road sit between the application site and the Conservation Area. Therefore there is a good level of separation between the application site and the Conservation Area. Whilst there would be an increase in both height and massing on the site, it is considered that the proposed buildings are not too excessive in height and massing and would be well distanced away from the Conservation Area to ensure that there would be no harm to its character or setting. It is therefore considered that the proposal would preserve the South Park Gardens Conservation Area.

Design Conclusion

7.4.40 The site is considered to be in a good location for taller and more dense

buildings that can maximise the potential for its redevelopment. For the reasons stated above, the overall design approach is therefore supported by officers.

7.5 **Safety**

- 7.5.1 A number of objections have been received from neighbours regarding concerns with safety with incidents from the use of the existing YMCA facilities.
- 7.5.2 In response to a range of comments received from the public and statutory comments received by the Metropolitan Police, the below sets out measures that will be incorporated into the scheme following a meeting by the applicant with the Met Police officer.
- 7.5.3 The security measures required to agree under the condition suggested by the MET are discussed in part below following a meeting with Officers. It is important to note final details will be secured by condition:
- (a) In order to address concerns regarding the 'back of house' links and use of the rear courtyard between the various uses, access to the rear courtyard will be limited and controlled via fob access to YMCA staff, commercial staff and residential occupants;
 - (b) The vehicular access to the rear courtyard via Trinity Road will be fob controlled;
 - (c) Fob controlled access will also be provided to the cycle store, bin store, communal storage areas and amenity spaces. The cycle storage inside the buildings will only be accessible to residents, with an appropriate locking system to ensure residents are not accidentally locked in;
 - (d) Fob controlled access will be installed to control access throughout residential blocks;
 - (e) Comments have been received that the wide overhang soffit may offer the chance for groups to loiter, or provide an area for rough sleepers. However this overhang is two storeys in height and the width is reduced to the central public space and along Trinity Road. The YMCA and the commercial uses will offer natural surveillance over this space alongside additional measures such as CCTV, whilst the YMCA actively discourage rough sleeping and work closely with LB Merton through a programme of measures should this arise;

(f) Mailbox provision will be provided in the entrance lobby to mitigate against any opportunities of theft;

(g) A concierge will be provided on-site for the residential building to assist with allowing access to trades people and monitoring access to different parts of the building.

(h) CCTV will be installed across the entire development and we expect details of this to be conditioned, with appropriate coverage to provide identity images of those who enter alongside activity images within these spaces;

(i) The enlarged cycle parking has been amended so it is within a lockable store. This is reflected in the revised ground floor plans;

(j) The short stay cycle spaces in Trinity Road have been relocated within the public realm at the front of the development to benefit from greater surveillance. This is reflected in the revised ground floor plans;

(k) The communal amenity roof terraces will have perimeter screens to prevent items being thrown, or people jumping / falling off. Any plant containers will be located and fixed appropriate to eliminate the chance to climb over balustrades or be thrown over balustrades. It is expected that a management strategy for communal roof terraces will be conditioned;

(l) The play spaces have been designed to be adjacent to living rooms of residential units to provide natural surveillance as required. Appropriate planting within the roof gardens will be maintained so they do not obstruct any vision within these spaces and do not compromise lighting or CCTV. We expect details of these measures to be conditioned;

(m) The public piazza will benefit from a combination of existing street lighting and proposed new bollard lighting. It is expected final details of the lighting scheme would be conditioned;

7.5.4 The applicant states that the new YMCA development has been designed and will be managed in a way that significantly improves safety at the site and seeks to minimise disturbance to neighbouring residents.

7.5.5 Natural surveillance from the hostel rooms and apartments above will be provided to the new piazza at the front of the building and the ground floor commercial uses will add to the surveillance over this space through active frontages and external seating. Following concerns being raised

during the consultation stage about noise and rubbish being thrown out of the existing YMCA windows, the design included windows that provide ventilation but do not allow objects to be thrown out.

- 7.5.6 In addition, the YMCA itself has been designed so that both the reception and the staff offices overlook the piazza and behavior can be monitored. YMCA managers will be available on site 24hrs a day and night, enabling them to spot and take action in the event of any problems in that area. Management and surveillance will be further backed up with modern CCTV systems.
- 7.5.7 The YMCA are also providing a managed smoking area for residents within the new hostel, at first floor level terrace area, which will reduce the incentive for residents to congregate at the front of the YMCA.
- 7.5.8 Concerns from neighbours relating to disturbance and safety have formed ongoing dialog with the applicant. The applicant has been in discussion with MET and neighbours to try and address concerns raised. The design of the proposed building and its management does seek to reduce impact where possible. Planning conditions relating to secure by design will need to be approved by the police before the building can be occupied. In reality there is no amount of good design or management that can totally guarantee that incidents will not occur, however the application submission and further details relating to safety can help reduce such events from taking place.

7.6 **Density**

- 7.6.1 Table 3.2 of the London Plan identifies appropriate density ranges based on a site's setting and PTAL rating.
- 7.6.2 The area has a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 6b (best), where 1 is poor and 6 is excellent. It is considered that the site is located within an Central area for the purposes of Table 3.2 of the London Plan, given the nature of surrounding built form and the criteria set out in the supporting text to Table 3.2 (density matrix) of the London Plan.
- 7.6.3 The proposed development would have a density of 1,287 habitable rooms per hectare. The proposed density is above the relevant density range of 650-1100 habitable rooms per hectare, as set out in Table 3.2 for the setting (Central) and PTAL 6.
- 7.6.4 In terms of the emerging London Plan, Policy D6 (Draft London plan Policy) sets out that:

“Development proposals must make the most efficient use of

land and be developed at the optimum density. The optimum density of a development should result from a design-led approach to determine the capacity of the site. Particular consideration should be given to:

1. the site context
2. its connectivity and accessibility by walking and cycling, and existing and planned public transport (including PTAL)
3. the capacity of surrounding infrastructure”

7.6.5 The emerging London Plan does not include a density matrix as it does not necessarily provide a consistent means of comparing proposals.

7.6.6 Whilst density is a material consideration, it is not the overriding factor as to whether a development is acceptable; London Plan paragraph 3.28 states that it is not appropriate to apply the density range mechanically. The potential for additional residential development is better considered in the context of its bulk, scale, design, sustainability, the impact upon neighbouring amenity, living standards for prospective occupants and the desirability of protecting and enhancing the character of the area and the relationship with surrounding development.

7.6.7 The London Plan states that development at densities outside table 3.2 will still be considered, however require particularly clear demonstration of exceptional circumstances. In this instance, it is considered that the proposed design and provision of high quality hostel and residential accommodation is of a high enough standard to justify the higher density proposed in this high PTAL location.

7.7 **Housing mix**

7.7.1 Planning policy DM H2 (Housing Mix) of the Sites and policies Plan state that to create socially mixed communities, creating for all sectors of the community by providing a choice of housing with respect to dwelling size and type in the Borough. In assessing development proposal the Council will take account of Merton’s Housing Strategy (2011-2015) borough level indicative proportions of 33% (one bed), 32% (two bed) and 35% (three plus bed). The proposed mix is 1 x studio unit, 108 x 1-bed units, 25 x 2-bed units and 1 x 3-bed unit. The proposed development would have a housing mix as follows:

Housing Mix	Number	Percentage	Merton’s policy
1 bed (including Studios)	109	80.75%	33%
2 bed	25	18.5%	33%
3 bed	1	0.75%	33%

7.7.2 Policy DM H2 (Housing mix) and Draft Local Plan policy H4.3 (Housing Mix) both set out a preferred bed unit size mix of roughly 33% even split for 1, 2 and 3+ bed units. However this requirement must be applied having regard to a number of relevant factors including site circumstances, site location, identified local needs and economics of provision such as financial viability or other planning contributions.

7.7.3 The applicant has put forward Merton's Merton Strategic Housing Need Assessment (SHMA) data, market advice and viability arguments for the high level of one bedroom flats within the development. These are set out below:

Merton SHMA (2019)

7.7.4 The Merton SHMA (2019) sits within the evidence base for the new Local Plan and is helpful in establishing some context within which the proposal sits.

Prevalence of Larger Units in the Borough

- Pg 19 - over half of the existing homes in Merton / Wimbledon are 3b+ family units.
- Pg 25 - Wimbledon already has highest number of 3 bed + homes in Merton at 33%.
- P113 – the table shows Wimbledon already has 69% 3 bed+ houses compared to only 8% 1 bed homes among owner occupiers.

7.7.5 All of these emphasise the point raised above about how the Borough, and in particular Wimbledon, is well stocked in larger homes and there is ever increasing pressure to convert family sized housing with gardens, into smaller sub-divided flats. If this trend continues, then the larger family housing stock within the Borough will continue to be diminished.

7.7.6 Purpose built smaller accommodation relieves the pressure of these conversions and ensures that high quality housing is available for the 1-bed market.

Home Ownership and Affordability

- Pg 25 – ownership has decreased by 1.5% in Merton due to worsening affordability and declining access to mortgages, above the London average of a 1% decrease.
- Pg 49 - affordability is already a problem in Wimbledon with median house prices at £850,000 and mean house prices at £1.3m. 'It is

the size of the properties that make Wimbledon expensive to live in’;

- Pg 52 – the table demonstrates prices for houses as considerably higher than prices for flats.
- Pg 70 - affordability is a problem in much of Merton, especially Wimbledon ‘...one of the highest across all the comparators’

7.7.7 Home ownership across the Borough is decreasing, principally due to prices increasing and much of the market of younger, first time buyers have been priced out of Wimbledon. The SHMA supports this case and notes that the prevalence of larger houses in Wimbledon / Merton are a barrier to younger buyers.

7.7.8 This proposal provides purpose built smaller accommodation which will be targeted at younger, first time buyers who are looking to buy in Wimbledon – and benefit from all its services, daytime and evening economy and excellent public transport – but are currently unable to afford to do so.

Market for Younger Buyers

- P61 - in the Wimbledon submarket, Estate Agents noted the most popular age bracket for buyers is between 25-40 years old (some said 30-40 years).

7.7.9 This reiterates that there is demand and interest amongst younger buyers in this market, but they are seeking smaller, more affordable homes in an area dominated by larger, unaffordable 3 bed+ houses.

Market Advice

7.7.10 The applicant has included specialist market advice from a local residential expert (JLL) to understand likely values and demands arising from a scheme in this location. JLL state that their experience demonstrates that there are several factors influencing the type of purchaser within a new build block of flats including:

- Access to transport
- Access to other amenities (shops / restaurants etc)
- Traffic/noise in the micro location
- Provision of local freehold family housing
- Access to green space
- Provision of parking within the development
- Price point

7.7.11 JLL have found that the more you have of the top four features, the more geared demand will be to younger buyers and therefore smaller units.

Young professionals with no dependants are more likely to be looking for good transport into the centre of London both for work and leisure, they also desire to be closer to hustle and bustle for similar reasons and this is a more important factor than say green space which features highly on the list of requirements for second steppers.

7.7.12 Second steppers, who are looking for two and three bed apartments to be able to expand their family into, also want to be further from the noise and pollution that traffic brings to provide a better environment for young children and therefore we find that blocks of flats on A roads are far more popular for those without dependants.

7.7.13 Another issue JLL have outlined is, where there is good availability of local freehold housing stock with gardens, this detracts from sales of larger units. Their letter references seeing this most strongly at Ram Quarter (4km to the north of the application site), where buyers of larger units would generally tend to purchase in the Tonsleys – a nearby Victorian estate. It is also worth highlighting buyers of larger apartments have a higher demand for parking.

7.7.14 It is clear from the advice received therefore that there will be high demand for the 1-beds within this scheme due to the access to public transport and local services, whilst there is going to be less demand for larger units due to the noise and traffic generated in the immediate vicinity and the provision of larger housing in the locality. This advice underpins the decisions taken in the scheme to provide a range of different sized 1-bed units so that whilst there is a high percentage of small units, there is a variety of accommodation offered within the scheme for the target market. The Council's Planning Policy Officer has concurred with some of the arguments put forward by the applicant for the housing mix and have raised no objection. The scheme is also car-free (other than disabled parking) which further lends itself towards smaller households rather than families.

Viability

7.7.15 The Applicant's cost consultant has concluded that there would be a cost saving if two one bedroom flats were converted into a 2 bedroom flat of these situations of around £21,500, based on a range of measures associated with the reduced cost of fitting the unit out (i.e. one kitchen rather than two etc).

7.7.16 JLL have also provided an indication of the values of 1 and 2 bedroom flats. The 2 x 1-beds have previously been valued at £404,000 and £407,000 respectively giving them a total value of £811,000. If these two apartments were converted into 1 x 2-bed apartment, then JLL have

valued this unit at £732,000.

- 7.7.17 There would thus be a decrease in value of £79,000 against a cost saving of £21,500 meaning that in each of these instances, such an amendment would take £57,500 out of the value of the scheme.
- 7.7.18 It is clear from this exercise, coupled with the viability assessment, that the scheme is therefore unable to alter the mix that is proposed within the same building footprint. In order to achieve a mix which would increase the number of 2-beds and reduce the number of 1-beds, a taller, denser scheme would be necessary. However this is an area that the Applicant has worked extensively to avoid through pre-application engagement given the level of local opposition and comments received by key stakeholders including the Design Review Panel.
- 7.7.19 The Councils Future Merton Team has assessed the planning arguments put forward by the applicant and taking account the individual circumstances of this proposal, it is considered on balance that the justification for the proposed housing mix in this case is justified. The site is in an area of high PTAL accessibility making it appropriate for flatted housing development. Wimbledon has a high existing prevalence of family sized accommodation compared to the rest of the borough. Hence the proposal contributes to providing greater choice in housing size mix in Wimbledon.
- 7.7.20 The points made in regards to altering the layout of the scheme under the current footprint of the building on viability grounds seems logical and acceptable to this particular case. Viability has already been tested and it has been agreed that there would be a deficit in viability terms and therefore the scheme cannot support any affordable housing. Therefore any changes to the mix, with more 2 bedroom flats will result in making the current scheme even more unviable. Officers consider that the proposal does maximize the potential of the application site as required by planning policy and NPPF and any further increases in height and mass may not be considered acceptable. For this reason, officers consider that it is undesirable to seek changes under this building design and to the housing mix despite the high number of 1 bedroom flats, which can also be justified in other terms relating to need and appropriateness to the location of the site in the town centre with its excellent access to transport and amenities.

7.8 **Neighbour Amenity**

- 7.8.1 London Plan policies 7.6 and 7.7, CS policy 14, and SPP policy DM D2 seek to ensure new developments do not unacceptably impact on the amenities of the occupiers of any adjoining and nearby surrounding

properties. Planning policy DM D2 (Design considerations in all developments) states that amongst other planning considerations that proposals will be expected to ensure provision of appropriate levels of sunlight and daylight, quality of living conditions, amenity space and privacy, to both proposed and adjoining buildings and gardens.

Material Considerations

- 7.8.2 Material planning considerations in this instance which should be considered include the condition of the existing buildings, the town centre location, site allocation within the local plan and the recent appeal decision (23rd Jan 2020) on the adjoining site (188 - 194 The Broadway, LBM ref 18/P2918).

Existing Buildings

- 7.8.3 The existing buildings on the site are not only in a poor and rundown condition, their original design does little to help and reduce their somewhat slab appearance. The existing buildings are therefore not only considered to be a negative impact on the street scene but also have a bleak and uninspiring impact on surrounding residential properties. Whilst the proposed redevelopment of the site would result in larger buildings, this doesn't always result in a poorer situation for neighbours in terms of the visual impact of a development. If new buildings are designed with good quality and include features to help reduce height and massing, then these can be seen as positive changes. The existing buildings are such poor quality that they fail on all fronts that the redevelopment of the site is welcomed.

Town Centre Location

- 7.8.4 The application site is located within the boundaries of Wimbledon Town Centre. The town centre is an identified area in the Borough where growth (including larger buildings) are directed and are to be expected. The town centre is a location where existing larger buildings already exist, will be directed in the future and have the benefit of excellent public transport links. The Town Centre is a growth area which is reflected in the Council's tall building paper and recent Future Wimbledon Master Plan which seeks to provide guidance on building height.

Site Allocation

- 7.8.5 The application site has a site allocation for redevelopment in the Local Plan since at least 2014. Its allocation sets a clear message to the public that the site is suitable for redevelopment and is likely to come forward for redevelopment. The existing buildings on the site are already large in

scale and any redevelopment would not be able to justify a reduction in floorspace or built form if the site is to deliver its maximum potential as required by NPPF and planning policy.

Appeal Decision

- 7.8.6 The recent appeal decision on the adjoining site, (188 - 194 The Broadway, LBM ref 18/P2918) is a strong material planning consideration. This is due to the appeal site forming part of the site allocation in the local plan, its recent decision date (23rd Jan 2020) and why the planning inspector allowed the appeal following objections raised by officers in regards to neighbouring amenity. The full appeal decision can be found in **Appendix 2.0** of this committee report for full reference. The following extracts from the appeal decision give officers a clear indication how the Planning Inspectorate are taking a view on urban development. The following extracts must therefore be taken into account:

‘The effect of the development on the outlook from the windows serving the stairwell would not be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 180 as they serve a non-habitable room. The window of the living/dining room does not face directly onto the flank wall so it would not be visible from deeper in the room. However, the flank wall would be clearly visible from close to the window. As this window serves a habitable room and has a view over the garden it is likely that the occupiers of No. 180 would wish to enjoy the view from it. The height, depth and resultant massing of the flank wall of the proposed development would result in its being oppressive and harmful to the outlook from that window.

The window to the attic bedroom is a dormer with restricted access. Nevertheless, the photographs received from the Council on 13 February 2019 submitted by the appellant indicate that this window is openable and the positioning of a desk and keyboard in front of it suggest that the occupiers of No. 180 may spend some time within the dormer close to the window. The height, depth and resultant massing of the flank wall of the proposed development would thus also be harmful to the outlook from this window.

The proposed development would extend along the boundary of the garden for approximately half its length and, from the evidence before me, would be approximately 21.2 m high. It would therefore present a very substantial bulk of flank wall immediately adjacent to the garden for a significant proportion of its overall length. Although there would be a more open area to the end of the garden and it would be possible to face away from the flank wall, there would be no escaping its presence as it would be immediately obvious when

entering the garden from the flat. The entrance to No. 180 is located in the north elevation and the flank wall would dominate this entrance.

Occupiers of Viscount Point, the residential apartment complex opposite the site on the south side of The Broadway, are concerned about the potential loss of light, privacy and views resulting from the proposed development. I note the dissatisfaction with aspects of the Daylight and Sunlight Report expressed by some third parties. However, no evidence has been provided to me that disputes the calculations in the Daylight and Sunlight Report and the reduction in daylight for some of the occupiers of Viscount Point does not form part of the Council's reasons for refusal. Nevertheless, it is my view that these reductions in daylight and consequent effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of these properties weigh against the proposed development.

With the exception of No. 188 The Broadway, the application site forms part of Site Proposal 62 (Wimbledon YMCA) as defined in the SPP. Site Proposal 62 is an allocation for a range of mixed uses, including offices. However, the policy simply establishes the principle of the redevelopment of the site; it does not set any parameters for that redevelopment in terms of built form.

The Future Wimbledon Masterplan (FWM) indicates that the appeal site would be appropriate for a building up to 7 storeys high. From the evidence before me the FWM is a Supplementary Planning Document that has been subject to one round of public consultation but has yet to be adopted. Furthermore, it is only guidance and does not form part of the development plan. I therefore give it only limited weight.

Accordingly, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 180 due to being overbearing as a consequence of its height, depth and resultant massing and proximity to both the windows to habitable rooms in the rear elevation and to the rear garden of that property. It would also cause limited harm to the living conditions of some of the occupiers of properties in Viscount Place due to a partial loss of daylight. The proposed development would be contrary in this respect to clause a) v of Policy DM D2 of the SPP which, amongst other things, protects the quality of living conditions of the occupiers of adjoining buildings and gardens.

...the proposed development would be contrary in this respect to clause f) of paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy

Framework (the Framework), which requires planning decisions to ensure that developments create places that have a high standard of amenity for existing users.

The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) also supports economic growth and productivity and the vitality of town centres, with significant development focused on sustainable locations in terms of access and making effective use of land. The development would help achieve the economic, social and environmental objectives for the planning system as set out in paragraph 8 of the Framework.

Planning Balance

In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the development plan is the starting point for decision making. I have found conflict with the development plan in respect of the harmful effect upon the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties as set out in the conclusion on that main issue.

However, in the particular circumstances of this case, the majority of the site lies within a site allocated for redevelopment in the SPP and its height would conform with the emerging FWM. In that context, both the adopted and emerging development plan emphasise the delivery of new office development within Wimbledon Town Centre. The proposed development would provide significant employment opportunities in a highly accessible location which are benefits of the proposal to which I afford considerable weight.

When having regard to the above, on balance, the compliance of the proposed development with other policies of the adopted and emerging development plan, and the extent of the benefits of the proposal that I have identified which constitute material considerations, together outweigh the harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and the conflict with the associated policy of the development plan in that respect.'

- 7.8.7 The appeal decision sets a clear message that whilst there were some identified impacts on the amenities of existing neighbours, the applications site context, policies/guidance and benefits of the scheme would outweigh the harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. This is particularly relevant to the application site where identified impacts relating to sun and day light have been documented and justified in the applicants Sun and Daylight report.

Use of Roof Terraces

- 7.8.9 The proposed development includes the use of a number of flat roof areas for both private and communal amenity areas. The proposed amenity areas are well distanced away from neighbouring residential properties to ensure that there would be no adverse impact from noise and disturbance. The proposed roof top terrace areas have been designed to be inset from the edge of the building to help mitigate overlooking and loss of privacy. A planning condition preventing the use of other flats roof areas (not identified on the drawings) can ensure that there would be no adverse impact on neighbours. A planning condition requiring full details of the proposed plant or side screen to the first floor YMCA terrace is considered necessary in order to ensure that there is no overlooking or loss of privacy from this terrace area.

Overlooking

- 7.8.10 The design of the building and its layout ensures that windows and doors either are directed towards the flanks of the proposed building, or are well distanced away from neighbouring residential gardens/properties, or directed towards public areas or where there are reduced separation distanced (such as the YMCA element adjacent to properties on South Park Gardens) some of the rear windows will be obscured glazed. A planning condition requiring the windows to be obscured glazed in perpetuity can ensure that there would be no undue loss of amenity.

Sun and Daylight

- 7.8.11 The Building Research Establishment (BRE) numerical guidelines should be considered in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which stipulates that local planning authorities should take a flexible approach to daylight and sunlight to ensure the efficient use of land. The NPPF states:

“Local planning authorities should refuse applications which they consider fail to make efficient use of land, taking into account the policies in this Framework. In this context, when considering applications for housing, authorities should take a flexible approach in applying policies or guidance relating to daylight and sunlight, where they would otherwise inhibit making efficient use of a site (as long as the resulting scheme would provide acceptable living standards).”

- 7.8.12 The applicant has submitted an independent sun, daylight and overshadowing report produced by Robinsons Surveyors Limited.

Robinsons Surveyors Limited are Chartered Surveyors and Specialist Modellers, with decades of experience in DLSL modelling on many of the most complicated and large scale projects in Central London, Greater London and beyond. Robinsons specialise in Daylight and Sunlight based modelling and analysis.

7.8.13 Robinsons state that they have taken a robust approach using surveyed models and have clearly identified shortfalls in terms of daylight and sunlight impacts by reference to all available tests in the BRE Guide. The report highlights, in detail, areas that comply with the strict aspirations of the BRE Guide. The BRE Guide aspirations are drafted to suit both suburban and urban environments. The BRE Guide suggests the use of alternative targets in 'dense urban environments' (i.e. the Broadway). Whilst the majority of the accompanying analysis shows compliance with the strictest aspirations of the BRE Guide, for reasons detailed in the report, more challenging areas are considered supportable when assessed in the context of the local environment.

Right of Light Consultants

7.8.14 In response to the comment/objection received from Right of Light Consultants on behalf of residents in South Park Road (no's 26, 30, 32, 55, 59, 61, 63, 69, 71, 73, 75 and 77) and 7 Trinity Road, the applicant's sun and daylight specialist has provided a direct response to the objections raised. See section 5.1.5 for points raised by Right of Light Consultants.

Applicant's response

'The BRE Guide provides aspirations for daylight and sunlight. These aspirations are designed for use in low density (suburban) environments together with some urban environments.

The BRE Guide states:

"The advice given here is not mandatory and this document should not be seen as an instrument of planning policy. Its aim is to help rather than constrain the designer. Although it gives numerical guidelines, these should be interpreted flexibly because natural lighting is only one of many factors in site layout design. In special circumstances the developer or Planning Authority may wish to use different target values. For example, in an historic city centre a higher degree of obstruction may be unavoidable if new developments are to match the height and proportions of existing buildings".

Within our report, submitted with the planning application, we have referenced shortfalls against the strict aspirations of the BRE Guide - providing analysis to define them in detail. As the Proposed Development is not located in a suburban setting, indeed LB Merton identify Wimbledon as their only Major Town Centre, we have followed BRE Guide recommendations and have considered this analysis against alternative targets and precedents.

Whilst referenced within the ROLC letter, sensitivity analysis is commonly only used on larger planning applications as part of an Environmental Statement. Accordingly, LB Merton confirmed in a response to an EIA Screening Opinion that a full Environmental Impact Assessment / Statement was not required in this instance. Therefore we prepared a stand-alone report and the criterion mentioned in the ROLC letter is not required.

At Robinsons, we always strive to use the most robust survey and modelling skillsets and techniques when undertaking daylight and sunlight analysis. Our report (and analysis) is based upon site inspections and planning records including those obtained during a site visit to view L.B. Merton's hard copy planning records.

As detailed within our report and drawings our modelling of the properties in question is based upon survey data - a laser scanned model. This is then located within a wider photogrammetric model. Where planning records were not available for neighbouring property layouts, these have been based upon reasonable assumptions in accordance with conventional practices. Our model is therefore robust and ROLC are able to confidently comment upon our detailed findings, as presented.

As can be seen from our previous daylight and sunlight report, with the exception 73 - 77 South Park Road and Flat 2 and 19 Nairn Court, all of the daylight and sunlight impacts to these properties are fully compliant with the strictest aspirations of the BRE Guide.

Whilst there are derogations to 73 - 77 South Park Road these only affect a modest number of windows/rooms, with all others being fully compliant with the strict BRE Guide aspirations for daylight and sunlight. Where shortfalls occur, the windows/rooms are considered against the 'alternative target' approach suggested within the BRE Guide. When compared to alternative targets it can be seen that there are no shortfalls in the majority of cases and where there are shortfalls these are modest and supportable for reasons stated.

In terms of flats 2 and 19 Nairn Court, Flat 19 is believed to be a second floor flat, whereas flat 2 is located at ground floor level; both are located in the same block. As can be seen from our report, the daylight analysis shows the flat 19 is fully compliant with the strict BRE Guide aspirations for suburban locations. In terms of sunlight there is full compliance with the exception of a single modest 1% winter shortfall (against an aspirational target of 5%) to the living room window (W1). This is because this window is single aspect and faces just 14 degrees from outside 90 degrees of due south. Windows outside 90 degrees of due south do not need to be analysed under the BRE Guide as they are not capable of viewing the sun path owing to orientation. As it stands, this window can only see 15% of the total sun path and therefore the poor design of this building is a limiting factor requiring due consideration. With a reduction of 20% this is deemed acceptable in this location and is above other, existing context, winter sunlight levels locally. This is therefore fully supportable.

Whilst flat 2 does suffer a 3 - 5% shortfall against the strict VSC aspirations, this is partly because the individual apertures are analysed as separate windows. The VSC in the proposed context, for all 4 windows, is over 20% which is significantly above the mid-teen target for dense urban and environments quoted in the report and this represents a very good level of daylight which exceeds existing VSC levels to this building in the existing/pre-development context. Also, the daylight within the room (DD) is fully supportable against the BRE Guides strict aspirations. Whilst there are modest sunlight (APSH) shortfalls of 1% against individual windows to this aperture (W1) where all windows to the aperture are accounted for the cumulative impact fully complies with the strictest aspirations of the BRE Guide'.

Overshadowing

7.8.15 The applicants sun and day light report confirms that all amenity areas will benefit from 2 hours of sun following completion of the proposed development during the day (on 21 March). The proposed development therefore complies with the test laid down within the BRE guide.

2 & 2A Trinity Road

7.8.16 Located directly to the north of the application site. The building is currently used as the Conservative Club which is a non-residential use. The proposed development would therefore have no undue impact upon this neighbouring property in terms of both visual impact and sun and day light.

5 Trinity Road (Oadtrin Lodge)

- 7.8.17 This neighbouring building is a part 3, part 4, part 5 storey block of flats located on the east side of Trinity Road, to the east of the application site. It has to be noted that currently the end section of the application plot has no buildings. This has been the situation for a number of years. Therefore the current situation creates a very good level of outlook towards the application site from these neighbouring properties, which is unusual in a dense urban town centre environment.
- 7.8.18 These neighbouring block of flats sit predominately opposite (east) the 9 storey element (Block B) of the proposed new buildings. However, it should be noted that the building does reduce in height to 5 storeys further north along Trinity Road. In addition, the design of the building includes a number of design features that will help reduce its perceived height and massing, these include a lightweight setback top floor, slight elevation curve to Block B facing Trinity Road and the vertical subdivision of each block including changes in brick colour. Taken collectively these design features will help reduced the perceived height, bulk and massing of the development when viewed from these neighbouring flats. It also has to be noted that the proposed design is considered to be exceptional, a vast improvement on poor appearance and condition of the existing flank elevation of the YMCA building and a public highway (Trinity Road) provides a physical barrier and a reasonable level of separation between the two sites. On balance, the proposed is not considered to result adverse visual intrusion from these neighbouring flats within this town centre location.
- 7.8.19 The applicant's sun and daylight report identifies that the proposal would result in shortfalls in BRE guidance to some windows. However it must be noted that the BRE is only guidance. It is:

"...not mandatory and this document should not be seen as an instrument of planning policy. Its aim is to help rather than constrain the designer. Although it gives numerical guidelines, these should be interpreted flexibly because natural lighting is only one of many factors in site layout design. In special circumstances the developer or Planning Authority may wish to use different target values."

Technical justifications have been provided within the applicant's sun and daylight report that justify why some shortfalls and alternative targets can be considered acceptable in this dense urban context and against other planning considerations.

7.8.20 On balance, it is noted that there would be an uplift in the massing and height of the development and its relationship with these neighbouring properties. The uplift is considered to be in line with the height and massing of existing buildings along The Broadway and this section of Trinity Road. In regards to assessing all material consideration in the planning balance of the scheme, weight must be given to the condition and appearance of existing buildings, application sites location in the town centre, site allocation, recent appeal decision and what benefits the scheme will deliver. When having regard to the above, on balance, the compliance of the proposed development with policies of the adopted and emerging development plan, and the extent of the benefits of the proposals identified which constitute material considerations, together are considered to outweigh the impact to the living conditions of the occupiers of these neighbouring properties.

7 Trinity Road (Nairn Court)

7.8.21 This neighbouring building is a series of interconnecting 3 storey block of flats located on the east side of Trinity Road, to the east of the application site.

7.8.22 These neighbouring block of flats would sit predominately opposite the 5 Block E) and 6 (Block D) storey elements of the proposed buildings. The design of the building does however include a number of design features to help reduce height and massing, these include a lightweight setback top floor and the vertical subdivision of each block including changes on brick colour. Blocks E and D are also more domestic in scale, responding to the scale of the existing blocks of flats on Trinity Road. The combination of the height and massing of the building and its design features that help reduce its presence would ensure that there is no undue loss of amenity. It also has to be noted that the proposed design is considered to be exceptional and a public highway (Trinity Road) provides a physical barrier and reasonable level of separation between the two sites. On balance, the proposed is not considered to result adverse visual intrusion from these neighbouring flats within this town centre location.

7.8.23 The applicant's sun and daylight report identifies that the proposal would result in shortfalls in BRE guidance to some windows. However it must be noted that the BRE is only guidance. It is:

"...not mandatory and this document should not be seen as an instrument of planning policy. Its aim is to help rather than constrain the designer. Although it gives numerical guidelines, these should be interpreted flexibly because natural lighting is only one of many factors in site layout design. In special circumstances the developer or Planning Authority may wish to use different target values."

Technical justifications have been provided within the applicant's sun and daylight report that justify why some shortfalls and alternative targets can be considered acceptable in this dense urban context and against other planning considerations.

- 7.8.24 On balance, it is noted that there would be an uplift in the massing and height of the development and its relationship with these neighbouring properties. The uplift is considered to be in line with the height and massing of existing buildings along this section of Trinity Road. When having regard to the above, on balance, the proposal is not considered to cause harm to these neighbouring properties.

9 & 11 Trinity Road

- 7.8.25 This pair of semi-detached residential properties is located on the east side of Trinity Road, to the northeast of the application site. The proposed development is well distanced away to ensure that there would be no undue loss of outlook or visual intrusion. The applicant's sun and daylight report confirms that the proposal would meet BRE guidance.

32 South Park Road

- 7.8.26 This residential property is located on the north side of South Park Road, to the north of the application site. The proposed development is well distanced away to ensure that there would be no undue loss of outlook or visual intrusion. The applicant's sun and daylight report confirms that the proposal would meet BRE guidance.

59 – 71 South Park Road

- 7.8.27 These semi-detached residential properties are located on the south side of South Park Road, to the north of the application site. The majority of these neighbouring properties (59 – 65 South Park Road) would sit to the northwest of the application site. Therefore direct outlook to the rear of these neighbouring properties and gardens would not be adversely affected.

- 7.8.28 67 & 69 South Park Road would be located directly to the rear of the YMCA's proposed single storey addition with heat pump chillers above. Whilst being located close to the rear boundary of the application site, this part of the proposed development is single storey only. Planters are proposed on the edge of the single storey flat roof. These will be used as part of an extensive soft landscaping scheme on the rear elevation. They will help screen the proposed chillers and soften the appearance of the building. These neighbours have good sized rear gardens that will also

would offer some protection from the proposed building and chiller area. It is therefore considered that there would be no undue loss of amenity. A planning condition relating to full details of landscaping, screening and restriction on noise levels from the chillers can ensure that there would be no undue loss of amenity.

7.8.29 71 South Park Road would be located directly to the rear of the YMCA single storey addition (as above) and partly to the rear of the southern wing of the 8 storey YMCA building. In terms of the impact of the single storey element of the YMCA building, the same consideration set out above for 67 & 69 are relevant. The rear elevation of the YMCA building include two wings, these wings have been designed with a staggered form, stepping away from the rear boundary. This includes two floor setbacks above ground floor level and a singular setback at the top floor. The first/second, third floor, fifth floor and seventh floors of the staggered rear wings would be set approx. 5m, 7m, 13m and 15m respectively from the rear site boundary. The principle of staggered rear elevations has been used affectively in town centre development (including the appeal decision on adjacent site, 188 – 194 The Broadway which included a sloping rear elevation (rather than setbacks), where sensitive relationships with existing residential properties exist. This approach will considerably help reduce the overall massing of the building when viewed from this neighbouring property.

7.8.30 As set out above, soft landscaping planters will be extensively used to help soften the appearance of the rear elevation. Full details of soft landscaping will be conditioned to ensure that the soft landscaping is high quality and affective. Rear windows are proposed on the wings, however these will be obscure glazed to prevent overlooking and loss of privacy. A planning condition requiring them to be kept obscure glazed in perpetuity will ensure that there is no undue loss of amenity.

7.8.31 The proposal includes a small courtyard area to the rear of the YMCA gym. The outside space would be located on the rear boundary and thus adjacent to the rear garden of this neighbour (and partly to number 73). Whilst the amenity space is modest in size, it is considered that this space could cause adverse harm byway of noise disturbance from both persons using the space and from noise within the units as a result of open doors or windows. This is particularly relevant for a gym and studios where heavy equipment is used and music often played in such environments. Therefore a planning condition is required preventing the use of this outdoor area and doors/windows are to remain shut.

7.8.32 For 59 – 71 South Park Road the applicant's sun and daylight report confirms that the proposal would meet BRE guidance.

73 & 75 South Park Road

7.8.33 These semi-detached residential properties is located on the south side of South Park Road, to the north of the application site. They would be located directly to the north of the main 8 storey element of the YMCA building.

7.8.34 In terms of the impact of the single storey element of the YMCA building, the same consideration set out above for 67, 69 and 71 South Park Road are relevant. The rear elevation of the YMCA building include two wings, these wings have been designed with a staggered form, stepping away from the rear boundary. This includes two floor setbacks above ground floor level and a singular setback at the top floor. The first/second, third floor, fifth floor and seventh floors of the staggered rear wings would be set approx. 5m, 7m, 13m and 15m respectively from the rear site boundary. This approach will considerably help reduce the overall massing of the building when viewed from this neighbouring property. The 8 storey middle section of the YMCA building between the two rear wings is set 24m (approx.) back into the site from the north boundary and therefore well distanced away from the neighbours property and rear garden. As set out in the report above, a proposed rear terrace area for the YMCA is proposed on the flat roof area, however this is well distanced away from the rear boundary and behind a proposed generator so there would be no undue impact from noise, overlooking or loss of privacy.

7.8.35 As set out above, soft landscaping planters will be extensively used to help soften the appearance of the rear elevation. Full details of soft landscaping will be conditioned to ensure that the soft landscaping is high quality and affective. Rear windows are proposed on the wings, however these will be obscure glazed to prevent overlooking and loss of privacy. A planning condition requiring them to be kept obscure glazed in perpetuity will ensure that there is no undue loss of amenity

7.8.36 The applicant's sun and daylight report identifies that the proposal would result in shortfalls in BRE guidance to some windows. However it must be noted that the BRE is only guidance. It is:

"...not mandatory and this document should not be seen as an instrument of planning policy. Its aim is to help rather than constrain the designer. Although it gives numerical guidelines, these should be interpreted flexibly because natural lighting is only one of many factors in site layout design. In special circumstances the developer or Planning Authority may wish to use different target values."

Technical justifications have been provided within the applicant's sun and daylight report that justify why some shortfalls and alternative targets can

be considered acceptable in this dense urban context.

7.8.37 On balance, it is noted that there would be an uplift in the massing and height of the development and its relationship with these neighbouring properties. The uplift has been carefully considered with a staggered rear building form and appropriate levels of setbacks and design features to help reduce visual impact. When having regard to the above, and the benefits of the scheme, on balance, the compliance of the proposed development with policies of the adopted and emerging development plan, and the extent of the benefits of the proposals identified which constitute material considerations, together are considered to outweigh the impact to the living conditions of the occupiers of these neighbouring properties.

77 South Park Road

7.8.38 This residential property is divided into flats and is located on the south side of South Park Road, to the north of the application site. These flats would be located directly to the rear of the eastern wing of the YMCA building and Block A and E within the residential element of the scheme. The rear service yard would sit between the proposed buildings and these neighbours rear outdoor space (which currently accommodates single storey garages).

7.8.39 As set out above, these neighbours have the benefit of being separated from the proposed buildings by a rear service yard. This creates a good level of separation and a physical barrier. In addition, the open space area to the rear of these flats has a number of single storey garages, is a location for bins and doesn't appear to be an amenity area or well used amenity area for the residents. Outlook from the ground floor windows in some of the flats are already affected by the single storey garages within close proximity. A number of trees on this neighbours land also sit along the boundary with the application site which provides some screening. The height, mass and design of the existing YMCA building would also need to be taken into consideration as it does create a somewhat bleak environment when viewed from this site (noted existing trees do screen some views from this neighbouring building). In light of the above, it is considered that there would be no adverse visual intrusion from these neighbouring properties.

7.8.40 The applicant's sun and daylight report identifies that the proposal would result in shortfalls in BRE guidance to some windows. However, it must be noted that the BRE is only guidance. It is:

"...not mandatory and this document should not be seen as an instrument of planning policy. Its aim is to help rather than constrain the designer. Although it gives numerical guidelines, these should

be interpreted flexibly because natural lighting is only one of many factors in site layout design. In special circumstances the developer or Planning Authority may wish to use different target values.”

Technical justifications have been provided within the applicant’s sun and daylight report that justify why some shortfalls and alternative targets can be considered acceptable in this dense urban context.

7.8.41 On balance, it is noted that there would be an uplift in the massing and height of the development and its relationship with these neighbouring properties. The uplift has been carefully considered with a staggered rear building form, appropriate setbacks and design features to help reduce visual impact, including the provision of the rear service yard. In regards to assessing all material considerations in the planning balance of the scheme, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in its relationship to these neighbouring properties.

168 - 186 The Broadway

7.8.40 These properties are located on the north side of The Broadway, to the west of the applicant site. They comprise commercial units at ground floor and some residential above. The proposed development is well distanced away to ensure that there would be no undue loss of outlook or visual intrusion. The applicant’s sun and daylight report confirms that the proposal would meet BRE guidance.

188 - 194 The Broadway

7.8.41 These properties are located to the north side of The Broadway, to the west of the application site. They comprise commercial units and a residential unit at the upper level. This property has recently received full planning permission for a 7 storey office building (allowed on appeal) and has a pending planning application for an additional floor. Given an application has been submitted for an additional floor it is considered highly likely that the site will be redeveloped in the near future. There would be no loss of amenity if the office development is built as this is a non-residential use. If the site is not redeveloped as expected then this neighbouring site includes commercial and a residential unit on the upper floors. There would be no loss of amenity to the commercial units given their non-residential status. In terms of impact on the rear windows of the residential unit, these are at the upper levels and would maintain some views over the single storey YMCA element directly to the rear of this neighbouring property. Whilst there would be a large flank wall of the YMCA along the boundary with this neighbour, the planning inspector’s conclusion on this matter (large flank wall along the boundary with 180 The Broadway) has already been established with the appeal decision on

this neighbouring site. The proposal would be a similar situation (not as dominant) to that already deemed acceptable by the planning inspector, thus this situation is considered acceptable.

199 The Broadway (Viscount Point) and 201 - 203 The Broadway

7.8.42 This neighbouring building is a part 5, part 6 storey block of flats located on the south side of The Broadway, to the south of the application site. These neighbouring block of flats would sit predominately opposite the proposed 8 storey YMCA and residential Block A elements of the building design. The design of the building includes a number of design features that will help reduce its perceived height and massing, these include a lightweight setback top floor, horizontal banding, subdivision of the building into three blocks, setting back of the building from the pavement, new public square and double height colonnades. Taken collectively these design features will create a vast improvement to the visual amenities of the street scene and will help reduce the perceived height, bulk and massing of the development when viewed from these neighbouring flats. It also has to be noted that the proposed design is considered to be exceptional, a vast improvement on poor appearance and condition of Olympic House/YMCA building and a public highway (The Broadway) provides a physical barrier and reasonable level of separation between the two sites. The proposed is not considered to result adverse visual intrusion from these neighbouring flats within this town centre location.

7.8.43 The applicant's sun and daylight report identifies that the proposal would result in shortfalls in BRE guidance to some windows. However it must be noted that the BRE is only guidance. It is:

"...not mandatory and this document should not be seen as an instrument of planning policy. Its aim is to help rather than constrain the designer. Although it gives numerical guidelines, these should be interpreted flexibly because natural lighting is only one of many factors in site layout design. In special circumstances the developer or Planning Authority may wish to use different target values."

Technical justifications have been provided within the applicant's sun and daylight report that justify why some shortfalls and alternative targets can be considered acceptable in this dense urban context.

7.8.44 On balance, it is noted that the would be an uplift in the massing and height of the development and its relationship with these neighbouring properties. In regards to assessing all material consideration in the planning balance of the scheme, weight must be given to condition/appearance of the existing buildings, application sites location in the town centre, site allocation, recent appeal decision and what benefits

the scheme will deliver. When having regard to the above, on balance, the compliance of the proposed development with policies of the adopted and emerging development plan, and the extent of the benefits of the proposals identified which constitute material considerations, together are considered to outweigh the impact to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties

1A Montague Road (Carrington House)

- 7.8.45 This neighbouring building is a part 4, part 5 storey building with commercial at ground floor and residential flats above located south of the application site at the junction between The Broadway and Montague Road.
- 7.8.46 These neighbouring block of flats would sit predominately opposite the 9 storey corner residential Block B. The design of Block B includes a number of design features that will help reduce its perceived height and massing, these include a lightweight setback top floor, horizontal banding, setting back of the building from the pavement, new public square and double height colonnades. Taken collectively these design features will create a vast improvement to the visual amenities of the street scene and help reduce the perceived height, bulk and massing of the development when viewed from these neighbouring flats. It also has to be noted that the proposed design is considered to be exceptional, a vast improvement on poor appearance and condition of the YMCA building and a public highway (The Broadway) provides a physical barrier and reasonable level of separation between the two sites. On balance, the proposed is not considered to result adverse visual intrusion from these neighbouring flats within this town centre location.
- 7.8.47 The applicant's sun and daylight report identifies that the proposal would result in shortfalls in BRE guidance to some windows. However, it must be noted that the BRE is only guidance. It is:
- "...not mandatory and this document should not be seen as an instrument of planning policy. Its aim is to help rather than constrain the designer. Although it gives numerical guidelines, these should be interpreted flexibly because natural lighting is only one of many factors in site layout design. In special circumstances the developer or Planning Authority may wish to use different target values."*
- Technical justifications have been provided within the applicant's sun and daylight report that justify why some shortfalls and alternative targets can be considered acceptable in this dense urban context.
- 7.8.48 On balance, it is noted that the would be an uplift in the massing and

height of the development and its relationship with these neighbouring properties. In regards to assessing all material consideration in the planning balance of the scheme, weight must be given to condition/appearance of the existing buildings, application sites location in the town centre, site allocation, recent appeal decision and what benefits the scheme will deliver. When having regard to the above, on balance, the compliance of the proposed development with policies of the adopted and emerging development plan, and the extent of the benefits of the proposals identified which constitute material considerations, together are considered to outweigh the impact to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

2A Montague Road (Montway Heights)

7.8.49 This neighbouring building is a part 3, part 5 storey building with commercial at ground floor and residential flats above located southeast of the application site on the junction between The Broadway and Montague Road.

7.8.50 These neighbouring block of flats has been designed with an angled corner feature directed towards the application site. Other than this element, all other windows face away from the application site. This corner feature will be directed towards the 9 storey corner residential Block B. This would be across the junction and would be at a suitable distance from a town centre location. Whilst the proposal will result in an uplift in built form and would be clearly visible from these neighbouring windows, it is not considered to be harmful to their outlook. The proposed is not considered to result adverse visual intrusion from these neighbouring flats within this town centre location.

7.8.51 The applicant's sun and daylight report confirms that the proposal would meet BRE guidance.

1 - 9 Keble Court

7.8.52 This multi-storey block of flats is located on the north side of South Park Road, to the north of the application site. The proposed development is well distanced away to ensure that there would be no undue visual intrusion. The applicant's sun and daylight report confirms that the proposal would meet BRE guidance.

7.9 **Standard of Residential Accommodation**

7.9.1 London Plan policies 3.5, 3.6, 3.7 & 3.8, CS policy CS 14, and SPP policies DM D1 and DM D2 seek to ensure that new residential development is of a high standard of design both internally and externally

and provides accommodation capable of adaptation for an ageing population and for those with disabilities, whilst offering a mix of unit size reflective of local need.

7.9.2 Planning policy CS 14 (Design) of Merton’s Core planning Strategy seeks to encourage well designed housing in the Borough by ensuring that all residential development complies with the most appropriate minimum space standards. The most up-to-date standards are the housing standards, minor alterations to the London Plan (March 2016).

7.9.3 In terms of the quality of the accommodation proposed, it is considered that the proposed flats would provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation for future occupiers. The proposed flats would exceed/meet minimum London Plan Gross Internal Area, room size and amenity space standards. Each habitable room would receive suitable light levels and adequate outlook. Given the shape of the site, some of the rooms have an unconventional layout, however each unit would meet minimum space standards.

7.9.4 The scheme has been designed so that there are no north facing single aspect units. The only north facing facade becomes a deck access, which provides dual aspect to the three units per floor in the core that it serves. A large courtyard in the centre of the building and a smaller one at the northern end of the site have been introduced to allow more dual aspect units in the design and improve the approach to the apartments. The number of dual aspects is as follows:

Dual Aspect	64%
Single Aspect	36%
North facing single aspect	0%

7.9.5 In relation to the proposed residential units:

Proposed GIA standards:

Flat No.	Level	Type	Proposed GIA (sqm)	Required GIA (sqm)	Propsoed Amenity Space (sqm)	Required Amenity Space (sqm)	Compliant
1	G	2B/4P	90	70	15	7	Yes
2	G	1B1P	46	39	7	7	Yes
3	G&1 st	3B6P	110	103	15 + 7	9	Yes
4	G&1 st	2B4P	91	79	7 + 7	7	Yes
5	G&1 st	2B3P	86	70	7 + 6	6	Yes
6	G&1 st	2B3P	82	70	7 + 6	6	Yes
7	G&1 st	2B4P	86	79	8 + 7	7	Yes

8	1 st	1B1P	46	39	5	5	Yes
9	1 st	1B1P	40	39	5	5	Yes
10	1 st	1B1P	47	39	6	5	Yes
11	1 st	1B2P	65	50	6	5	Yes
12	1 st	1B1P	47	39	5	5	Yes
13	1 st	1B1P	41	39	5	5	Yes
14	1 st	1B1P	39	39	5	5	Yes
15	1 st	1B2P	50	50	5	5	Yes
16	1 st	2B4P	71	70	7	7	Yes
17	1 st	1B2P	50	50	5	5	Yes
18	1 st	1B1P	44	39	5	5	Yes
19	1 st	1B1P	43	39	5	5	Yes
20	1 st	1B1P	43	49	6	5	Yes
21	1 st	1B1P	43	39	6	5	Yes
22	2 nd	1B1P	46	39	5	5	Yes
23	2 nd	1B1P	42	39	5	5	Yes
24	2 nd	1B1P	47	39	6	5	Yes
25	2 nd	1B2P	65	50	6	5	Yes
26	2 nd	1B1P	47	39	5	5	Yes
27	2 nd	1B1P	41	39	5	5	Yes
28	2 nd	1B1P	48	39	6	5	Yes
29	2 nd	1B1P	56	39	5	5	Yes
30	2 nd	1B1P	43	39	5	5	Yes
31	2 nd	1B1P	42	39	5	5	Yes
32	2 nd	1B1P	40	39	8	5	Yes
33	2 nd	1B1P	40	39	5	5	Yes
34	2 nd	2B3P	61	61	9	6	Yes
35	2 nd	1B2P	50	50	5	5	Yes
36	2 nd	1B2P	50	50	5	5	Yes
37	2 nd	Studio	55	39	6	5	Yes
38	2 nd	1B1P	49	39	11	5	Yes
39	2 nd	1B2P	51	50	6	5	Yes
40	2 nd	1B2P	51	50	6	5	Yes
41	2 nd	1B2P	51	50	6	5	Yes
42	3 rd	1B1P	46	39	5	5	Yes
43	3 rd	1B1P	42	39	5	5	Yes
44	3 rd	2B3P	65	61	6 + 4	6	Yes
45	3 rd	2B3P	63	61	6 + 12	6	Yes
46	3 rd	1B1P	47	39	5	5	Yes
47	3 rd	1B1P	41	39	5	5	Yes
48	3 rd	2B3P	66	61	6 + 4	6	Yes
49	3 rd	1B2P	51	50	5 + 10	5	Yes

50	3 rd	1B1P	43	39	5	5	Yes
51	3 rd	1B1P	42	39	5	5	Yes
52	3 rd	1B1P	40	39	8	5	Yes
53	3 rd	1B1P	40	39	5	5	Yes
54	3 rd	2B3P	61	61	9	6	Yes
55	3 rd	1B2P	50	50	5	5	Yes
56	3 rd	1B2P	50	50	5	5	Yes
57	3 rd	1B2P	59	50	6 + 11	5	Yes
58	3 rd	1B2P	50	50	11	5	Yes
59	3 rd	1B2P	51	50	6	5	Yes
60	3 rd	1B2P	51	50	6	5	Yes
61	3 rd	1B2P	51	50	6	5	Yes
62	4 th	1B1P	47	39	6	5	Yes
63	4 th	1B1P	42	39	5	5	Yes
64	4 th	2B3P	65	61	6	6	Yes
65	4 th	2B3P	63	61	6	6	Yes
66	4 th	1B1P	44	39	8	5	Yes
67	4 th	1B1P	41	39	5	5	Yes
68	4 th	2B3P	66	61	6	6	Yes
69	4 th	1B2P	51	50	5	5	Yes
70	4 th	1B1P	43	39	5	5	Yes
71	4 th	1B1P	42	39	5	5	Yes
72	4 th	1B1P	40	39	8	5	Yes
73	4 th	1B1P	40	39	5	5	Yes
74	4 th	2B3P	61	61	9	6	Yes
75	4 th	1B2P	50	50	5	5	Yes
76	4 th	1B2P	50	50	5	5	Yes
77	4 th	1B2P	59	50	6	5	Yes
78	4 th	1B2P	50	50	11	5	Yes
79	4 th	1B2P	51	50	6	5	Yes
80	4 th	1B2P	51	50	6	5	Yes
81	4 th	1B2P	51	50	6	5	Yes
82	5 th	1B1P	40	39	7 + 19	5	Yes
83	5 th	2B3P	65	61	6	6	Yes
84	5 th	2B3P	63	61	6	5	Yes
85	5 th	1B1P	39	39	8 + 21	5	Yes
86	5 th	2B3P	65	61	6	6	Yes
87	5 th	1B2P	51	50	5	5	Yes
88	5 th	1B1P	43	39	5	5	Yes
89	5 th	1B1P	42	39	5	5	Yes
90	5 th	1B1P	40	39	8	5	Yes
91	5 th	1B1P	40	40	5	5	Yes
92	5 th	2B3P	61	61	9	6	Yes

93	5 th	1B2P	50	50	5	5	Yes
94	5 th	1B2P	50	50	5	5	Yes
95	5 th	1B2P	59	50	6	5	Yes
96	5 th	1B2P	50	50	11	5	Yes
97	5 th	1B2P	51	50	6	5	Yes
98	5 th	1B2P	51	50	6	5	Yes
99	5 th	1B2P	51	50	6	5	Yes
100	6 th	2B4P	70	70	15 + 31	7	Yes
101	6 th	1B2P	50	50	12 + 25	5	Yes
102	6 th	1B2P	50	50	5	5	Yes
103	6 th	1B1P	42	39	5	5	Yes
104	6 th	1B1P	40	39	8	5	Yes
105	6 th	1B1P	40	39	5	5	Yes
106	6 th	2B3P	61	61	9	6	Yes
107	6 th	1B2P	50	50	5	5	Yes
108	6 th	1B2P	50	50	5	5	Yes
109	6 th	1B2P	58	50	6	5	Yes
110	6 th	1B2P	50	50	11	5	Yes
111	6 th	1B2P	51	50	6	5	Yes
112	6 th	1B2P	51	50	6	5	Yes
113	6 th	1B2P	51	50	6	5	Yes
114	7 th	2B4P	76	70	26	7	Yes
115	7 th	2B3P	61	61	8	6	Yes
116	7 th	1B1P	40	39	5	5	Yes
117	7 th	2B3P	61	61	9	5	Yes
118	7 th	1B2P	50	50	5	5	Yes
119	7 th	1B2P	50	50	5	5	Yes
120	7 th	1B1P	41	39	6	5	Yes
121	7 th	1B1P	50	39	11	5	Yes
122	7 th	1B2P	51	50	6	5	Yes
123	7 th	1B2P	51	50	6	5	Yes
124	7 th	1B2P	51	50	6	5	Yes
125	8 th	1B2P	51	50	8	5	Yes
126	8 th	1B1P	42	39	12	5	Yes
127	8 th	1B1P	38	37	12	5	Yes
128	8 th	2B3P	62	61	37	6	Yes
129	8 th	1B1P	42	39	19	5	Yes
130	8 th	1B1P	40	39	10	5	Yes
131	8 th	1B1P	41	39	7	5	Yes
132	8 th	1B1P	49	39	11	5	Yes
133	8 th	1B2P	50	50	6	5	Yes
134	8 th	1B2P	50	50	6	5	Yes

135	8 th	1B2P	50	50	6	5	Yes
-----	-----------------	------	----	----	---	---	-----

Private Amenity Space

7.9.6 The London Plan 2016 (London Housing Design Guide) states that all dwellings should provide a minimum of 5 sq m private outdoor space for 1-2 bedroom dwellings and an extra 1 sq m for each additional occupant. All new flats would have direct access to appropriate private amenity space in addition to an outdoor communal area at sixth floor levels.

Children's Play Space

7.9.7 The strategic planning policy requirement to provide for children's play space is set out at Policy 3.6 (Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation Facilities) of the London Plan 2016. This policy uses the Mayor's child yield calculator to determine what amount of play space is required.

7.9.8 Following the Stage 1 response from GLA, it has been anticipated that the proposals would generate a play space requirement of between 158 sq.m. and 222 sq.m. Following these comments from the GLA, the applicant has rerun their calculations and agree that the proposed mix would create a need for 158 sqm of play space, broken down as follows:

- 9 x 0-4 year olds requirement
- 6 x 5-11 year olds
- 1 x 12 – 15 year olds (including for rounding)

7.9.9 A total of 110 sqm is provided on-site at sixth floor level which will serve the youngest children of the development. This is in the form of built-in play space measures designed into the landscape including rubber play balls, balance beams and stepping logs as shown in the landscape drawings submitted with the application. As such, additional play space provision would be required. The application site would not be able to accommodate any additional play space provision given site constraints and other design aspirations being delivered as part of the proposals. The GLA state that evidence should be provided to demonstrate that the proposed off-site play provision fully satisfies the needs of the development whilst continuing to meet the needs to existing residents. Subject to addressing this requirement of the SPG, Merton Council should secure the off-site play provision of the 5-11 and 12+ age brackets (creation of new provision, improvements to existing play facilities and/or an appropriate financial contribution) within a legal agreement, accordance with the Policy S4, 3.16 and the Play and Informal Recreation SPG.

7.9.10 The applicant states that in respect of the older children, South Park Gardens is located 250 metres (2 minute walk) to the north of the site which provides a range of lawn spaces for older children (5+) to play within. Likewise and with greater provision for a variety of play spaces, Haydons Road Recreation Ground falls 450 metres (6 minute walk) to the east of the site, containing sports pitches and a dedicated play area in its south-eastern corner. There is thus both the provision of on-site play and high quality off-site play within close proximity of the site for children of all ages.

7.9.11 Further work is required to establish if existing play facilities in the area can be created, upgraded or if existing provision can accommodate the proposed increase in demand as a result of the proposed development. This matter will be resolved post committee decision and prior to Stage II consultation with the GLA.

Standard of hostel YMCA accommodation

7.9.12 The standard of accommodation for the new hostel is considered to be of high quality, with each bedroom containing en-suite facilities. Each floor would provide a shared kitchen facility and a large communal lounge and outdoor amenity area at first floor level. The size of the bedrooms and communal living spaces and layout has been customized specifically for the YMCA operation and officers raise no concerns with the standard of accommodation proposed in this regard.

Bin and Recycling Storage

7.9.13 The YMCA and residential elements of the scheme would have their own dedicated bin and recycling areas. The YMCA storage area would be 19smq in size. The residential storage areas would include a communal storage area (112smq in size) and the duplex flats facing Trinity Road will have their own bin stores in the front gardens. The applicants have outlined that the size and number of bins have been provided in line with that advised by the LB Merton Waste Officer at pre-application stage which was a capacity of 220L per residential unit. This equates to a total demand of 29,700L. In line with guidance from Merton, this is to be split 50/50 between household waste and recycling. The plans include 24no. 1280L, providing a total capacity of 15,360L for general household waste and 15,360L for recycling. In addition, there are five 240L food waste bins as requested by the waste officer. 5x1100L Eurobins are provided for the YMCA. Waste storage for the retail units will be provided within the unit and the size/volume of storage will be dependent upon the future occupier of the unit and their needs. It is further outlined that the YMCA will have a private waste and recycling collection undertaken 3 times a week.

7.9.14 Collection of refuse from the duplex flats would take place from Trinity Road. All other collections would take place on site from the rear service yard. The applicants have submitted vehicle tracking to show that a refuse vehicle can enter the site for servicing in the rear courtyard. The Council's Future Merton Waste Officer has confirmed that the 4m undercroft head height is of suitable height for a refuse vehicle to enter and exit the site. The Council's Future Merton Waste Officer raises no objection to the bin storage areas. Final details relating to bin storage can be controlled via planning condition seeking a Waste Management Collection Strategy.

7.10 **Flooding and Drainage**

7.10.1 The NPPF and London Plan policies 5.12, 5.13, Merton's policy CS 16 and SPP policies DMF1, DM F2 and DMD2 all seek to ensure that adequate flood risk reduction measures, mitigation, and emergency planning are in place to ensure there is no increase in flood risk offsite or to the proposed development.

7.10.2 The application site is located within flood zone 1, which is considered to be at low risk of flooding from pluvial sources, groundwater, artificial sources, and sewer surcharge. The applicant has submitted a Suds Drainage Statement with the application. It is proposed to restrict the peak surface water run-off rate from the development site to 2 l/s, providing 96% betterment on the existing surface water discharge rate for the 1 in 100 year return period. This is predominantly achieved through the use of an underground attenuation tank. Green roofs are also proposed which will provide amenity and biodiversity benefits and will reduce the overall volume of water discharging from the site in any given year.

7.10.3 The Council's Flood Officer and the Environment Agency have both confirmed no objection to the proposal subject to conditions.

8 **Transport and Parking**

8.1 Policy 6.1 of the London Plan (2016) states that the Mayor will support developments, which generate high levels of trips at locations with high levels of public transport accessibility and which improves the capacity and accessibility of public transport, walking and cycling.

8.2 At a local level Policy CS.19 of the Core Planning Strategy states that the Council will ensure that all major development demonstrates the public transport impact through transport assessments. Travel plans will also be required to accompany all major developments. Policy CS.18 promotes active transport and encourages design that provides attractive, safe, covered cycle storage, cycle parking and other facilities (such as showers, bike cages and lockers).

- 8.3 London Plan policies 6.3 and 6.12, CS policies CS20 and CS18 and SPP policy DM T2 seek to reduce congestion of road networks, reduce conflict between walking and cycling, and other modes of transport, to increase safety and to not adversely effect on street parking or traffic management.

Existing Situation

The Broadway

- 8.4 The Broadway is a two-way single carriageway road and forms part of the A219, which links the A24 in South Wimbledon with the A4 in Hammersmith. In the immediate vicinity of the site, The Broadway is approximately 9m wide and subject to a speed limit of 30mph. Footways and regular street lighting are present on either side of the carriageway with pedestrian crossing facilities present at key locations. The Broadway serves a range of commercial, retail and leisure facilities and offers access to numerous public transport, walking and cycling facilities in the vicinity of the site.
- 8.5 In immediate vicinity of the site, single-yellow lines restrict parking along either side of the carriageway from Monday to Saturday between 07:00 – 23:00 and Sunday between 14:00 – 18:00. No loading is permitted along this road section between Monday and Saturday from 07:00 – 10:00 and 16:00 – 19:00.
- 8.6 'Pay & Display' on-street parking bays are present along the northern side of the carriageway at the south-western edge of the site, which are operational between Monday – Saturday from 08:30 – 23:00 and Sundays from 14:00 – 16:00 and are restricted to a maximum stay of 2 hours. Outside of these hours, parking is free for 20 min and stays restricted to maximum of two hours. Double-yellow lines are present at junctions with minor roads, prohibiting parking at all times.

Trinity Road

- 8.7 Trinity Road is a two-way single carriageway that runs in a north-south alignment from Queen's Road to The Broadway. The road is subject to a speed limit of 20mph and serves mainly residential properties as well as the car park of the existing YMCA building and ancillary facilities. Speed humps and traffic calming features in the form of road narrowings are present in regular intervals to calm traffic within this residential area. In the immediate vicinity of the site, single-yellow lines are present on either side of the road that restrict parking from Monday to Saturday between 08:30 – 23:00 and Sunday between 14:00 – 18:00.

- 8.8 At its northern extent, Trinity Road adjoins Queen's Road via a staggered junction, with a Zebra crossing provided on the eastern approach of the junction. At its southern extent, Trinity Road forms the northern arm of a signalised junction with The Broadway and Montague Road.

Cycle parking

- 8.9 A total of 224 cycle parking spaces will be provided on-site. This will comprise the following:
- 188 residential cycle parking spaces located within a cycle store on the first floor of the development;
 - two spaces for enlarged cycles on the ground floor; and
 - 10 cycle parking spaces for the proposed YMCA development;
 - 24 short stay cycle spaces will be provided for visitors and will be located within the public realm at the front of the development.
- 8.10 It is noted that TFL have raised some concern relating to the attractiveness of the cycle parking design and layout, however the Councils Transport Planner has confirmed that the proposed cycle parking is in accordance with the London Plan. Officers therefore considered that there would be limited grounds to refuse planning permission when taking all other planning considerations and benefits the scheme would deliver into account.

Car parking

- 8.11 In accordance with the requirements of the London Plan, the development will be car free, with no general on-site car parking provision within the scheme. Residents of the site, with the exception of Blue Badge holders, would be prohibited from applying for on-street parking permits. A total of four parking spaces for disabled users will be provided within the site. These spaces will, if required, be leased to disabled residents who need on-site parking on first occupation. All parking spaces will be equipped with active provision for the charging of electric vehicles.
- 8.12 The proposal would result in the reduction of the car parking area currently on site. The proposal only includes 4 onsite car parking space and a service area. The proposal would therefore result in a considerable reduction in car travel to and from the site and there

Car Club Membership

- 8.13 The applicant has agreed to fund three years car club membership for new residents of the proposed development. The promotion of free car club membership will help inform new residents of sustainable modes of

travel which is welcomed. The three year free Car Club Membership can be secured within the S106 agreement.

Pedestrians

- 8.14 As the proposed development would only include 4 on site car parking spaces and would be a car free development, travel by foot will be a popular travel choice by residents and visitors. The proposal would improve the pedestrian experience along this section of The Broadway and Trinity Road with increase width footpaths and a new public square on The Broadway. The improvements in and around the site are welcomed.

Construction Vehicle Routing

- 8.15 Full details regarding the programming and phasing of the works will need to be provided upon appointment of a contractor to undertake the works. Details can be controlled via a suitable planning condition prior to works be undertaken.

Construction Logistics Plan

- 8.16 The submitted Construction Logistics Plan outlines the strategy for managing and monitoring the impacts of the construction of the proposed development on the site, neighbours and the surrounding highway network. A planning condition requiring full details of the CLP for each phase of development can be secured to ensure that impact on surrounding properties is kept to a minimum.

Servicing

- 8.17 Following lengthy discussion at pre-application stage, all servicing at the site will be undertaken from within the development and not from The Broadway or Trinity Road, part from several duplex flats. Tracking has been undertaken to demonstrate that the refuse vehicle can access and turn within the site to allow for egress in a forward gear.
- 8.18 Deliveries to the commercial units will also be undertaken from within the development. A dedicated LGV bay has been provided within the courtyard to allow deliveries to be undertaken without obstructing the remainder of users of the parking area. This bay will also accommodate LGV deliveries to the residential units.
- 8.19 For future safety and movement in close proximity to the signalised junction at Trinity Road the Council will look to introduce all day waiting and loading restrictions (24hr) on the Broadway and into Trinity Road via a section s106 contribution. This level of restriction has not been in the past

deemed necessary as the existing site has more extensive rear servicing and hence on-street demand for loading is low.

Trip movement

- 8.20 The number of person trips likely to be generated by the proposed development will be low and consequently the development proposals would not have a material impact on the operation of the public highway or public transport network.
- 8.21 The removal of the existing car park on the site will reduce vehicle trips to and from the development. The Transport Assessment determines the number of additional trips that would arise as a result of the additional units and the Councils Transport Planner concurs with its conclusions that the increase will be insignificant.

Travel Plan

- 8.22 The applicant has submitted a Travel Plan with the application, it sets out a range of measures and management strategies to support and encourage the use of the most sustainable forms of travel, walking and cycling, thereby facilitating low car ownership levels. The Travel Plan can be secured within the S106 agreement.
- 8.23 The GLA state that the Technical Note (TN) provided by the applicant following their original comments includes a Healthy Streets Check for Designers. The Healthy Streets check for designers should only be used where there are physical works to the public highway that are likely to cost in excess of £200k and should not be applied to the site as a whole. This is because the check for designers has to be audited by TfL to make sure it has been undertaken correctly and does not overestimate the scheme's Healthy Streets benefits. Further work has been undertaken in terms of assessing the quality of the key routes surrounding the sites and recommendations for improvements have been made. However, the TN states that the applicant is not proposing to deliver any of the pedestrian and cycle improvements identified. Given the improvements are all on borough roads it is for Merton to decide if a contribution towards these improvements are secured.
- 8.24 The redevelopment of the site would deliver a vast improvement to the pedestrian experience along The Broadway with setback buildings, a wider public footpath (including at the junction with Trinity Road) and a new public square at the front of the site. These changes are under the control of the application and are considered to be welcomed features that have been included as part of the overall design approach. As set out above, the viability of this scheme has been subject of lengthy discussions

with the Councils viability consultant. The conclusions of viability confirm that there is a deficit with bringing forward the scheme as it stands, therefore officers consider that it would be unrealistic at this late stage in the process to seek additional contributions from the applicant.

9 **Biodiversity**

9.1 Planning Policy DMO2 (Nature Conservation, Trees, hedges and landscape features) of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity, particularly on sites of recognised nature conservation interest. To protect trees, hedges and other landscape features of amenity value and to secure suitable replacements in instances where their loss is justified

9.2 The applicant has provided an independent ecology report by Ecology by Design Ltd. The recommend the following:

- A single emergence bat survey should be undertaken of the tower block;
- Any dense vegetation removal should be completed outside the bird-nesting season (March to August inclusive) or preceded by a check for nests. If nests are found, they should be left undisturbed until the young have fledged;
- Recommendations for ecological enhancements.
- Should potential development not commence within 2 years of this report a resurvey is recommended due to the potential for the ecological interest of the site to change.

9.3 The recommendations of the ecological report include:

- The inclusion of a green/brown roof on the new development could significantly increase the sites value for biodiversity. Any green or brown roof should be designed in consultation with a green roof specialist following the principles of the GRO 'Green Roof Code'.
- Provision will be made for five integrated bird boxes. It is recommended that hollow bricks are used which are specifically designed for black redstart.
- Any planting plans for the site should include a wide variety of plants, with some native species where possible.
- Any recommendations within the subsequent bat report should also be followed.

9.4 Following the advice in the applicants ecology report, a detailed bat survey was also undertaken by Ecology by Design Ltd. The report states that no emerging bats were recorded coming from the tower block during the

survey. No bat activity was recorded at all across the site. The report recommends that that two Habitat boxes (or an equivalent) will be installed within the fabric of the walls of the new building on site. It should be installed on the southern aspect at c. 4m height, with unobstructed access and no direct illumination from external lighting.

- 9.5 A planning condition requiring evidence that the development has implemented the recommendations of the ecology and bat report would ensure that the site delivers enhanced biodiversity. Officers note the recommendations from the Swift Group in their consultation response and officers consider appropriate swift friendly bricks could be incorporated to the proposal, to be secured under the ecological condition.

10 **Contamination**

- 10.1 Merton's Sites and Policies Plan Policy DM EP4 (Pollutants) aims to reduce pollutants and reduce concentrations to levels that will have minimal adverse effects on people and the natural and physical environment.
- 10.2 The applicant has provided a Preliminary Investigation Report by Soils Limited. The Council's Environmental Health Officer has confirmed no objection subject to conditions.

11 **Sustainability**

- 11.1 Planning policy CS15 (climate Change) of Merton's adopted Core Planning Strategy (2011) seeks to tackle climate change, reduce pollution, develop low carbon economy, consume fewer resources and use them more effectively.
- 11.2 Planning Policy 5.2 of the London Plan (2016) states that development proposals should make the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with the following energy hierarchy:
1. Be lean: use less energy
 2. Be clean: supply energy efficiently
 3. Be Green: use renewable energy
- 11.3 The applicant has submitted an updated Energy Statement. The Council's Climate Change Officer has confirmed that no objection subject to conditions and S106 agreement.
- 11.4 As the proposal is for a major residential development a S.106 agreement for the carbon offset cash in lieu contribution will need to be finalised prior to planning approval in line with Policy 5.2 of the London Plan. The

applicant has updated their energy strategy and calculation in discussion with the GLA. The final details and carbon off-set figure will be agreed at Stage II referral with the GLA. The contribution can then be secured within the S106 agreement.

12 **Air Quality**

12.1 Planning Policy DM EP4 of Merton's Adopted Sites and Policies plan (2104) seeks to minimise pollutants and to reduce concentrations to levels that have minimal adverse effects on people, the natural and physical environment in Merton. The policy states that to minimise pollutants, development:

a) Should be designed to mitigate against its impact on air, land, light, noise and water both during the construction process and lifetime of the completed development.

b) Individually or cumulatively, should not result in an adverse impact against human or natural environment.

12.2 Planning policy 7.14 (Improving Air Quality) of the London Plan 2016 recognises the importance of tackling air pollution and improving air quality to London's development and the health and wellbeing of its people. The London Plan states that the Mayor will work with strategic partners to ensure that the spatial, climate change, transport and design policies of the London Plan support implementation of Air Quality and Transport strategies to achieve reductions in pollutant emissions and minimize public exposure to pollution.

12.3 In accordance with the aims of the National Air Quality Strategy, the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy seeks to minimise the emissions of key pollutants and to reduce concentration to levels at which no, or minimal, effects on human health are likely to occur.

12.4 To meet the aims of the National Air Quality Objectives, the Council has designated the entire borough of Merton as an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). Therefore, development that may result in an adverse air quality including during construction, may require an Air Quality Impact Assessment in order for the Council to consider any possible pollution impact linked to development proposals.

12.5 The applicant has provided an air quality assessment with the application. The independent air quality assessment by RSK Environment Ltd (RSK). The applicant has submitted additional information following the GLA's original stage 1 comments. The GLA have now confirmed that the amended air quality report is acceptable and in line with policy. The

Councils Air Quality Officer has also raised no objection subject to conditions.

13 **Trees**

- 13.1 The applicant has submitted an independent arboricultural impact assessment and Method Statement by Arbour Cultural LTD. The report identifies that some trees would need to be removed and others protected during constructions. None of the trees are currently protected by TPO or located within a Conservation Area therefore there is no protection for their retentions. It should also be noted that the proposed landscaping scheme would include new tree planting in the public square and following further ground investigation potentially street trees along The Broadway and Trinity Road. The Councils Tree Officer has confirmed no objection subject to conditions.

14 **Affordable Housing**

- 14.1 Planning policy CS 8 (Housing Choice) of Merton's Core Planning Strategy states that development proposals of 10 units or more require an on-site affordable housing target of 40% (60% social rented and 40% intermediate). In seeking affordable housing provision, the Council will have regard to site characteristics such as site size, its suitability and economics of provision such as financial viability issues and other planning contributions. The application proposes a replacement hostel facility, with 121 bedrooms. As this use is not a C3 residential use (Sui-Generis), it does not technically fall within the definition of affordable housing at national or local policy level. Notwithstanding this, it is a housing facility to house the most vulnerable people. Officers attach significant weight to this in the assessment of the proposal.
- 14.2 The amount of affordable housing this site can accommodate has been subject of a viability assessment. Following discussions, the Councils independent viability assessor (Altair) has confirmed that the scheme cannot provide any affordable housing. An early and late stage viability review is however required which would ensure that any surplus profit outside the agreed position is secured within the legal agreement. Although no affordable housing can be provided on site, the scheme is to be delivered in 2 phases with the first phase being the demolition of the Olympic House and the western wing of the YMCA, and construction of the new YMCA building. This would allow a full de-cant of the existing YMCA facility into the new one, without having to close or disperse people. The phasing of the proposal can be secured within the S106 Agreement.

15. **Local Financial Considerations**

15.1 The proposed development is liable to pay the Merton and Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Merton's Community Infrastructure Levy was implemented on 1st April 2014. This will enable the Council to raise, and pool, contributions from developers to help pay for things such as transport, decentralised energy, healthcare, schools, leisure and public open spaces - local infrastructure that is necessary to support new development. Merton's CIL has replaced Section 106 agreements as the principal means by which pooled developer contributions towards providing the necessary infrastructure should be collected.

16. **GLA**

16.1 The GLA has stated that the outstanding matters relating to inclusive access, equalities and the circular economy can be agreed prior to stage 2 referral.

Urban greening

16.2 The GLA has also confirmed that the applicant has calculated the UGF of the proposed development as 0.38, which is close to meeting the target of 0.4 set by Policy G5 of the ItP London Plan. The urban greening design appears to be maximised, and there are clear constraints in that the site area includes a large area of public realm adjoining the highway. The UGF of 0.38 is therefore accepted in this instance.

17. **Sustainability and environmental impact assessment requirements**

17.1 The proposal is for major mixed-use development and an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required in this instance.

17.2 The application does not constitute Schedule 1 or Schedule 2 development. Accordingly, there are no requirements in terms on EIA submission.

18. **CONCLUSION**

18.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that when determining a planning application, regard is to be had to the development plan, and the determination shall be made in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

18.2 NPPF - Paragraph 122 explains planning decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account the identified need for different types of housing and other forms of development, and the availability of land suitable for accommodating it;

- the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting, and the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places.
- 18.3 NPPF Paragraph 123 states that it is especially important that planning decisions avoid homes being built at low densities, and ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site.
- 18.4 The delivery of this site for community facilities, commercial and new housing are all in line with the adopted site allocation in the Sites and Policies Plan 2014. The new uses on the site would include both the re-provision of a new YMCA facility and new residential units which are particularly welcomed and much needed. The 135 proposed flats and 333sqm commercial units at ground floor level will create much needed new homes and jobs. The principle of development is considered to be acceptable with a mixed use development retaining a source of employment and providing much needed new hostel and residential accommodation.
- 18.5 The standard of residential accommodation is considered to offer good accommodation that would meet the needs of future occupiers. Each unit would have direct access to private amenity space as well as communal areas at sixth floor level which would exceed minimum standards. The proposed housing mix is considered to be acceptable for its town centre location and viability constraints. The level of affordable housing is agreed due to viability considerations.
- 18.6 The design of the development is considered to be of exceptional quality in terms of appearance and character and would be appropriate in terms of height and massing in this context. At street level, the proposed development is considered to improve the visual amenities of the street scene, with a vast improvement of the design of the buildings on the site, increased footpath width and a new public square. The proposed density range is considered acceptable in this instance given the quality of the design. The proposed building would respect the context of the site, wider area and as such would preserve the nearby South Park Gardens Conservation Area.
- 18.5 The letters of objection from neighbouring properties have been assessed. The applicant's Sun and Daylight report sets out justifications for shortfalls and alternative targets of BRE guidance used in the industry to justify the impacts on surrounding properties. It is acknowledged, that the proposed building would result in a noticeable uplift in development on the site, however the potential of the site is being delivered within this urban town centre setting where the larger building would not appear out of keeping with existing and future patterns of development in Wimbledon Town

Centre. On balance, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in undue loss of neighbouring amenity to warrant refusal of planning permission in this instance, given the context of the site, planning policy and recent appeal decision stated throughout the report.

- 18.6 There would be no undue impact upon flooding, transport, biodiversity, contamination, sustainability, archaeology, air quality or trees.
- 18.7 The proposal is considered to be in accordance with Adopted Sites and Policies Plan, Core Planning Strategy and London Plan policies. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions and S106 agreement.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to –

1. The application being referred to the Mayor of London, in accordance with the Mayor of London Order 2008
2. Subject to conditions and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement covering the following heads of terms:-
 - (1) Subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement covering the following heads of terms:-
 1. Permit Free.
 2. Zero Carbon (TBA contribution).
 3. Car Club Membership (3 years).
 4. Implementation of loading Restrictions (TBA contribution), pavement re-surfacing and street tree planting.
 5. Travel Plan.
 6. Affordable Housing (early and late stage viability review required).
 7. Hostel must remain for that use in perpetuity.
 8. Phasing of development (Phase1 and Phase 2)
 9. The developer agreeing to meet the Councils costs of preparing, drafting and monitoring the Section 106 Obligations.

And the following conditions:

1. A1 Commencement of Development (full application)
2. A7 Approved Plans
3. B.1 Materials to be approved, including detailed plans at a scale of 1:20 of some of the typical details
4. B.4 Details of Surface Treatment
5. B.5 Details of Walls/Fences
6. C06 Refuse & Recycling
7. C08 No use of flat roofs
8. D01 Hours of Use
10. D03 Restriction of Music/Ampilified Sound
11. D10 External Lighting
12. D11 Construction Times
13. E05 Restriction – Use of Premises (no supermarket)
14. F01 Landscaping/Planting Scheme (including street trees)
15. F09 Hardstanding's
16. H03 Redundant Crossovers
17. H04 Provision of Vehicle Parking
18. H06 Cycle Parking
19. H10 Construction Vehicles, Washdown Facilities Etc (major sites)
20. H12 Delivery and Servicing Plan to be submitted
21. H13 Demolition/Constriction Logistic Plan to be subject (major development) - (including a Construction Management plan in accordance with TfL guidance) should be submitted to LPA for approval before commencement of work.

22. H14 Garage Doors/Gates
- 22 Management strategy for communal roof terraces
- 23 Signage
- 24 No use of gym garden and windows/doors kept closed.
- 25 Residential CO2 reductions and water use
- 26 Non-residential CO2 reductions and BREEAM
- 27 District Heat Networks – London Heat Networks Manual
- 28 Be Seen' energy monitoring
- 29 Energy Efficiency Target
- 30 Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed scheme for the provision of surface and foul water drainage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority for both phases of the development. The drainage scheme will dispose of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) at the agreed runoff rate (no more than 2l/s, with no less than 228m³ of attenuation volume), in accordance with drainage hierarchy contained within the London Plan Policy (5.12, 5.13 and SPG) and the advice contained within the National SuDS Standards
- Reason: To reduce the risk of surface and foul water flooding to the proposed development and future users, and ensure surface water and foul flood risk does not increase offsite in accordance with Merton's policies CS16, DMF2 and the London Plan policy 5.13.
- 31 Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit a detailed proposal on how drainage and groundwater will be managed and mitigated during and post construction (permanent phase), for example through the implementation of passive drainage measures around the basement structure.
- Reason: To reduce the risk of surface and foul water flooding to the proposed development and future users, and ensure surface water and foul flood risk does not increase offsite in accordance with Merton's policies CS16, DMF2 and the London Plan policy 5.13

32. Prior to the commencement of development, the detailed design and specification for the green roofs shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The design shall be carried out as approved, retained and maintained by the applicant in perpetuity thereafter.

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

33. Ecology and bat report (including swift bricks)

34. Tree Protection: The details and measures for the protection of the existing trees as specified in the hereby approved document 'BS5837 Arboricultural Report, Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Method Statement' reference 'AC.2020.151' dated '21 May 2020' shall be fully complied with. The methods for the protection of the existing tree shall fully accord with all of the measures and stages as specified in the report and these shall be installed prior to the commencement of any site works and shall remain in place until the conclusion of all site works.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing trees in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS13 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and 02 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

35. Site Supervision (Trees) – The details of the approved 'BS5837 Arboricultural Report, Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Method Statement' shall include the retention of an arboricultural expert to monitor and report to the Local Planning Authority not less than monthly the status of all tree works and tree protection measures throughout the course of the demolition and site works. A final Certificate of Completion shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority at the conclusion of all site works. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing trees in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS13 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and 02 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

36 The development hereby permitted shall incorporate security measures to minimise the risk of crime and to meet the specific security needs of the development in accordance with the principles and objectives of Secured by Design. Details of these measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to commencement of the development and shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation.

Reason: In order to achieve the principles and objectives of Secured by Design to improve community safety and crime prevention in accordance with Policy 14 (22.17) of Merton Core Strategy: Design, and Strategic Objectives 2 (b) and 5 (f); and Policy 7.3 Designing out Crime of the London Plan.

37. Prior to occupation a Secured by Design final certificate shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to achieve the principles and objectives of Secured by Design to improve community safety and crime prevention in accordance with Policy 14 (22.17) of Merton Core Strategy: Design, and Strategic Objectives 2 (b) and 5 (f); and Policy 7.3 Designing out Crime of the London Plan.

38. No works will commence on site until the below documents have been submitted and agreed by the Planning Officer.

- a) Detailed Demolition Method Statement produced by the Contractor appointed for demolishing the existing buildings.
- b) Detailed piling methodology produced by the Contractors appointed for the piling.
- c) Structural drawings of the piles adjacent to the highway boundary.
- d) Movement monitoring report produced by specialist surveyors appointed to install monitoring gauges to detect any movement of the highway/neighbouring properties from pre-construction to completion of the project works as recommended by the Construction Method Statement. The report should include the proposed locations of the horizontal and vertical movement monitoring, frequency of monitoring, trigger levels, and the contingency measures for different trigger alarms.

39. Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) - All Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) of net power of 37kW and up to and including 560kW used during the course of the demolition, site preparation and construction phases shall comply with the emission standards set out in chapter 7 of the GLA's supplementary planning guidance "Control of Dust and Emissions During Construction and Demolition" dated July 2014 (SPG), or subsequent guidance. Unless it complies with the standards set out in the SPG, no NRMM shall be on site, at any time, whether in use or not, without the prior written consent of the local planning authority. The developer shall keep an up to date list of all NRMM used during the demolition, site preparation and construction phases of the development on the online register at <https://nrmm.london/>

Reason: To ensure that the development would not result in a deterioration of air quality.

40. Construction Management Plan - Prior to the commencement of the development a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority outlining measures that will be taken to control dust, noise, vibrations and other environmental impacts of the development.

41. A deskstudy, then an investigation shall be undertaken to consider the potential for contaminated-land, and if necessary, a detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a suitable state for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to health and the built environment, and submitted to the approval of the LPA.

Reason: To protect the health of future users of the site in accordance with policy 5.21 of the London Plan 2015 and policy DM EP4 of Merton's sites and policies plan 2014.

42. The approached remediation shall be completed prior to development. And a verification report, demonstrating the then effectiveness of the remediation, subject to the approval of the LPA.

Reason: To protect the health of future users of the site in accordance with policy 5.21 of the London Plan 2015 and policy DM EP4 of Merton's sites and policies plan 2014.

43. No properties shall be occupied until confirmation has been provided that either:- 1. Capacity exists off site to serve the development or 2. A housing and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed with Thames Water. Where a housing and

infrastructure phasing plan is agreed, no occupation shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed housing and infrastructure phasing plan. Or 3. All wastewater network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows from the development have been completed.

Reason - Network reinforcement works may be required to accommodate the proposed development. Any reinforcement works identified will be necessary in order to avoid flooding and/or potential pollution incidents.

44. No properties shall be occupied until confirmation has been provided that either:- all water network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows to serve the development have been completed; or - a housing and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed with Thames Water to allow additional properties to be occupied. Where a housing and infrastructure phasing plan is agreed no occupation shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed housing and infrastructure phasing plan.

Reason - The development may lead to no / low water pressure and network reinforcement works are anticipated to be necessary to ensure that sufficient capacity is made available to accommodate additional demand anticipated from the new development.

45. 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 water 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 in close proximity to underground water utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground water utility infrastructure.

46. Details of playspace

47. Due to the potential impact of the surrounding locality on the development the recommendations to protect noise intrusion into the residential dwellings as specified in the RBA Acoustics, Noise Assessment Report Ref:9432.RP01.AAR.1, dated 26th May 2020 shall be implemented as a minimum standard for the glazing and

mechanical ventilation. A post construction noise survey shall be conducted and remedial measures implemented should be submitted criteria fail to be achieved, first being agreed by the LPA.

48. The use, hereby approved, shall not commence until a scheme for the soundproofing of the building for the Gymnasium/Childrens Area element to prevent the transmission of noise and vibration from the use of the gym, including impact noise, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The measures as approved shall be implemented in strict accordance with the approved details prior to the first use of the development and shall thereafter be retained.
49. The use of the rear ground floor open area of the development shall be prohibited for use in connection with the permitted planning development, with the exception of building maintenance/servicing.
50. Noise levels, (expressed as the equivalent continuous sound level) LAeq (15 minutes), from the new plant/machinery shall not exceed LA90-10dB at the boundary with the closest residential property.
51. No music or other amplified sound generated on the premises shall be audible at the boundary of any adjacent residential premises.
52. No development shall take place until a Demolition and Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the demolition and construction period.

The Statement shall provide for:

- 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/demolition. (including the methodology for the basement excavation and any 24 hour generator/pumping)
- demonstration to show compliance with BS5228

- 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

53. Obscure glazing to rear facing hostel windows
54. Fire Strategy Report
55. Inclusive Design

Planning Informatives:

1. Carbon emissions evidence requirements for post construction stage assessments must provide:
 - 'As Built' SAP Compliance Reports and detailed DER and TER worksheets for the as built development. The output documents must be based on the 'as built' stage of analysis and must account for any changes to the specification during construction. The outputs must be dated and include the accredited energy assessor's name and registration number, the assessment status, plot number and development address. OR, where applicable:
 - A copy of revised/final calculations as detailed in the assessment methodology based on 'As Built' SAP outputs;
 - AND
 - Confirmation of Fabric Energy Efficiency (FEE) performance where SAP section 16 allowances (i.e. CO2 emissions associated with appliances and cooking, and site-wide electricity generation technologies) have been included in the calculation.
 - AND, where the developer has used SAP 10 conversion factors:
 - The completed Carbon Emissions Reporting Spreadsheet based on the 'As Built' SAP outputs.
 - AND, where applicable:
 - MCS certificates and photos of all installed renewable technologies.
2. Water efficiency evidence requirements for Post Construction Stage assessments must provide:
 - Documentary evidence representing the dwellings 'As Built'; detailing:

- the type of appliances/ fittings that use water in the dwelling (including any specific water reduction equipment with the capacity / flow rate of equipment);
- the size and details of any rainwater and grey-water collection systems provided for use in the dwelling; AND:
- Water Efficiency Calculator for New Dwellings; OR
- Where different from design stage, provide revised Water Efficiency Calculator for New Dwellings and detailed documentary evidence (as listed above) representing the dwellings 'As Built'

3. Carbon emissions evidence requirements for Post Construction stage assessments must provide:

- Detailed documentary evidence confirming the Target Emission Rate (TER), Building Emission Rate (BER) and percentage improvement of BER over TER based on 'As Built' BRUKL model outputs; AND
- A copy of the Building Regulations Output Document from the approved software. The output documents must be based on the 'as built' stage of analysis and must account for any changes to the specification during construction; AND
- A BREEAM post-construction certificate demonstrating that the development has achieved a BREEAM rating of not less than the standards equivalent to 'Very Good

AND, where the developer has used SAP 10 conversion factors:

- The completed Carbon Emissions Reporting Spreadsheet based on the 'As Built' SAP outputs.

AND, where applicable:

- MCS certificates and photos of all installed renewable technologies.

4. Environment Agency - Although we have no comments on this planning application, the applicant may be required to apply for other consents directly from us. The term 'consent' covers consents, permissions or licenses for different activities (such as water abstraction or discharging to a stream), and we have a regulatory role in issuing and monitoring them.

The applicant should contact 03708 506 506 or consult our website to establish whether a consent will be required -

<https://www.gov.uk/environmental-permit-check-if-you-need-one>

5. No surface water runoff should discharge onto the public highway including the public footway or highway. When it is proposed to connect to a public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required (contact no. 0845 850 2777).

No waste material, including concrete, mortar, grout, plaster, fats, oils and chemicals shall be washed down on the highway or disposed of into the highway drainage system.

6. It is Council's policy for the Council's contractor to construct new vehicular access. The applicant should contact Council's Highway Team on: 0208 545 3829 prior to any work starting to arrange for this works to be done.

Highways must be contacted prior to any works commencing on site to agree relevant licences, and access arrangements – no vehicles are allowed to cross the public highway without agreement from the highways section.

7. In preparing the Construction Management Plan, the applicant should refer to the GLA's Supplementary Planning Guidance on The Control of Dust and Emissions During Construction and Demolition to identify best practice.

8. The applicant should be aware that the site may provide a useful habitat for swifts. Swifts are currently in decline in the UK and in order to encourage and improve the conservation of swifts the applicant is advised to consider the installation of a swift nesting box/bricks on the site.

9 INF9 Works on the Public Highway

10 INF12 Works Affecting the Public Highway

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
10th December 2020

<u>UPRN</u>	<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>Item No:</u>	<u>DATE VALID</u>
	20/P1399		05/06/2020
Address/Site:	95 Devonshire Road Colliers Wood London SW19 2EQ		
Ward:	Colliers Wood		
Proposal:	ADDITION OF BASEMENT AND ERECTION OF SECOND STOREY AND PART SINGLE, PART DOUBLE REAR EXTENSION TO CREATE TWO NEW SELF CONTAINED FLATS.		
Drawing No.s:	19361/06F, 19361/07F, 19361/08E, 19361/09F, 19361/10F, 19361/11E, 19361/12.		
Contact Officer:	Catarina Cheung (020 8545 4747)		

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to S106 Obligation or any other enabling agreement and 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: 19
- External consultations: 0
- Controlled Parking Zone: Yes, Zone CW
- Archaeological Zone: No
- Conservation Area: No

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is being brought forward before Planning Applications Committee for consideration due to the nature and number of objections received.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site comprises a detached dwellinghouse located on the southern side of Devonshire Road in Colliers Wood.
- 2.2 The site is not located in a Conservation Area nor is the building listed.
- 2.3 The site is not located in an area of high flood risk.
- 2.4 The site has a PTAL of 2 (measured on a scale of 0 to 6b, where 0 is considered the worst).
- 2.5 Devonshire Road is located in a Controlled Parking Zone, Zone CW.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The proposal seeks planning permission for a number of extension works to improve the existing 4 units and to create two new self-contained units, involving:

- Erection of a single storey rear extension, measuring a maximum depth of 5.2m (4m projection toward the eastern elevation), 8.07m width and flat roof with a maximum/eaves height of 3m;
- Erection of a first floor rear extension, measuring 1.5m depth, 6.7m width (matching the existing two storey addition) and 2.83m height (measured from the roof of the ground floor extension);
- Basement extension to enlarge the existing, with the provision of 2 lightwells toward the front elevation concealed by metal grates and 2 lightwells toward the rear. The basement would be of the same footprint as the main dwellinghouse, internally measuring 8.82m width, 7.47m depth (8.33m including the front bay windows) and externally, 2.4m height;
- Mansard roof extension with an inset roof terrace and insertion of 4 rooflights to the front roof slope. The extension would measure 7.67m depth, maximum 8.92m width/6.55m width over the existing two storey addition and 2.3m height over the rear roofslope/2.65m height over the two storey addition;
- Provision of a window on the first floor rear elevation to serve the existing bedroom of Flat 4.

- 3.2 The proposed mix of units would be as follows:

	Type	Storeys	Proposed GIA (sqm)	Proposed amenity (sqm)
Flat 1	1b2p	2	65	112 – shared garden
Flat 2	3b4p	1	74	48 – private garden
Flat 3	1b2p	2	60	112 – shared garden
Flat 4	2b3p	1	53	112 – shared garden
Flat 5	3b4p	1	62	112 – shared garden
Flat 6	2b3p	1	62	3 (roof terrace) + use of the 112 shared garden

- 3.3 Refuse bins provided in the front garden. Cycle storage provided within the rear garden.
- 3.4 The development would be car-free, except for Flats 2, 4, 5 and 6 which are allocated the existing parking permits – further explained under section 7.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 87/P0848: APPLICATION FOR CONTINUED USE OF PREMISES FOR MULTIPLE OCCUPATION WITH SERVICED TENANCIES. – Application granted 13/08/1987
- 4.2 MER902/84: CHANGE OF USE FROM FOUR FLATS TO HOSTEL. – Refused 13/12/1984
- 4.3 MER453/83: CONVERSION INTO FOUR SELF-CONTAINED FLATS AND TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION – Granted 11/08/1983

5. CONSULTATION

External

- 5.1 Public consultation was undertaken by way of letters sent to 19 neighbouring properties. 10 neighbouring representations were received, summary of their concerns as follows:
- Overdevelopment of the site;
 - Will become higher with a third storey and much longer than any house in the street and could set a precedent;
 - Out of character;
 - Will affect neighbouring dwelling's right to light, leading overshadowing;
 - Impact toward the privacy of flats on Myrna Close;
 - Overcrowding;
 - Considerable loss of garden privacy;
 - 93 and 97 have sump pumps in their cellars, therefore a basement dig-out could affect water course;
 - Increase in traffic and demand for parking spaces;
 - The land is contaminated by knotweed;
 - Inaccuracies in the application form: the property is described as not vacant when it is; there are trees on proposed development site; the proposed housing mix;
 - The requirement to dispose of additional surface water to the main sewer, which is already an overloaded combined Victorian sewage system, could lead to back-up to adjoining properties;
 - Unclear access to recreational area;
 - The increased capacity of the property will obviously bring additional residents and consequently increased noise and wear and tear on resources.
 - There will be at least 12 rubbish bins outside this property, if not more, in addition to recycling boxes and garden refuse; with the obvious risk of attracting foxes and rats, and flies in the summer - health concern. The proposed bin store does not look sufficient;
 - Impact of new foundations/basement toward neighbouring properties and public road;
 - Basement suffering from damp;
 - The basement construction will cause substantial noise and traffic disruption to the road;
 - There is a lot of building waste currently on site;
 - Did not receive notification of planning application;

- The rear extension was rebuilt around 20 years ago, this has poor foundations, and potential asbestos;
- These flats are unlikely to be for key workers and social housing and are being developed for profit.

Internal

- 5.2 **Transport officer** – The site sits just beyond the distances used for calculating PTAL for bus services, which is reflected in the lower 2 score. In practice, given Colliers Wood underground station is only 9-10 minutes walk it seems reasonable that residents would walk the extra couple of minutes to access the full range of bus services in the vicinity. Both Colliers Wood underground and Tooting Station are in walking/cycling distance.

Local streets are increasingly congested with parked vehicles and the accumulation/incremental development would add to local pressures. I would therefore suggest the applicant is asked to enter into unilateral undertaking for the new flats to be permit free.

To facilitate regular cycle proposed store should meet the Department for Transport's LTN (Local Transport Note) 1/20 standards as a minimum.

- 5.3 **Flood risk officer** – pre-commencement conditions have been recommended requiring the submission of further details, including a detailed proposal on how drainage and groundwater will be managed and mitigated during construction and post construction (permanent phase), with a detailed basement construction method statement to include a detailed scheme for the provision of surface and foul water drainage.
- 5.4 **Environmental Health officer (contamination)** – conditions recommended regarding contaminated land.

6. POLICY CONTEXT

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

Section 5 – Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

Section 11 – Making effective use of land

Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places

6.2 London Plan (2016)

3.3 Increasing housing supply

3.4 Optimising housing potential

3.5 Quality and design of housing developments

3.8 Housing choice

5.1 Climate change mitigation

5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions

5.3 Sustainable design and construction

5.17 Waste Capacity

5.21 Contaminated land

6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity

6.9 Cycling

6.13 Parking

7.4 Local character

7.6 Architecture

8.2 Planning Obligations

8.3 Community infrastructure levy

- 6.3 Merton Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011)
 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)
 DM D2 Design considerations
 DM D3 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
 DM H2 Housing Mix
 DM T2 Transport impacts of development
 DM T3 Car parking and servicing standards
- 6.5 Supplementary planning considerations
 London Plan Housing SPG – 2016
 DCLG Technical Housing Standards - nationally described space standards 2015
 Basement and Subterranean Planning Guidance – March 2017

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 The key planning considerations of the proposal are as follows:
- Principle of development
 - Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the area
 - Impact upon neighbouring amenity
 - Standard of accommodation
 - Transport, parking and cycle storage
 - Refuse and recycling
 - Sustainability
 - Other matters

Principle of development

- 7.2 The National Planning Policy Framework, London Plan Policy 3.3 and the Council's Core Strategy Policies 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 states that boroughs should seek to enable additional development capacity which includes intensification, developing at higher densities.
- 7.3 The proposal seeks to provide a further 2 residential units on site by increasing the density through the construction of new extensions to the building. The principle of doing so is considered acceptable and in line with policies to increase provision of additional homes and seeking opportunities through intensification of the site.
- 7.4 Whilst the principle of the development is considered acceptable, the scheme is also subject to the following criteria being equally fulfilled and compliant with the policies referred to above.

Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the area

- 7.5 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. SPP Policy DMD3 in particular states that roof alterations and extensions should ensure the use of sympathetic materials, be of a size and design that respects the character and proportions of the original building and surrounding context, does not dominate the existing roof profile and are sited away from prominent roof pitches, unless they are a specific feature of the area.

Basement extension

- 7.6 There is an existing basement which the proposal seeks to enlarge to match the footprint of existing property. This element would not be visible toward the streetscene or neighbouring properties.
- 7.7 Merton's Basement SPD states: "the presence or absence of lightwells helps define and reinforce the prevailing character of a neighbourhood. Where basements and subterranean development; and visible lightwells are not part of the prevailing character of a street, new lightwells should be discreet and not harm the architectural character of the building, or the character and appearance of the surrounding area, or the relationship between the building and the street". Lightwells are not a prevailing feature of Devonshire Road so should be designed to be discreet. Toward the front of the property, two lightwells are proposed to serve the basement rooms but these would be concealed by grates installed flush with the ground level. This is considered an appropriate and discreet design approach.

Ground floor: single storey extension

- 7.8 The ground floor extension is considered to be of a subordinate scale when viewed in relation to the main dwelling. It would keep within the main dwelling's building lines to maintain separation from the boundaries. It is further noted, that at the rear of number 97 Devonshire Road there is a two storey extension with a further single storey conservatory addition, the proposed single storey extension here would exhibit a similar overall projection to this.

Upper level: first floor rear extension and mansard roof addition

- 7.9 The existing two storey flat roof extension at the rear is of an already substantial size. Originally proposed, the further 2m projection at the first floor with a mono-pitched roof attachment and mansard roof addition covering over half the flat roof area of the existing two storey element was considered excessive and visually prominent, and did not respond well to the existing building.
- 7.10 However, the upper level extensions have been amended to address officer's concerns. The first floor extension reduced by 0.5m and displays a flat roof design, and the mansard extension pushed back to half the depth of the existing two storey element – 2.8m from the rear building line increased to 3.79m.
- 7.11 The existing two storey extension, being of a flat roof design, is a difficult form to enhance with the challenge of alterations being easily viewed as increasing its bulk. However, the approach of the amended 1.5m flat roof addition is considered a reasonably suitable solution in this instance, creating another minor flat roof element would better distinguish itself and visibly exhibit a 'step down' from the previously proposed pitched roof form which looked to inappropriately elongate the upper level.
- 7.12 The mansard style roof extension has been reduced to project only halfway over the existing two storey extension, greatly reducing its bulky appearance and also enhances the appearance of the existing large flat roof. Given the size of the dwelling and the extensions, it is considered the choice of a mansard style is more thoughtful

than a box style dormer as it is less bulky in form, and with sloped ends helps to create the appearance of a proper roof element and not an extended third storey.

- 7.13 The roof terrace design for Flat 6 has been integrated into the mansard's roofslope so would not be visually prominent and appropriately concealed.
- 7.14 Rooflights inserted in the front roofslope are not considered detrimental in terms its impact toward the appearance of the main building.
- 7.15 Given the amendments described above, it is considered the extensions have been suitably reduced to decrease their prominence and bulk when viewed from the neighbouring occupiers. Impact on neighbouring amenity is further discussed below. Overall, the design of the extensions is considered acceptable.

Impact upon neighbouring Amenity

- 7.16 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.

Existing extensions:

- 7.17 The main rear buildings line of numbers 93, 95 and 97 are closely aligned, each with differing rear extensions which do not project dissimilar extension depths from one another. Number 93 exhibits part single part two rear additions, altogether projecting a maximum depth of 6.7m (as shown from their last planning permission drawings 00/P1316 and the existing block plan [1936/01]), the existing flat roof addition at the application property projects 7.3m. But, given the slight angled positioning of the two properties, there would not be a greatly visible projection of number 95's existing extension from 93 - even if so, very slight. There is also a 3.1m separation gap between the rearmost points of the extensions.
- 7.18 Number 97 has an existing two storey flat roof rear extension with additional single storey elements on the ground floor. Their two storey element displays a 7m projection (as shown on the existing block plan, but the plans from their last planning permission drawings of 90/P0068, show a 7.3m projection which is the same as that at number 95). Their additional conservatory addition to the rear of this is a further 3.1m, so overall, a total of around 10m depth. Between the two storey extensions of both properties, there is a separation distance spanning around 7m.

Proposed extensions:

Basement

- 7.19 The basement extension would not be considered unduly harmful toward neighbouring amenity in terms of light or outlook given its siting below ground level. Concerns regarding the structural stability/flood risk are discussed further from paragraph 7.45 onwards.

Ground floor

- 7.20 The ground floor extension would be set back suitably from the boundaries (as it remains in line with the main building's side elevations), displaying a reasonable height and projection.
- 7.21 Toward number 93, the extension would display a depth of 4m, would be 3m high and be set back from the boundary around 1.6-1.8m; and toward number 97 would display a depth of 5.2m, be 3m high and set back 1.3-1.5m from the boundary.

First floor rear

7.22 The first floor extension would increase the projection of the upper level by 1.5m, but considering the neighbouring additions (which are described in detail in the above description of the Existing extensions) with the existing separation distances, would not be considered greatly harmful to neighbouring amenity.

Mansard roof addition and roof terrace

7.23 The mansard roof extension would be sited at an upper level which would not project beyond the eaves/ buildings lines of the existing dwelling and extension. Therefore, it is not considered there would be unduly impact toward neighbouring light. However, the mansard extension has been reduced in depth aiding to reduce a potentially bulky appearance toward neighbouring outlook/views.

7.24 The terrace has been designed to be inset into the rear roof slope, reducing its visibility toward neighbouring occupiers and given the further setback of the mansard extension, this increases the terrace’s separation from the rear building line. Views of the terrace from neighbouring gardens would therefore be largely screened by the existing flat roof.

Myrna Close

7.25 The separation distance between the properties along Myrna Close and the rear of the proposed first floor addition would be at least 33m, and from the roof extension/terrace around 38m. Consequently, the proposed extensions are considered sufficiently set back so as not to negatively impact the amenity of the properties along Myrna Close in terms of loss of privacy or overlooking.

7.26 Given there are existing large additions at the rear of the application site and adjacent buildings, impact toward neighbouring amenity is not considered to be harmful, as to warrant refusal. Nonetheless, with the amendments of the upper level extensions (discussed under paragraphs 7.10-7.12), this has improved the additions’ bulk and massing which in turn has reduced a potentially obtrusive view toward the neighbouring occupiers.

Standard of accommodation

Internal

7.27 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
Flat 1	1b2p	2	65	58	Yes*
Flat 2	3b4p	1	74	74	Yes
Flat 3	1b2p	2	60	58	Yes*
Flat 4	2b3p	1	53	61	No**
Flat 5	3b4p	1	62	74	No**
Flat 6	2b3p	1	62	61	Yes

- 7.28 It is noted there are 4 existing units in the building, including Flats 4 and 5 which demonstrated above fall short of the minimum space standards, but, these are not to be assessed as an offer of new accommodation. However, Units 2 and 6 are new, so, they must comply with the minimum standards:
- 7.29 ***Flats 1 & 3** – these are the existing ground floors units which have been reconfigured and enlarged by way of the basement extension. As demonstrated by the table above, whilst they are not an offer of new accommodation and to be assessed as such, they do meet and exceed the minimum space standards.
- 7.30 ****Flats 4 & 5** – the existing units on the first floor are not largely altered by the scheme, but the first floor extension does offer some opportunity to enlarge these. Flat 4 is reconfigured at the rear to provide a single kitchen/living/dining area, the room slightly increased by the extension, and the extension would also enlarge the rearmost bedroom of Flat 5. It is noted in the current situation, the flats do not meet minimum space standards, and given they are pre-existing units, cannot be assessed as an offer of new accommodation. Whilst they will remain undersized, the proposal does seek to improve them. Officers consider refusal on the grounds of failing to meet National standards would be unreasonable.
- 7.31 **Flat 2 and 6** – new units offered, these are compliant with the minimum space standards.
- 7.32 Bedrooms and living room areas would all have windows providing access to light and ventilation.

External

- 7.33 The London Housing SPG requires a minimum of 5sqm of private outdoor space for 1-2 person dwellings and an extra 1sqm provided for each additional occupant.

	Type	Proposed amenity (sqm)	Required amenity (sqm)	Compliant
Flat 1	1b2p	112 – shared garden	5	Yes
Flat 2	3b4p	48 – private garden	7	Yes
Flat 3	1b2p	112 – shared garden	5	Yes
Flat 4	2b3p	112 – shared garden	6	Yes
Flat 5	3b4p	112 – shared garden	7	Yes
Flat 6	2b3p	115 (3, roof terrace and access to the shared garden)	6	Yes

- 7.34 The ground floor 3 bed family unit would have access to a private garden. The remaining units upper would have access to a communal garden at the rear of the property, this area providing 112sqm. Unit 6, the loft level unit, would also have access to a small roof terrace. Altogether, the amenity areas provided would comply with the standards set out in the London Housing SPG.

Transport, parking and cycle storage

- 7.35 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.
- 7.36 The site has a PTAL of 2 and is located in a Controlled Parking Zone, CW.
- 7.37 The Council's Transport officer was consulted and notes that the site sits just beyond the distances used for calculating PTAL for bus services, which is reflected in the lower 2 score. But in practice, given Colliers Wood underground station is only 9-10 minutes walk it seems reasonable that residents would walk the extra couple of minutes to access the full range of bus services in the vicinity. Both Colliers Wood Underground station and Tooting Station are in walking/cycling distance from the site.
- 7.38 The Transport officer has also observed that in this area, local streets are increasingly congested with parked vehicles and the accumulation/incremental development would add to local pressures. Therefore, recommends that the applicant enters into a Unilateral Undertaking for the new flats to be permit free. The existing 4 flats benefit from parking permits. These will be assigned to Flats 2, 4, 5 and 6, (the 2 and 3 bed units), and newly configured 1 bed duplex units shall be designated as permit free.
- 7.39 This arrangement has been agreed by the applicant and permission would be issued on completion of a S106 legal agreement.
- 7.40 In relation to the cycle parking, the proposed number of units would require 10 cycle store spaces, the proposal provides 12 so is considered sufficient. The cycle stands have also been amended to increase their separation distance to enable easy access as per the Transport officer's comments.

Refuse and recycling

- 7.41 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.
- 7.42 The proposed site plan indicates an area in the front garden for refuse bin store. This is considered an appropriate location for convenient access and collection. Therefore, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy 5.17 of the London Plan and Policy CS 17 of the Core Strategy, a condition will be attached requiring provision of details of the design of the bin enclosure.

Sustainability

- 7.43 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 to achieve a 19% improvement on Part L of the Building Regulations 2013 and water consumption should not exceed 105 litres/person/day.
- 7.44 In order to secure the above emission reductions and water targets, the Council's Sustainable Design and Construction (New build residential: minor) standard

pre-occupation condition shall be attached to any grant of permission, this to be discharged at the pre-occupation stage.

Other matters

Basement construction

Flood Risk:

- 7.45 Policy DM D2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan, supported by Merton's Basement SPG, requires assessment of basement and subterranean scheme impacts on drainage, flooding from all sources, groundwater conditions and structural stability where appropriate.
- 7.46 In the Basement Impact Assessment submitted, it states: "It is however assumed that the appointed Structural Engineer will not be commencing a design until a comprehensive ground investigation has been carried out and this will be a condition of the planning approval." Concluding: "A full site investigation in the form of a borehole to determine with confidence the water table level and any specific characteristic of the local gravel will be needed by the structural engineers so that the design and the sequence of construction can be tailored to suit site specifics".
- 7.47 The Council's Flood Risk officer has commented that in order to satisfactorily assess the development in terms of flooding and drainage, a borehole survey is required to be carried out on site and the design of the basement and associated drainage based on what this survey yields. To ensure this is carried out, a pre-commencement condition has been recommended relating to this.

Structural stability:

- 7.48 Policy DM D2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan, paragraph 6.28, in relation to basements and subterranean developments seeks: To ensure that structural stability is safeguarded and neighbourhood amenity is not harmed at any stage by the development proposal, planning applications for basement developments must demonstrate how all construction work will be carried out. A Construction Method Statement must be included as part of validating the planning application; this should set out how the development will be excavated, sequenced, phased and managed in order to satisfy the decision maker that local neighbour amenity will not be harmed. Where appropriate, a Hydrology Report should also be included, setting out the impacts of the development on groundwater and surface water movements and how these will be addressed. Where the site is steeply sloped or there are land stability issues, a Land Stability Investigation should be undertaken by a chartered structural or civil engineer. A Demolition and Construction Management Plan (DCMP) will also be required by condition.
- 7.49 Appendix A included in the submitted Basement Impact Assessment is a Method Statement. The details set out the proposed design work required for the basement, the construction procedures involved and monitoring process, these are considered satisfactory to give officers confidence that the various stages of work required for the basement construction have been considered. The Basement Impact Assessment also states: "It is assumed that a suitably qualified Structural Engineer, will be appointed to carry out the detailed design and detailing as well supervising the construction works. It is further assumed that the works will be carried out by a competent contractor with a good track record in carrying out the work".
- 7.50 A condition shall be attached ensuring that a qualified engineer is appointed for the duration of the works, and their appointment confirmed in writing to the Local Planning

Authority, this shall ensure the basement construction is suitably monitored and supervised throughout.

- 7.51 A condition requiring a detailed construction method statement to be submitted to the LPA shall also be attached to any grant of permission.

Contamination

- 7.52 Representations submitted raised concerns of knotweed and asbestos, therefore the Council's Environmental Health officer was consulted. And following review of the scheme, they have recommended contamination conditions to be attached to the application.

8. CONCLUSION

- 8.1 The proposals are consistent with underlying London Plan objectives that seek to optimise housing output. Officers consider that the scheme achieves a suitable blend of planning objectives providing extra units, improving floorspace standards for existing units, and delivering adequate access to external amenity space while the remodelled building envelope delivers a more intensive use of the site via extensions, the scale, form, and design of which would not impact detrimentally on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, streetscene or on neighbouring amenity. Potential impact on parking pressure can be mitigated by a suitable S106 agreement to restrict occupiers of the new units from obtaining parking permits.
- 8.2 The proposal is considered to comply with the principles of policies referred to under Section 6 and it is recommended to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a section 106 legal undertaking restricting parking permits to the additional units.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to the completion of a S106 unilateral undertaking to restrict parking permits and the following conditions:

- A1 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.
Reason: To comply with Section 91 (as amended) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.
- A7 Approved Plans:** The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
- B3 External materials as Specified:** The facing materials to be used for the development hereby permitted shall be those specified in the application form unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
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.
- B5 Details of Walls/Fences:** No development shall be occupied until details of all boundary walls or fences are submitted in writing for approval to the Local Planning

Authority (including the new dividing fence in the rear garden, screening for the rear lightwells and any new front boundary treatment). No works which are the subject of this condition shall be carried out until the details are approved, and 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 walls and fencing 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 and D2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

5. **C06 Refuse & Recycling (Details to be submitted):** No development shall take place until a scheme for the storage of refuse and recycling has been submitted in writing for approval to the Local Planning Authority. No works which are the subject of this condition shall be carried out until the scheme has been approved, and the development shall not be occupied until the scheme has been approved and has been carried out in full. Those facilities and measures shall thereafter be retained for use at all times from the date of first occupation.

Reason: To ensure the provision of satisfactory facilities for the storage of refuse and recycling material and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 5.17 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS17 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM D2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

6. **C08 No Use of Flat Roof:** Access to the flat roof of the development, other than the roof terrace area provided for Flat 6, 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.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities and privacy of the occupiers of adjoining properties 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.

7. **C09 Balcony/Terrace (screening):** The screening or enclosure to the roof terrace of Flat 6, as shown on the approved plans, shall be implemented before the development is first occupied and retained permanently thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities and privacy of the occupiers of adjoining properties 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.

8. **D11 Construction hours:** 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.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the area and the occupiers of neighbouring properties and ensure compliance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.15 of the London Plan 2016 and policy DM EP2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

9. **H07 Cycle Parking to be implemented:** The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the 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.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory facilities for cycle parking are provided and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 6.13 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS18 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM T1 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

10. **L3 Sustainability Standard Pre-occupation:** No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until evidence has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority confirming that the development has achieved CO2 reductions of not less than a 19% improvement on Part L regulations 2013, and internal water 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 2015 and Policy CS15 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011.

11. **Non-standard condition (flood risk):** Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit a detailed proposal on how drainage and groundwater will be managed and mitigated during construction and post construction (permanent phase), for example through the implementation of passive drainage measures around the basement structure. This will be based on the findings of a site specific borehole survey.

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

12. **Non-standard condition (flood risk):** Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed scheme for the provision of surface and foul water drainage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority for both phases of the development. The drainage scheme will dispose of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) based on the 100yr plus 40% climate change event, in accordance with drainage hierarchy contained within the London Plan Policy (5.12, 5.13 and SPG) and the advice contained within the National SuDS Standards.

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

13. **Non-standard condition (construction method statement):** Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit a detailed construction method statement (CMS) produced by the respective Contractor/s responsible for building the approved works to the approval of the Local Planning Authority. Details to include:

- a) Temporary works drawings, Sections of the basement retaining walls, Underpinning sequence drawings produced by the appointed Contractor.
- b) Detail of how flood risk and drainage will be managed during construction and how the risk to pollution of the water environment will be mitigated.

Reason: To ensure compliance with Policy DMD2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014 and Merton's Basement and Subterranean Planning Guidance 2017, and to reduce the risk of surface and foul water flooding to the proposed development and future users, and ensure surface water and foul flood risk does

not increase offsite in accordance with Merton's policies CS16, DMF2 and the London Plan policy 5.13.

14. **Non-standard condition (basement):** No development shall commence until:
- (A) A Chartered Civil Engineer (MICE) or Chartered Structural Engineer (MI Struct.E) has been appointed for the duration of building works and their appointment confirmed in writing to the Local Planning Authority, and
 - (B) The name, and contact details of the person supervising engineering and construction on site for the duration of building works have been confirmed in writing to the Local Planning Authority.

In the event that either the Appointed Engineer or Appointed Supervisor cease to perform that role for whatever reason before the construction works are completed, those works shall cease until a replacement chartered engineer of the afore- described qualification or replacement supervisor has been appointed to supervise their completion and their appointment confirmed in writing to the Local Planning Authority. At no time shall any construction work take place unless an engineer and supervisor are at that time currently appointed and their appointment has been notified to this Authority in accordance with this condition.

Reason: The details are considered to be material to the acceptability of the proposal, and for safeguarding the amenity of neighbouring residential properties and to comply with the Basements SPD and policy DM.D2 of the Sites and Policies Plan 2014. It is necessary for the condition to be on the basis that "No development shall commence until" as compliance with the requirements of the condition at a later time would result in unacceptable harm contrary to the policies of the Development Plan.

15. **Non-standard condition (contamination – site investigation):** No development shall commence until a deskstudy, then an investigation shall be undertaken to consider the potential for contaminated-land, and if necessary, a detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a suitable state for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to health and the built environment. The developer may be encouraged to appraise the potential for encountering Japanese Knotweed, then requirements regarding its treatment, and buried asbestos. And aforementioned reports, submitted to the approval of the LPA.

Reason: To protect the health of future users of the site in accordance with policy 5.21 of the London Plan 2016 and policy DM EP4 of Merton's sites and policies plan 2014.

16. **Non-standard condition (contamination – remediation and verification):** Where required, the approached remediation shall be completed prior to commencement of the development. And a verification report, demonstrating the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to the LPA for approval.

Reason: To protect the health of future users of the site in accordance with policy 5.21 of the London Plan 2016 and policy DM EP4 of Merton's sites and policies plan 2014.

Informatives

1. INF 01 Party Walls Act
2. INF 15 Discharge conditions prior to commencement of work
3. INF 20 Street naming and numbering
4. Non-standard INF for Sustainability

5. Non-standard INF: No waste material, including concrete, mortar, grout, plaster, fats, oils and chemicals shall be washed down on the highway or disposed of into the highway drainage system.
6. Non-standard INF: No surface water runoff should discharge onto the public highway including the public footway or highway. When it is proposed to connect to a public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required (contact no. 0845 850 2777).
3. NPPF Note to Applicant – approved schemes

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
10th December 2020

Item No:

UPRN

APPLICATION NO.

DATE VALID

20/P2276

21/07/2020

Address/Site:

30 Lancaster Gardens, Wimbledon, SW19 5DG

(Ward)

Village

Proposal:

Demolition of existing house and erection of a new six bedroom detached dwelling with accommodation in basement and roof levels

Drawing Nos:

579 A 1B, 2C, 3C, 4B, 5D, 7B, 8D, 9B & Site Location Plan

Contact Officer:

David Gardener (0208 545 3115)

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT Planning Permission Subject to Conditions

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- Heads of agreement: No
- Is a screening opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental Statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Impact Assessment been submitted: No
- Press notice: Yes
- Site notice: Yes
- Design Review Panel consulted: No
- Number of neighbours consulted: 10
- External consultations: None

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The applications have been brought before the Planning Applications Committee due to the number and nature of representations received as a result of public consultation.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The site comprises a detached mid-20th Century, two - storey residential dwelling which is located on at the north east end of Lancaster Gardens, a cul-

de-sac in Wimbledon. The site surroundings comprise residential plots of varying character and form. Surrounding properties are residential and the site is not located in a Conservation Area although it does adjoin the Merton (Wimbledon North) Conservation Area.

- 2.3 The site is located within a controlled parking zone (Zone - V0N) and has poor access to public transport with a PTAL of 1b.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The application proposes the demolition of the existing building and erection of a replacement six - storey detached dwelling arranged over 4 floors (basement, ground, first and second floors). The house would incorporate dormers on the front and rear roof slopes and a rear first floor balcony.
- 3.2 Facing materials comprise brick for the walls, handmade clay tile for the roof and timber fenestration.
- 3.3 Two off-street car parking space would be provided at the front.
- 3.4 Amenity space would exceed 50sqm.
- 3.5 Amended Plans: Please note that the application has been amended since the application was first submitted. The eaves has been reduced in height by 30cm, the ridge by 8cm and the southwest part of the front elevation has been set back a further 60cm.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

The following planning history is relevant:

- 4.1 WIM4253 – Erection of a detached dwelling. Granted - 07/04/1959
- 4.2 MER463/69 – Single storey rear extension. Granted - 19/06/1969

5. POLICY CONTEXT

- 5.1 The following policies from the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014):

DM D1 (Urban design and the public realm), DM D2 (Design considerations in all developments), DM D4 (Managing heritage assets), DM F2 (Sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) and; Wastewater and Water Infrastructure), DM O2 (Nature Conservation, Trees, hedges and landscape features), DM T1 (Support for sustainable transport and active travel), DM T3 (Car parking and service standards)

- 5.2 Adopted Core Strategy (July 2011)
CS.13 (Open space, nature conservation, leisure and culture), CS.14 (Design), CS.15 (Climate Change), CS.20 (Parking, Servicing and Delivery)

- 5.3 London Plan (March 2016) are:
3.3 (Increasing Housing Supply), 3.5 (Quality and Design of Housing Developments), 3.8 (Housing Choice), 5.3 (Sustainable Design and Construction), 6.13 (Parking)
- 5.4 Mayor's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (March 2016)
- 5.5 DCLG Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standard March 2015
- 5.6 National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

6. CONSULTATION

6.1 The application has been publicised by means of Conservation Area press and site notice procedure with individual letters also sent to occupiers of neighbouring properties. In response, 10 letters of objection were received on the following grounds:

- Loss of existing tree on site, which have already been felled/Inadequate retention of trees. Arboricultural Implications assessment is inaccurate
- Applicant should submit a flood risk assessment
- Excessive bulk and massing in southwest corner of the site/building line too far forward
- Fails to meet climate change objectives/not sustainable
- Loss of daylight/sunlight and privacy
- Proposed street elevations do not show true relationship
- Excessive size of proposed basement and impact on groundwater flows/flood risk/drainage
- Excessive height

6.2 Belvedere Estate Residents' Association

- 6.21 Object to the proposal, raising the following concerns:
- Significant over-development of the site contrary to policy DM D2
 - Sinking an enormous basement into unstable and unsuitable ground which may also contain hazardous materials.
 - No Basement Impact Assessment or Construction Method Statement
 - The basement area comprises more than 50% of the total garden area.
 - No daylight and sunlight reports have been submitted.
 - Failure to comply with DM 02 - Nature Conservation, Hedges and Landscape Features
 - Failure to undertake an Ecological Appraisal of the site contrary to CS 13
 - The loss of a mature garden to squeeze in a large dwelling
 - Removal of trees which are essential for surface water reduction and removing carbon dioxide from the air which helps to combat Climate Change.
 - There is no traffic management plan.

6.3 Parkside Residents' Association

- 6.31 Object to the proposal raising the following concerns:
- Loss of greenery which screens the house when viewed from rear of Burghley Road
 - No Basement Impact Assessment, Construction Method Statement or energy report
 - Impact of basement on groundwater flow/excavation would be below water table/impact of surface water flow due to larger footprint of house
 - Overlooking

6.4 Tree Officer

- 6.41 No objections subject to appropriate conditions.

6.5 Future Merton – Flood Risk Engineer

- 6.51 Submitted documents relating to ground and surface water flows, and drainage are acceptable subject to appropriate conditions.

7. **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

The main planning considerations concern the design and appearance of the replacement dwelling, its impact upon the character and appearance of the Lancaster Gardens street scene, standard of accommodation to be provided, and impact of the development upon residential amenity, parking and trees.

7.2 **Design and appearance**

- 7.21 Policies DM D2 and DM D3 seek to ensure a high quality of design in all development, which relates 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.
- 7.22 The proposed house is considered to be acceptable in terms of its design and appearance. The house would have a traditional design comprising red brick elevations, hipped roof with handmade clay tile, and vertical sliding sash timber windows. The two dormers located on both the front and rear elevations are not overly large and set back from the roof eaves and in from the flank walls.
- 7.23 The proposed house is also considered acceptable in terms of its size. The house would be less bulky than No.32, which is a contemporary design featuring a low profile twin pitch roof set in from the first floor parapet walls. Although the ridge of the proposed house would be 49cm higher than the ridge at No.32, the eaves would be 77cm lower than the first floor parapet due to the longer slope of the roof.
- 7.24 The application site is located at the end of a cul-de-sac with properties at this end of road located on plots which narrow from the rear to the front. The house would be wider than the existing house, however would retain a minimum 1m gap to both side boundaries similar to No.32. The proposed house would also

have a similar building line to existing. Overall, it is considered that the proposal is an acceptable design and does not have an unacceptable impact on the Lancaster Gardens street scene or adjoining Conservation Area and as such accords with relevant design policies.

7.3 Standard of Accommodation

7.31 Policy 3.5 of the London Plan 2016 and the Department for Communities and Local Government 'Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard' set out a minimum gross internal area standard for new homes. This provides the most up to date and appropriate minimum space standards for Merton. In addition, adopted policy CS.14 of the Core Strategy and DM D2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) encourages well designed housing in the borough by ensuring that all residential development complies with the most appropriate minimum space standards and provides functional internal spaces that are fit for purpose. New residential development should safeguard the amenities of occupiers by providing appropriate levels of sunlight & daylight and privacy for occupiers of adjacent properties and for future occupiers of proposed dwellings. The living conditions of existing and future residents should not be diminished by increased noise or disturbance.

7.32 As the proposed house would comfortably exceed the minimum space standards set out in the London Plan, with each habitable room providing good outlook, light and circulation, it is considered the proposal would provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation. In addition, the proposed house would provide a minimum of 50sqm of private amenity space required by policy DM D2. The proposed house would therefore comply with policy 3.5 of the London Plan (March 2016), CS.14 of the Core Planning Strategy (July 2011) and DM D2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) in terms of residential amenity.

7.4 Residential Amenity

7.41 Policy DM D2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) states that proposals for development will be required to ensure provision of appropriate levels of sunlight and daylight, quality of living conditions, amenity space and privacy, to both proposed and adjoining buildings and gardens. Development should also protect new and existing development from visual intrusion.

7.42 It is considered that the proposed house would not be visually intrusive or overbearing when viewed from adjoining properties or result in an unacceptable loss of daylight/sunlight. No.32 features a wide frontage, which extends near to the boundary with the application site. It should be noted that on the advice of planning officers, the application has been amended with the part of the front elevation closest to No.32 set back a further 60cm, further reducing its impact when viewed from this property. It is considered that although the front corner of the house would be visible from the nearest first floor windows at No.32, these windows are to an en-suite and therefore the impact would be acceptable.

The proposed house would not project beyond the rear elevation of No.32 and as such would have little impact on the rear of this property.

- 7.43 The house would extend 9m beyond the rear elevation of No.28 at first floor level, which is approx. 4m further back than the existing house. This is considered acceptable in this instance given the flank wall of the house would be angled away, with the northeast corner sited approx. 4.5m from the side boundary. The flank wall of No.28 is also located approx. 3.2m from the side boundary further reducing its impact when viewed from the rear windows of this property. With regards to the first floor rear terrace, a condition will be attached requiring a privacy screen is located on its east side to reduce any overlooking to this property. Overall, it is considered that the proposal accords with all relevant planning policies relating to neighbour amenity.

7.5 Parking and Traffic

- 7.51 The application site is located in a controlled parking zone (CPZ V0N) and has a PTAL rating of 1b, which indicates that it has poor access to public transport services. It is proposed to provide two off-street car parking spaces at the front of the house. Policy DM T3 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) states that development should only provide the level of car parking required to serve the site taking into account its accessibility by public transport (PTAL) and local circumstances in accordance with London Plan standards unless a clear need can be demonstrated. Policy 6.13 Table 6.2 of the London Plan (March 2016) allows for up to 2 spaces for dwellings with 4 bedrooms or more. The level of parking provision is therefore in accordance with London Plan policy.

7.6 Flood Risk and Basement Construction

- 7.61 The applicant has submitted a Basement Impact Assessment, and drainage strategy including drainage layout plan. The site is located on a historic infilled fish pond similar to a number of areas within Wimbledon. The Council's Flood Risk engineer has assessed the submitted documents and considers the impact on ground and surface water flow to be acceptable noting that given ground water levels dewatering will be required during construction. It is also noted that surface water captured on this site will be routed into the below ground drainage system and discharge at no more than 5.0 l/s including the provision of rainwater harvesting measures and permeable paving. Conditions regarding how drainage and groundwater will be managed and mitigated during construction and post construction, and final construction level details for the proposed surface water and foul drainage scheme are recommended.

7.7 Trees and Landscaping

- 7.71 It is noted that a number of trees were removed from the site prior to the submission of the application. However, given the trees were not subject to a Tree Preservation Order and the site is not located in a conservation area there was no policy preventing their removal. Nevertheless, the applicant has

submitted an Arboricultural report which proposes the planting of eight semi-mature trees on the rear boundary of the site. The proposed tree planting will be secured by condition.

8. SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

- 8.1 The application does not constitute Schedule 1 or Schedule 2 development. Accordingly, there are no requirements in terms of EIA submission.

9. LOCAL FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 9.1 The proposal would result in a net gain in gross floor space and as such will be liable to pay both the Mayoral and Merton Community Infrastructure Levies (CIL). The funds will be spent on the Crossrail project, with the remainder spent on strategic infrastructure and neighbourhood projects.

11. CONCLUSION

- 11.1 The proposed new dwelling provides an acceptable standard of accommodation, and is considered acceptable in terms of design, massing and siting, and would not have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity. The proposal would also have an acceptable impact on surface and groundwater flows. Overall, the proposal is of a high quality and would not have an unacceptable impact on the Lancaster Gardens street scene. Accordingly, it is recommended that planning permission is granted.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

1. A1 (Commencement of Development)
2. B1 (External Materials to be Approved)
3. B4 (Details of Site/Surface Treatment)
4. B5 (Details of Walls/Fences)
5. B6 (Levels)
6. C1 (No Permitted Development (Extensions))
7. C2 (No Permitted Development (Windows and Doors))
8. C9 (Balcony/Terrace (Screening))
9. C.10 (Hours of Construction)

10. H6 (Cycle Parking – Details to be Submitted)
11. No developments shall commence on site until the below documents have been submitted and agreed by the planning officer:
 - i) Detailed Construction Method Statement produced by the Contractor responsible for excavation, underpinning and construction of retaining walls. This shall be reviewed and agreed by the Structural Engineer designing the temporary and permanent retaining structures.
 - ii) Plan showing any temporary works, underpinning sequence and sections of the retaining walls produced by the relevant appointed Contractor.
 - iii) Detailed design calculations

Reason: To ensure structural stability of adjoining houses are safeguarded and neighbour amenity is not harmed and to comply with policy DM D2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

12. F.9 (Hardstandings)
13. No development other than demolition and site clearance shall take place until evidence has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority confirming that the development will achieve a CO2 reduction of not less than a 19% improvement on Part L Regulations 2013, and internal water usage rates of no greater than 105 litres per person per day.

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 2011 and policy CS15 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011.

14. Tree Protection: The details and measures for the protection of the existing trees as specified in the hereby approved document 'Arboricultural Report to Accompany Planning Application' reference 'DPA8087/AIS/Rev1' dated 'July 2020' shall be fully complied with. The methods for the protection of the existing trees shall fully accord with all of the measures specified in the report and shall be installed prior to the commencement of any site works and shall remain in place until the conclusion of all site works.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing trees in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS13 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and 02 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

15. Site Supervision (Trees) – The details of the approved 'Arboricultural Report to Accompany Planning Application' shall include the retention of an arboricultural expert to monitor the site in accordance with the schedule/timetable of site monitoring and shall following each site visit provide a report to the Local Planning Authority on the status of all tree works and tree protection measures throughout the course of the demolition and site works. A final Certificate of Completion shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority at the conclusion

of all site works. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing trees in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS13 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and 02 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

16. Landscaping: The landscaping shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the approved drawing number 'DPA-8087-04 Rev A'. The works shall be carried out in the first available planting season following the completion of the development or prior to the occupation of any part of the development, whichever is the sooner, and any trees that die within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased or are dying, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of the same approved specification, unless the LPA gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To enhance the appearance of the development in the interest of the amenities of the area, to ensure the provision of sustainable drainage surfaces and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies 5.1, 7.5 and 7.21 of the London Plan 2016, policies CS13 and CS16 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2, F2 and 02 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

17. Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit a detailed proposal on how drainage and groundwater will be managed and mitigated during construction and post construction (permanent phase), for example through the implementation of passive drainage measures around the basement structure. This will be based on the findings of a site specific borehole survey.

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

18. Prior to the commencement of development, final construction level details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority for the proposed surface water and foul drainage scheme, which will dispose of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and limit flows offsite for surface water to no more than 5l/s.

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

19. INFORMATIVE: No surface water runoff should discharge onto the public highway including the public footway or highway. When it is proposed to

connect to a public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required (contact no. 0845 850 2777). No waste material, including concrete, mortar, grout, plaster, fats, oils and chemicals shall be washed down on the highway or disposed of into the highway drainage system.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

10 DECEMBER 2020

APPLICATION NO. **DATE VALID**

20/P1952

12/06/2020

Site Address: Wimbledon College of Art, 40 Merton Hall Road,
Wimbledon, SW19 3QA

Ward: Dundonald

Proposal: NEW FORECOURT LANDSCAPING, FAÇADE AND
ROOF ALTERATIONS TO THE THEATRE ANNEX
BUILDING. INSTALLATION OF NEW WINDOWS AND
CYCLE PARKING FACILITIES TO THE MAIN COLLEGE
BUILDING. ALTERATION TO CAMPUS SERVICES
EQUIPMENT.

Drawing Nos: 3606D_LBA_WCA_00_L_A_2100 (P3);
3606D_LBA_WCA_01_L_A_2101 (P3);
3606D_LBA_WCA_02_L_A_2102 (P3);
3606D_LBA_WCA_03_L_A_2103 (P1);
3606D_LBA_WCA_03_L_A_2113 (P1);
3606D_LBA_WCA_00_L_A_2260 (P1);
3606D_LBA_WCA_00_L_A_2270 (P1);
3606D_LBA_WCA_00_L_A_2271 (P1);
3606D_LBA_WCA_00_L_A_2280 (P1);
3606D_LBA_WCA_00_L_A_2281 (P1);
3606D_LBA_WCA_00_L_A_2282 (P1);
3606D_LBA_WCA_00_L_2800 (P1)

Contact Officer: Calum McCulloch

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT permission subject to conditions and S106 Agreement

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

Is a screening opinion required	No
Is an Environmental Statement required	No
Press notice	Yes
Site notice	Yes

Design Review Panel consulted	No
Number of neighbours consulted	76
External consultations	0
Internal consultations	3
Controlled Parking Zone	Yes - 5F

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This planning application has been brought before the planning committee due to the number and nature of representations received. Furthermore the application has been called in by Councillor Anthony Fairclough.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site comprises the grounds of Wimbledon Art College on Merton Hall Road, Wimbledon. The site contains of a range of buildings that vary in architectural style and age. The buildings most relevant to this application are those directly fronting Merton Hall Road. This includes:
- Theatre Annex, a 1980s steel framed construction faced in brick with wide gables.
 - 'Main Building' – the original 1930s three storey building containing studio spaces.
 - Library Building – sited between the Theatre Annex and Main building.
 - Houses 1 and 2
- 2.2 Located at the front of the grounds between the Theatre Annex and the street is an open space containing cycle stands and a designated car park for staff.
- 2.3 The site is located within a predominantly residential area within the Merton Hall Road Conservation Area. Directly opposite the site are a set of period 2-3 storey semi-detached dwellings.
- 2.4 The site has a PTAL rating of 2. The nearest train station is Wimbledon Chase Station 500m to the south west of the site. A number of bus connections are available near to the site on Kingston Road.
- 2.5 There are 7 nos. of on-site car parking spaces, as well as 2 disable parking bays. The site located within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) with parking restrictions between Mondays and Friday 8.30am - 6.30pm.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The application is seeking the following:
- Renovation of the forecourt fronting Merton Hall Road including:
 - Removal of railings on the boundary
 - Installation of low level planters to define the public/private boundary
 - Retention of existing mature trees.
 - Installation of security gates at either end of the new forecourt
 - Removal parking bays and replaced with a more accessible open space.
 - Redistribution of the majority of cycle bays to north and south of the site
 - Installation of outdoor lighting
 - Improvements to the Theatre Annex elevation fronting Merton Hall road through:

- Installation of larger windows and door openings
- Incorporation of canopies and extension of eaves
- Re-painting the façade
- Improvements to roofs:
 - Overall of roof works of the Theatre Annex building upgrading the thermal and acoustic performance and installing automated rooflights within the new gable roofs.
 - Remedial roof works to the Theatre, New Studio, Main Building and Houses
- A range of internal reconfigurations and enhancements to meet the educational needs of the school. As part of this, a Local Exhaust Ventilation unit would be installed in line with the consolidation of workshop space within the theatre annex.
- Replacement of all existing PVC and metal framed windows on the Main Building with aluminium double glazed windows.

3.2 The proposed works aim to help enable the college to “create an integrated performance environment and to facilitate more collaboration between design, acting, technical arts and performance courses and build a stronger student community”.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 16/P0962: REPLACEMENT WINDOWS TO GROUND, FIRST AND SECOND FLOORS OF BLOCK C - Granted 18/05/2016
- 4.2 14/P0158: ATTACHED TO LBM PLANNING APPLICATION 13/P2055 DATED 23/12/2013 RELATING TO THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES WITHIN SCULPTURE YARD AND ERECTION OF A TWO - STOREY BUILDING TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL STUDIO SPACE. - Granted 04/12/2014
- 4.3 14/P0091: APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF DETAILS RESERVED BY CONDITIONS 2 & 5 ATTACHED TO LBM PLANNING APPLICATION 13/P2055 DATED 27.08.2013 RELATING TO THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES WITHIN SCULPTURE YARD AND ERECTION OF A TWO - STOREY BUILDING TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL STUDIO SPACE. - Granted 17/03/2014
- 4.4 13/P2678: APPLICATION FOR CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT FOR THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES WITHIN SCULPTURE YARD - Granted 03/10/2013
- 4.5 13/P2055: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES WITHIN SCULPTURE YARD AND ERECTION OF A TWO - STOREY BUILDING TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL STUDIO SPACE. - Granted 03/10/2013
- 4.6 09/P0570: APPLICATION FOR THE RENEWAL OF TEMPORARY PERMISSION TO RETAIN BUILDINGS 'A', 'B' 'C' AND 'D' AND THE RETENTION OF TEMPORARY BUILDINGS 'E', 'F' AND 'G', ALL FOR FIVE YEARS - Granted 23/06/2009

- 4.7 07/P0401: DISPLAY OF NON ILLUMINATED INDIVIDUAL LETTERING ON FRONT ELEVATION AND SIGN ON FRONT ENTRANCE PIER - Granted 28/03/2007.
- 4.8 06/P2030: ERECTION OF EXTENSION TO EXISTING THEATRE AND ENTRANCE FOYER TO HOUSE NEW STUDIO AND ARCHIVE ROOM, INCLUDING REFURBISHMENT OF EXISTING THEATRE - Granted 30/10/2006
- 4.9 06/P1209: APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS IN RESPECT OF THE PROPOSED REPLACEMENT OF WINDOWS AND DOORS WITH UPVC WINDOWS AND DOORS - Certificate issued 17/07/2006
- 4.10 05/P0403: ERECTION OF A NEW ENTRANCE FOYER EXTENSION - Granted 18/04/2005
- 4.11 04/P1716: ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY BUILDING FOR USE AS A SCULPTURE STUDIO. - Granted 24/09/2004
- 4.12 03/P1082 - VARIATION OF A CONDITION OF PREVIOUS PLANNING PERMISSION TO ALLOW RETENTION OF SEVEN BUILDINGS ON THE SITE FOR A FURTHER TEMPORARY PERIOD. - Granted 14/07/2003.
- 4.13 01/P1137: RELOCATION OF EXISTING BUILDING AND STORAGE UNITS AND THE PROVISION OF TEMPORARY BUILDINGS DURING THE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW STUDIO GIVEN APPROVAL IN FEBRUARY 2001 (REF 00/P2195). - Granted 21/08/2001
- 4.14 00/P2195: ACCOMMODATION, EXHIBITION AND LECTURE SPACE AND A CANTEEN, INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SINGLE-STOREY BUILDINGS. ERECTION OF A NEW LIFT SHAFT ENCLOSURE ON THE ROOF OF THE MAIN BUILDING. - Granted 02/03/2001
- 4.15 00/P2203: CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT FOR DEMOLITION OF STUDIO AND WORKSHOP BUILDINGS IN CONNECTION WITH THE ERECTION OF NEW STUDIO ACCOMMODATION. - Granted 02/03/2001
- 4.16 00/P2195 - ERECTION OF A PART SINGLE-STOREY AND PART TWO-STOREY BUILDING IN THE NORTHERN PART OF THE SITE TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL STUDIO ACCOMMODATION, EXHIBITION AND LECTURE SPACE AND A CANTEEN, INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SINGLE-STOREY BUILDINGS. ERECTION OF A NEW LIFT SHAFT ENCLOSURE ON THE ROOF OF THE MAIN BUILDING. - Granted 21/02/2001.
- 4.17 99/P0457: ERECTION OF NEW STUDIO ACCOMMODATION WITHIN A PART SINGLE AND PART TWO STOREY BUILDING IN THE NORTHERN PART OF THE SITE, INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SINGLE-STOREY BUILDINGS, TOGETHER WITH ERECTION OF NEW LIFT ENCLOSURE AT REAR OF MAIN BUILDING. - Refused 22/07/1999. Appeal dismissed 08/02/2000
- 4.18 99/P0468: CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT FOR DEMOLITION OF STUDIO AND WORKSHOP BUILDINGS IN CONNECTION WITH THE ERECTION OF NEW STUDIO ACCOMMODATION. - Refused 23/07/1999. Appeal dismissed 08/02/2000

- 4.19 98/P1333: REPLACEMENT OF 1.3 METRES HIGH METAL RAILINGS ON STREET FRONTAGE (28 METRES LENGTH) WITH 1.8 METRES HIGH RAILINGS TO MATCH THE REST OF THE BOUNDARY TREATMENT (VARIATION OF PLANNING PERMISSION REF:98/P0139 DATED 31/03/98). - Granted 27/01/1999
- 4.20 98/P0139: REPLACEMENT OF TIMBER FENCING FRONTING MERTON HALL ROAD WITH 1.3 OR 1.8 METRES HIGH BLACK PAINTED METAL RAILINGS, GATES AND SECTION OF FACING BRICK WALL. - Granted 31/03/1998
- 4.21 94/P0982: EXTENSION OF EXTERNAL FIRE ESCAPE TO REAR OF DETACHED THEATRE HOUSE TO SERVE SECOND FLOOR LEVEL INVOLVING NEW DOOR OPENING WITHIN EXISTING ROOF LEVEL DORMER WINDOW (RETENTION). - Granted 04/10/1996
- 4.22 96/P0137: ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND THREE STOREY ENCLOSED STAIRCASE PLUS ALTERATIONS TO SOUTHERN ELEVATION ADJOINING LIBRARY TO PROVIDE AN IT RESOURCE CENTRE. - Granted 11/04/1996
- 4.23 96/P0139: CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT FOR MINOR ALTERATIONS TO SOUTHERN ELEVATION ADJOINING LIBRARY INCLUDING REMOVAL OF WINDOWS AND COLUMNS IN CONNECTION WITH PROPOSED SIDE EXTENSION TO PROVIDE IT RESOURCE CENTRE. - Granted 11/04/1996
- 4.24 95/P0326: CONSTRUCTION OF A DOUBLE SIDED ENTRANCE RAMP WITH BALUSTRADES TO MAIN SCHOOL ENTRANCE TO PROVIDE IMPROVED ACCESS FOR DISABLED PEOPLE. - Granted 05/06/1995
- 4.25 95/P0737: ALTERATIONS TO ROOF AND GROUND FLOOR EXTENSION OF EXISTING SCULPTURE STUDIO. - Granted 06/11/1995
- 4.26 95/P0326 - CONSTRUCTION OF A DOUBLE SIDED ENTRANCE RAMP WITH BALUSTRADES TO MAIN SCHOOL ENTRANCE TO PROVIDE IMPROVED ACCESS FOR DISABLED PEOPLE. - Granted 05/06/1995
- 4.27 94/P0721: ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY MODULAR STOREROOM BUILDING AT REAR OF SCHOOL. - Granted 08/12/1994
- 4.28 93/P1048: FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION ABOVE EXISTING GROUND FLOOR TOILET BLOCK TO FORM ADDITIONAL OFFICE AND KITCHEN ACCOMMODATION. - Granted 01/09/1993
- 4.29 93/P1182: ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY MODULAR BUILDING AT REAR OF PROPERTIES IN BRAESIDE AVENUE. - Granted 05/11/1993
- 4.30 92/P0156 - RETENTION OF EXISTING HUTTED TEACHING BUILDINGS TO NORTH WEST OF MAIN BUILDING RETENTION OF THREE STORAGE BUILDINGS NEAR SOUTH WEST BOUNDARY ADJACENT TO THE QUADRANT ERECTION OF NEW TEACHING STUDIO TO SOUTH EAST OF LOCK-UP GARAGES OFF BRAESIDE AVENUE INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SCULPTURE STORAGE STRUCTURE AND ERECTION OF NEW STORAGE SHELTER ON SOUTH EASTERN SIDE OF MAIN BUILDING. - Granted section 316 permission 25/06/1992.

- 4.31 89/P0966: ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION AT REAR TO ENCLOSE A GAS FIRED FURNACE. - Granted 13/09/1989
- 4.32 89/P0173 - ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION AT REAR TO ENCLOSE A GAS FIRED FURNACE. - Granted section 316 permission 29/03/1989.
- 4.33 MER763/83 - ERECTION OF NEW BUILDINGS AND PROVISION OF NEW PARKING AREAS AT FRONT AND SIDE INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING TEMPORARY BUILDING ON SITE. - Granted section 316 permission 27/10/1983.
- 4.34 MER975/70 - EXTENSION OF SINGLE STOREY SCULPTURE STUDIO AND 26 CAR PARKING SPACES. - Deemed consent 14/01/1971.
- 4.35 MER643/65 - ERECTION OF AN EXTENSION AT 1ST AND 2ND FLOOR LEVELS LINKING THE EXISTING MAIN BUILDING AND THEATRE TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL ACCOMODATION. - Deemed consent 04/11/1965.
- 4.36 18/P0585 - REPLACEMENT OF WELDING BAY ROOF - Grant Permission subject to Conditions - 26/03/2018

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1 Consultation was carried out by way of site notice erected at the site and letters sent to neighbouring properties.
- 5.2 Six objections were raised by local residents on the following grounds:
 - Concerns that the choice to paint the Theatre Annex dark grey would be out of character with the surrounding Conservation Area
 - Concerns that the dark metal grey roofing would be out of character with the surrounding Conservation Area
 - Concerns that the public space at the front of the site alongside the removal of fencing will result in anti-social behaviour.
 - Concerns over light pollution out of character with the street
 - Concerns that the development would increase traffic levels over and above the existing levels caused by schools in the area.
 - Concerns over the loading and unloading arrangements for deliveries with associated adverse impact on traffic.
 - Concerns that in a recent meeting to residents the college indicated that there would be an uplift from 800 to 1100 students and the intention to open up the theatre for wider community use resulting which will have associated adverse impacts on traffic and parking.
- 5.3 One objection was received from the John Innes Society raising the following points:
 - Concerns that the dark coloured roof and brick and grey façade colour would not be aesthetically pleasing.
 - Concerns that the use of darker surfaces will result in increased heat, energy consumption and associated carbon emissions.
- 5.4 One representation was received from the Friends of Wimbledon Town Centre

noting the following concerns:

- The black frontage, with black steel roof and windows, proposed for Wimbledon College of Art would make a negative impact on the Conservation Area and detract from the special character of the area.
- The black frontage would detract dramatically from the 'good example of the modernist architecture of the 1930s period' that is the c1935 building of the Wimbledon School of Art. The black paint proposed is not only inappropriate for the Conservation Area, it is one which is likely to show up water marks and bird excrement. The characteristics of the proposed development are inconsistent with the beautiful Edwardian houses on the opposite side of Merton Hall Road, and with the buildings and grounds of Wimbledon Chase School.
- Concerns about security issues – the lack of security lighting and the open forecourt. These two factors present risks for illegitimate users of the college site and for local residents and possibly also the children, parents and staff of Wimbledon Chase School.
- One representation was submitted highlighting the opportunity of the development to integrate artificial swift nests.

5.5 Met Police (Designing Out Crime Officer):

- Due to the venue being an educational premises, this application was passed onto the local Counter Terrorism Safety Officer, who has no comments regarding the layout and design.
- The use of the main entrance with a reception area for entry into the campus is of benefit security-wise
- Concerns the refurbishment of the forecourt may allow those with criminal intent to use the openness to the building to gather and therefore the chance of an increase in crime and or antisocial behaviour. This may be mitigated with CCTV coverage and security team moving on any ne'er-do-wells. A robust management policy and procedure needs to be in place especially for out of hours use.
- The cycle parking is to the north of the site with a designated entrance. The bicycles should be within dedicated cycle stores with appropriate CCTV and stands secured into concrete foundations.
- Lighting across the entire development should be to the required British Standards, avoiding the various forms of light pollution (vertical and horizontal glare). It should be as sustainable as possible with good uniformity. Bollard lights, under bench and architectural up lighting are not considered as good lighting sources for SBD purposes. 'Discreet columns nestled in within the trees is worry as lighting columns can be surrounded by vegetation after a few years growth unless a robust and costly maintenance plan of lobbying is organised. White light aids good CCTV colour rendition and gives a feeling of security to staff, students and visitors. The public space lighting should also meet the current council requirements.
- The design of planters should eliminate their use as impromptu seating especially those adjacent to the pavement. The soft landscaping at the front of the campus in the planters should not provide hiding places from implements used in crime and or illicit substances.

- CCTV should be installed to cover the entire site. Any lighting fixtures and the landscaping should not be in conflict with the CCTV cameras field of view.

5.6 **Conservation Officer:** The Council's Conservation Officer raised concern over the removal of the metal Crittall Windows in the 1930s Main School Building. They note the windows appear to be in very good condition. Usually people remove original Crittall because they are in bad condition and won't close properly. The officer suggests the applicant considers retaining the original windows. Otherwise they should provide detailed drawings of the proposed windows to make sure they look right. The Conservation Officer has no other objection to the scheme overall, except notes the painted brick may appear too dark.

5.7 **Tree Officer:** The arboricultural report confirms that there will be a lot of disturbance within the root protection area of the 2 trees fronting the site. The report also advises that there are methods for installing the various additional items in a manner that will minimise the potential impact on the tree. The report concludes that a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement and supervision should be required by condition. It would be preferable if the brick planters were removed from the layout altogether, and the area left as open grass. The plans are not sufficiently detailed for me to understand exactly what is intended to be installed within the root protection area of these trees. However, given the assurances of the report, I would recommend attaching the following planning conditions: Condition F5; Design of Foundations - No work shall be commenced until details of the proposed design, material and method of construction of the foundations of any structure to be installed within 14 metres of the two Horse Chestnut trees marked T1 and T2 on the Tree Protection Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA and the work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details; Condition F8.

5.8 **Council's Transport Officer:** The Council's Transport Officer raises no objections subject to the following conditions:

- Disabled bays (with EVCP) maintained.
- Cycle parking maintained.
- The applicant enters into a Unilateral Undertaking which would restrict future occupiers of all 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.
- 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.

5.9 **Council's Environment and Health Officer:** No objections subject to conditions.

6. POLICY CONTEXT

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

- Section 8 - Promoting healthy and safe communities
- Section 11 – Making effective use of land
- Section 15 – conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- Section 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

London Plan (2016)

- 7.4 Local Character
- 7.5 Public Realm
- 7.6 Architecture
- 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology
- 3.18 Educational Facilities
- 7.21 Trees and woodlands

Merton Core Strategy (2011)

- CS 14 Design
- CS 13 Open space, nature conservation, leisure and culture
- CS20 Parking, Servicing and Delivery

Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014)

- DM C1 Community facilities
- DM C2 Education for children and young people
- DM D2 Design considerations in all developments
- DM D3 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
- DM D4 Managing Heritage assets
- DM O1 Open space
- DM O2 Nature conservation, trees, hedges and landscape features
- DM T2 Transport Impacts of Developments
- DM T3 Car Parking and Servicing Standards

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The key planning considerations are:

- Principle of enhancing facilities at Wimbledon College of Art
- Design, Character and Appearance of the Merton Hall Road Conservation Area
- Neighboring amenity
- Trees
- Transport and parking
- Noise

- Sustainability

Principle of enhancing facilities at Wimbledon College of Art

- 7.1 Development plan policy supports the enhancement of educational facilities to meet the needs of young people. Merton Core Strategy CS11 (Infrastructure) notes the council will support improvement of infrastructure in the Borough, including supporting multi use of social, and educational facilities. SPP policy DM C2 part a) notes “Development proposals for new schools and/or improved education facilities for children (≥5) and young people will be supported, particularly where new facilities are required to provide additional school places in an area to meet an identified shortfall in supply. The NPPF Paragraph 91 also supports development that promotes social interaction, including opportunities for meetings between people who might not otherwise come into contact with each other. Also relevant is Merton Core Strategy Policy CS 12 which supports development that provide an adequate level of employment in the Borough.
- 7.2 The proposal is considered to accord with the principle of the policies above. The proposed development would improve the general environment for staff and students to meet its teaching requirements which would accord with development plan policies promoting the enhancement of educational facilities for young people. The proposals also contribute to the College’s vision of becoming more outward facing and better used by the local community. The reconfiguration of the forecourt would make the College more welcoming to the local community and would help to promote social interaction not just for students but with the wider community. The development also helps to maintain the viability of the College as a leader in higher education which helps preserve the staff employment levels on site. The principle of development is considered to be acceptable as policies at both a local and national level support the enhancement of educational facilities.

Character and Appearance of the Merton Hall Road Conservation Area

- 7.3 Policy DM D2, DMD3 and DM D4 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 (including conservation areas), 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 and protection of heritage assets is further supported by the London Plan London Plan Policies 7.4 and 7.6, 7.8 and Merton’s Core Strategy Policy CS14.
- 7.4 Wimbledon College of Art is sited within the Merton Hall Road Conservation Area and contributes to a strong sense of place. The original 1930s Main Building is particularly attractive adding significantly to the character and appearance of the surrounding Conservation Area. The Theatre Annex by contrast is relatively utilitarian and the existing forecourt with its railings and car park which has a neutral contribution to the street scene.

- 7.5 The enhancements to the Theatre Annex involve enlarging the windows, extending the eaves. These alterations will add some character to the building and modernise its appearance. It is also proposed to paint the brick a dark grey. Whilst this alteration would provide some contrast with the red brick surroundings, the applicant are able to make this alteration under Part II, Class C of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (as amended). Officers therefore cannot reasonably object to the colour of the bricks to be painted.
- 7.6 The forecourt enhancement involves removal of car parking spaces and existing front boundary and creation of a more cohesive open space with suitable areas for congregation, as well as the installation of low rise planter beds and railings to the front of the site. The existing mature trees would be retained, with additional multi-stem trees added. A clear boundary between the public realm and the semi-private grounds of the college would remain through the provision of railings and planting fronting Merton Hall Road with the principle access to the grounds remaining in line with the Theatre Annex entrance. The forecourt would be resurfaced in high quality permeable block paving which vary in material to differentiate between different spaces. The works together with the proposed alterations to the Theatre Annex would increase legibility of the college buildings, create an enhanced sense of openness and arrival to the benefit of the street scene and Conservation Area.
- 7.7 There would be some impact on the character of the 1930s Main School Building through removal of the original metal crittal windows, as highlighted by the Conservation Officer's comments. However, the new windows would not appear incongruous as they would still incorporate horizontal and vertical transoms reflective of the original windows. Some weight is also given to the benefit of additional light into studio spaces resulting from the reduction in the number of transoms. Notwithstanding, a condition is added to this planning permission requiring the details of the windows proposed as requested by the Conservation Officer.
- 7.8 Overall, the proposed development is considered to enhance the character and appearance Merton Hall Conservation Area and street scene. The proposal therefore is compliant with Policy DM D2, DMD3 and DM D4 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan in this respect.

Neighbouring Amenity and Site Security

- 7.9 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. Policy DMD2 also requires developments to provide layouts that are safe, secure and take account of crime prevention and are developed in accordance with Secured by Design principles.
- 7.10 Those likely to be impacted by the development are residents of Merton Hall Road facing the application site, namely nos. 51-81 (odds). The principle concern relating to development is the potential impact from noise and light generated from the façade alterations to the theatre annex and forecourt enhancements.
- 7.11 With regard to light, the preliminary lighting strategy in the D&A statement

shows that subtle lighting would be provided which enhances accessibility and frames buildings and spaces without resulting in undue glare upon the wider area and will remove the need for high glare security lighting on the main building. The draft Forecourt Management Plan also notes that ancillary lighting (landscaping lighting such as that of trees, planting, under seating areas etc.) is proposed to have a curfew at 20:00pm. Lighting for Health and Safety purposes will remain on, (such as lighting illuminating pathways, steps etc) but incorporation of low glare. On this basis, the proposed lighting is considered acceptable in principle and would unlikely cause harm to the amenity of nearby residents. However, the Council's Environment and Health Officer has recommended external lighting shall be positioned and angled to prevent any light spillage or glare beyond the site boundary. Officers also note the Designing Out Crime Officer's point that lighting across the entire development should be to the required British Standards, avoiding the various forms of light pollution (vertical and horizontal glare). To ensure that appropriate lighting is incorporated and no unnecessary, a condition requiring a detailed scheme of lighting has been added to this recommended approval.

- 7.12 The improvements to the forecourt are likely to result in some increase in noise relating to college activities. The draft Forecourt Management Plan notes that the college opening hours are between 8.30am and 21:30pm with onsite security to police noise issues between 8.30am and 22:00pm. Given that any uplift in noise will likely only occur during opening hours and the fact there would be onsite security to hand, the development is not considered likely to cause harm neighbour amenity from noise. The above must also be balanced with the existing situation, which is noise from cars using the car park and that the site is already utilised by students for amenity purposes.
- 7.13 As part of the development, new noise sources, specifically mechanical plant equipment, are to be introduced. This includes the installation of two replacement heat pumps at ground floor level serving the Theatre, and the installation of air source heat pumps located on top of the Main Building. Given the separating distance between the college grounds and neighbouring properties, the equipment is not considered to be harmful to nearby residential amenity from noise. The Council's Environmental Health Officer has raised no objections to the siting of new plant equipment but has recommended a standard noise limiting condition as a precautionary measure.
- 7.14 Concerns have been raised by some residents over the potential for increased impromptu gathering by unwanted individuals and antisocial behaviour. This concern is also noted by the Designing Out Crime Met Police Officer who makes the point this may be mitigated with CCTV coverage, security and a robust management in place especially for out of hours use. Officers consider it unlikely that the proposal would lead to anti-social behaviour provided suitable lighting is put in place and due to its location in a quiet residential area away from nearby urban centres with uses that can attract antisocial behaviour. That said, to address these concerns, a detailed Forecourt Management Plan is added as a condition to ensure appropriate measures are in place to address any antisocial behaviour. The plan will be approved in consultation with the Designing Out Crime Officer.
- 7.15 The enlargements to the windows in the Theatre Annex would increase

overlooking to a small degree towards residential properties on Merton Hall Road. However, this relationship is already present and given distance of the Theatre Annex from the street, this impact is not considered harmful.

- 7.16 Overall, the proposal is not considered to cause material harm to neighbouring amenity subject to conditions met.

Trees

- 7.17 London Plan Policy 7.21, Policy CS 13 and SPP policy DMO2 seeks to retain and enhance trees.
- 7.18 There are three mature trees located at the boundary of the school facing Merton Hall Road. These contribute significantly to the amenity of the Conservation Area and are protected to a degree due to their location in the Conservation Area. The trees are not subject to Tree Preservation Orders. The proposed enhancement to the forecourt would retain these trees which is supported. The supporting Tree Report advises there are methods for installing the various additional items in a manner that will minimise the potential impact on two trees located at the front of the site. The report advises a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement and supervision should be required by condition. The Council's Tree Officer has reviewed the proposal and raises no objection subject to conditions met. Some soft landscaping is proposed with tree planters, which will provide an overall enhancement.

Transport and parking

- 7.19 Policies CS20 (Parking, Servicing and Delivery) of the Adopted Merton Core Planning Strategy (2011) DM T2 (Transport Impacts of Developments) and (DM T3 (Car Parking and Servicing Standards) of the Adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014) require developers to demonstrate that their development would not adversely affect pedestrian and cycle movements, safety, the convenience of local residents or the quality of bus movements and/or facilities; on street parking and traffic management and provision of parking to the council's current standards.
- 7.20 The site currently accommodates eight car parking spaces including two disabled spaces. These spaces shall be removed to facilitate the proposed forecourt, with the exception of two disabled bays. The removal of parking is in line with the College's push for staff and students to utilise more sustainable transport alternatives, including travelling by public transport and/or cycling in order to minimise car usage. A move towards sustainable modes of travel is generally supported by the Council subject to there being no increase in parking pressure as a result of lost on-site parking. To ensure there would be no significant adverse impacts on local residents from parking, the applicant has agreed to enter into a legal agreement preventing the college from obtaining parking permits within the local CPZ.
- 7.21 Servicing would take place on Merton Hall Road. The transport statement demonstrates a 7.5 tonne box van can comfortably pull up on the double yellow lines and load / unload without obstructing traffic. The Council's Transport Planner has reviewed the proposal and deemed the servicing arrangement acceptable.

7.22 Overall the proposed development is considered acceptable with regard to transport and parking.

Sustainability

7.23 Merton Core Strategy CS 15 (Climate Change) seeks development that makes best use of resources and minimise CO2 emissions. Whilst the proposal does not trigger the sustainability requirements under this policy, the application does include improvements to the buildings to make them more sustainable. The proposed works include new double glazed windows installed into the Theatre Annex Building and 1930s Main Building and improvements to the roof. These works will improve thermal insulation of the buildings helping to address the impact on Climate Change.

8. CONCLUSION

8.1 The principle for the proposed enhancements to Wimbledon College of Art are supported by Officers as they accord with development plan policies promoting the improvement of educational facilities, preserving employment and promoting community interaction. The proposed development would not cause material harm to neighbouring amenity subject to a detailed lighting scheme and forecourt management plan prior to first use. The scheme is considered to enhance the character and appearance of the Merton Hall Conservation Area and is acceptable in respect trees, transport and parking subject to conditions met and a unilateral undertaking for permit-free.

9. RECOMMENDATION

9.1 Grant permission subject to conditions and legal agreement.

Legal Agreement

The applicant to enter into a legal agreement preventing the college from obtaining parking permits within the local CPZ.

Conditions

1. **A1 Commencement** of development (full application)
2. **A7 Approved Plans:** The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 3606D_LBA_WCA_00_L_A_2100 (P3); 3606D_LBA_WCA_01_L_A_2101 (P3); 3606D_LBA_WCA_02_L_A_2102 (P3); 06D_LBA_WCA_03_L_A_2103 (P1); 3606D_LBA_WCA_03_L_A_2113 (P1); 606D_LBA_WCA_00_L_A_2260 (P1); 3606D_LBA_WCA_00_L_A_2270 (P1); 3606D_LBA_WCA_00_L_A_2271 (P1); 3606D_LBA_WCA_00_L_A_2280 (P1); 3606D_LBA_WCA_00_L_A_2281 (P1); 3606D_LBA_WCA_00_L_A_2282 (P1); 3606D_LBA_WCA_00_L_2800 (P1); UTC-0466-P02-TSP; UTC-0466-P05-TPP

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. **B1 External Materials to be Approved:** No development shall take place until details of windows to be used on all on the front elevation of the 'Main Building' (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. **B3 External Materials as Specified:** Other than the materials required to be approved, the facing materials to be used for the development hereby permitted shall be those specified in the application form unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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.

5. **F05 Tree Protection:** The details and measures for the protection of the existing trees as specified in the hereby approved document 'Arboricultural Impact Assessment' dated ' 3 Jun 2020' reference '0466-03-AIA ' shall be fully complied with. The methods for the protection of the existing trees shall fully accord with all of the measures specified in the report and shall be installed prior to the commencement of any site works and shall remain in place until the conclusion of all site works.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing retained trees in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS13 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy O2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

6. **F06 Design of Foundations:** No work shall be commenced until details of the proposed design, material and method of construction of the foundations of any structure to be installed within 14 metres of the two Horse Chestnut trees marked T1 and T2 on the Tree Protection Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA and the work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing retained trees in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS13 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DMO2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

7. **F08 Site Supervision (Trees):** Appropriate supervision and monitoring shall be carried out as indicated in Appendix B of the approved 'Arboricultural Impact Assessment' dated '3 Jun 2020' reference '0466-03-AIA'. The arboricultural expert shall monitor and report to the Local Planning Authority within 5 days of each visit the status of all tree works and tree protection measures throughout the course of the demolition and site works. A final Certificate of Completion shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority at the conclusion of all site works. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan.

8. **Details of the boundary Treatment:** No development shall take place until details of all boundary wall fronting Merton Hall Road are submitted in writing for approval to the Local Planning Authority. No works which are the subject of this condition shall be carried out until the details are approved, and 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.

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 and D2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

9. **Scheme of lighting:** No development shall take place until a scheme of lighting has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and any such approved external lighting in respect of a phase shall be positioned and angled to prevent/minimise any light spillage or glare that will affect any nearby residential premises. The approved scheme of lighting shall be implemented prior to first use of the development.

10. **F01 Landscape/Planting Scheme:** No development shall take place until full details of a landscaping and planting scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved before the commencement of the use or the occupation of any building hereby approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include on a plan, full details of the size, species, spacing, quantities and location of proposed plants, together with any hard surfacing, means of enclosure, and indications of all existing trees, hedges and any other features to be retained, and measures for their protection during the course of development.

11. **F02 Landscaping (Implementation):** All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved landscaping plan in accordance with condition 9. The works shall be carried out in the first available planting season following the completion of the development or prior to the occupation of any part of the development, whichever is the sooner, and any trees which die within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased or are dying, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of same approved specification, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation. All hard surfacing

and means of enclosure shall be completed before the development is first occupied.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing retained trees in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS13 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DMO2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

12. **Forecourt Management Plan:** Prior to first use, a Forecourt Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Met Police Designing Out Crime Officer. The management plan should detail measures to address potential anti-social behaviour and ensure there would be no adverse impact on nearby residents from noise or lighting.

Reason: To protect the amenity of residents in the nearby vicinity.

13. **Noise Limit:** Noise levels, (expressed as the equivalent continuous sound level) LAeq (15 minutes), from any new fixed external new plant/machinery shall not exceed LA90-10dB at the boundary with any residential property or noise sensitive premises.

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

14. **Demolition and Construction Method Statement:** No development shall take place until a Demolition and Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the demolition and construction period.

The Statement shall provide for:

- 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 protect the amenities of future occupiers and those in the local vicinity.

15. **Construction Logistics Plan:** Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a Construction Logistics Plan 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.

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.

16. **Cycle Parking:** Prior to first use of the development, details of secure cycle parking facilities for the occupants of, and visitors to, the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved facilities shall be fully implemented and made available for use prior to the first use of the development and thereafter retained for use at all times.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory facilities for cycle parking are provided and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 6.13 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS18 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM T1 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

17. **Disabled Parking:** The disabled parking spaces shown on approved plan 3606D_LBA_WCA_00_L_2800 (P1) General Arrangement Landscape Plan shall be implemented prior to first use of the development. The disabled parking spaces shall electric vehicle charging points (EVCP). The parking spaces shall be retained permanently to serve the vehicles of occupiers.

Reason: To provide adequate parking provision and to promote the use of renewable energy and to improve air quality in accordance with Policies 6.13 and 7.14 of the London Plan 2016, Policy CS15 of the Core Planning Strategy 2011 and Policy DM T3 of the Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

18. **INFORMATIVE:** No surface water runoff should discharge onto the public highway including the public footway or highway. When it is proposed to connect to a public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required (contact no. 0845 850 2777).

19. **INFORMATIVE:** No waste material, including concrete, mortar, grout, plaster, fats, oils and chemicals shall be washed down on the highway or disposed of into the highway drainage system.

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

10 DECEMBER 2020

APPLICATION NO.

DATE VALID

20/P2610

18/08/2020

Site Address:

5 Parkside Avenue, Wimbledon, SW15 5ES

Ward:

Village

Proposal:

DEMOLITION OF 2 STOREY DWELLINGHOUSE AND
ERECTION OF REPLACEMENT DWELLINGHOUSE
WITH ACCOMODATION WITHIN THE ROOF SPACE.

Drawing Nos:

PO1 (Rev D); PO2 (Rev A); PO3 (Rev B) PO4 (Rev B);
EW01 (Rev D); EW02 (Rev A); Tree Retention and
Protection Plan (171901/TRPP/Rev 2);

Contact Officer:

Calum McCulloch

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT Planning permission subject to conditions

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

Is a screening opinion required	No
Is an Environmental Statement required	No
Press notice	Yes
Site notice	Yes
Design Review Panel consulted	No
Number of neighbours consulted	10
External consultations	1
Internal consultations	3
Controlled Parking Zone	Yes - VN

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This planning application has been brought before the planning committee due to the number of representations received. Furthermore, the application has been called in by Councillor Thomas Barlow representing Village Ward.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site comprises two-storey 1950s dwelling located on a generously sized plot (0.18 ha) on the north side of Parkside Avenue.
- 2.2 Parkside Avenue generally consists of large recently built semi-detached dwellings which have replaced 1950s dwellings over the course of the last three decades.
- 2.3 Currently the dwelling is largely screened from view by a line of mature cypress trees.
- 2.4 The site is located within the Wimbledon North Conservation Area.
- 2.5 The site has a significant amount of foliage with generous number of mature trees. A blanket TPO has been applied to the site.
- 2.6 The site is also located within the Wimbledon Village Archaeological Priority Area.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The application seeks to demolish the existing 1950s dwelling and construct a part two-storey, part three-storey dwelling positioned towards the southern boundary of the site. It would adopt a royal Victorian traditional style similar to other recent redevelopments in the nearby area, including no. 7 Parkside Avenue to the north of the site.
- 3.2 The proposed dwelling is split into three main sections with the main bulk of the dwelling located centrally with two projecting side wings each side.
- 3.3 Alterations are also proposed to the existing vehicle access, with closing one and re-opening another one on the south-western end of the site.
- 3.4 The proposal includes comprehensive re-landscaping, including provision of semi-mature trees at the front of the site following removal of trees.

Amendments

- 3.5 In response to feedback from the Tree Officer and to address concerns raised by neighbours, the applicant made the following physical alterations to the proposal during the application:
- Replacement of two dormers at 2nd floor level with a single dormer with obscure glazing on both side elevations.
 - Relocation of western plant room to the rear of the proposed house.
 - Omission of eastern plant room

4. PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 20/P1464 - PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE FOR EXISTING DWELLING HOUSE AND ERECTION OF DETACHED SINGLE DWELLING HOUSE - Pre App Complete - 24/06/2020
- 4.2 MER18/76 - ALTERATIONS TO DETACHED HOUSE AFFECTING REAR AND EAST ELEVATION – GRANT PERMISISON - 13/12/1976
- 4.3 MER65/80 - EXTENSION TO HOUSE AND ERECTION OF DOUBLE GARAGE – GRANT PERMISSION – GRANT PERMISSION SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS – 28/05/19980
- 4.4 WIM6426 - ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING HOUSE INCLUDING DOUBLE GARAGE, STUDY AND BEDROOM – GRANT PERMISSION SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS – 28/08/1962
- 4.5 WIM6503 - ALTERATIONS ON GROUND AND 1ST FLOORS FORMING A STUDY, BEDROOM, BATHROOM AND GARAGE - 23/10/1962

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1 Consultation was carried out through Conservation Area Site Notice, Press Notice, and letters sent to adjoining neighbours.
- 5.2 The following representations were received between 27th August 2020 and 26th September 2020. During this time a standard 21-day consultation ending 19/09/20 was administered. In addition, a re-consultation was administered ending 26/09/20 to consult on the amended plans.

External

Neighbouring Properties:

- 5.3 A total of five objections were received from neighbouring properties summarised below.
- 5.4 An objection was received from the occupier of 10 Peek Crescent noting the following concerns:
 - The proposal is harmful to character and appearance owing to its overall siting, size, massing and landscaping. The proposal is considered contrary to the Conservation Area Character Assessment. The very reasons why the application site was included in the Conservation Area in the first place will be lost with the current proposal, namely the felling of the dense evergreen planting, the set-back of house from the road frontage and the resulting varied building line.
 - The proposed house is around 40m wide and extends more or less the full frontage onto Parkside Avenue. The proposed height of the central block would be 2.8m taller than the height of the existing house and taller than other buildings within the immediate vicinity. We consider the proposal is excessive in scale, bulk and massing and should not extend along the whole plot frontage.

- Concerns with regards to the loss of TPO trees. As set out in section 5.3 of the Tree Development Report, these trees are not actually required to be felled to facilitate the development footprint but rather to allow natural light into the garden and into the extremely large re-orientated new house. The comment in the Tree Development Report that the trees are starting to cause a nuisance to the footway and road is spurious.
- Concerns that there is no supporting material to supporting showing the immediate and wider context to help justify the overall scale, height and form of the development.
- Concerns the D&A and heritage statement has very little design or heritage content.
- Concerns the development would have a harmful impact on no. 10 from overlooking. It's noted the existing trees along the front boundary to number 5 screen the house and its main windows are angled away from the road and our property. The replacement house shows a total of 14 first and second floor windows facing our garden. Only one of these windows in the taller central block and two in the side wings serve bathrooms (and would presumably be obscure glazed).

5.5 An objection was received from the occupier of No. 2 Windy Ridge Close raising the following concerns:

- The proposed property is its enormous size and length across the plot - bigger than anything else in the area.
- The main central section of the house looks in keeping with the area but the additional single-story extensions on either end make it into something quite unprecedented and rather unsightly.
- The size of the property is disproportionate.
- Concerns over the loss of trees

5.6 An objection was the occupier of no. 10 Parkside Avenue noting the following concerns:

- Overall size of the development
- Loss of garden space.

5.7 An objection was received from occupier of 1 Parkside Gardens raising the following concerns:

- Loss of trees to the west of the site would result in a loss of privacy
- Scale and height of the new house is particularly worrying. With trees removed as planned, the new house would dominate our view, overlook our garden and have a significant impact on the privacy we currently enjoy.

5.8 An objection was received from the occupier of no. 3 Parkside Avenue raising the following points:

- The removal of a significant number of trees with tree preservation orders (TPOs) and the fact that this huge development significantly encroaches into the root protection areas (RPAs) of our trees with TPOs. In addition, no comprehensive tree replanting scheme has been provided that would mitigate the loss of privacy and amenity to the surrounding properties (especially 3 Parkside Avenue and 1 Parkside Gardens).

- The safety concerns of the addition of a new driveway so near to the junction of Peek Crescent and Parkside Avenue.
- The sheer scale and overdevelopment of the plot with no consideration to the street scene and amenity of the Wimbledon village area.

5.9 The occupier of 3 Parkside Avenue have provided a third party report written by Indigo Tree Survey to support their objection on trees. The report raising the following points:

- The Tree Report acknowledges that the scheme will have an impact on trees within and adjacent to the site, concluding that in order to facilitate the scheme and landscape proposals, the proposed tree removals include 5 x 'B' category trees, 11 x 'C' category trees and 4 x 'C' category tree groups, although the quality of some of these trees could be considered suitable for higher category retention as 'A'.
- The landscape scheme indicates locations and species of replacement tree planting, however, mitigation guidance is not included within the Tree Report, nor does the landscape scheme include details of volume, location, nursery stock size, planting design or process or maintenance as per BS8545 : 2020, i.e. the proposal is not commensurate to those being removed, and does not demonstrate suitable mitigation for the removal of 'B' moderate quality, and possibly 'A' high quality TPO protected trees.
- The landscape plan doesn't appear consistent with the tree report, showing some trees as absent which would raise concern as to additional tree felling proposals, or inconsistencies which may lead to additional tree losses and further negative amenity impact, i.e. T28.
- There is a discrepancy between the estimated measurement and the actual measurement of G32. The RPA is actually greater and more significant from both the proposed driveway and the proposed building footprint (garage elevation).
- The tree crown impact at s.5.4.2 of the tree report only identifies G2 as having proposed tree works. However, the canopy of G32 and the largest and closest of stems and canopies are noted as having 4.0m clearance from ground level over the site, with the proposed ridge height of the garage elevation being 7.0m, possibly beneath the canopy of G32.
- The proposed scheme results in the loss of TPO trees, and impacts directly on the RPAs and crowns of trees located on the property which is contrary to policy and guidance in consideration for trees, namely the Merton Planning Policy Guidance NE11 Trees: Protection, the Merton Core Strategy Policy CS13, and BS5837.
- The application should present the relevant and adequate detail to demonstrate that the proposed scheme considers the existing tree stock and constraints, accommodates retained trees, and mitigates for tree losses, compliant with planning policy and BS5837, of which the application fails.

Wimbledon Society:

- Concerns that that proposed development would have an adverse impact on protected TPOs.

- Concerns that the substantial width for the proposal will impair the ‘green feel’ of the street and the present feeling of spaciousness.
- The proposed development does not accord with Council Planning policies on Tree Protection and Conservation Area character and the application should therefore be refused.
- The submitted landscaping plan only shows a row of 11 Acer Campestre Elsrijk trees proposed along the whole plot frontage (with shrubs / hedging between). This level of landscaping does not mitigate the loss of 43 protected mature trees. It would result in a completely different and open feel to this section of road.

Parkside Residents Association

- Concerns that the proposal infills the front of the original garden and thus creates a very dominant profile in the street scene of both Parkside Avenue and Peek Crescent. The height is greater than other houses nearby and although there are shallower wings on each side of the 3 storey central block, the footprint extends almost to the full width of the plot. Whilst we note from the Design & Access Statement that the wings have been reduced in width from the original design we remain of the view that the building is overly large and its massing and bulk will be too dominant in this setting. This is contrary to Policy DM D2.
- Concern that the removal of such a large quantity of trees (at the front of the site) is to be permitted then this should be on the basis that a reasonable number of replacements are provided which are specimens of equivalent maturity so that screening for neighbours is maintained and the “green” contribution, visible from the street, is not significantly diminished. Looking at the proposed Landscaping Plan which has been submitted, this does not seem to be the case so a suitable planning condition would be required to address this. It’s noted there are there is a particularly attractive row of beech trees in the rear garden of 3 Parkside Avenue which are close to the application site boundary and are also visible from the street.
- Concerns with regards to the siting of the vehicular access point close to the boundary with no. 3 Parkside Avenue would be potentially dangerous.

Internal

Tree Officer:

- 5.10 Initial feedback from the Tree Officer raised no objections subject to conditions (F5, F8, F1 and F2). They note “it is proposed to remove a total of 16 individual trees and 5 groups of trees. Amongst this number are 5 'B' category trees. Whilst this is a high number of trees, they have provided a landscaping plan that shows a number of Field Maple trees located on the new front boundary. These will be a welcome replacement for the unattractive Cypress trees that currently border the site.”
- 5.11 Subsequently the Tree Officer reviewed the third party report produced by Indigo Tree Survey. The main concern raised by Indigo was the impact upon the RPA’s to the row of Beech’s (G32) along the eastern boundary of No:3/5. The Tree Officer subsequently recommended amendments to the applicant to ensure there would be no harm to health and vitality of the trees in question.

This included reducing the extent of hardstanding a development in proximity to the row of Beech Trees.

Conservation Officer:

- The scale and massing is too large taking into consideration extensive width of the site at the front boundary. The house would be overly dominant with regard to the street scene in what is a visually prominent position.
- Generally it is an area of generous vegetation and trees. Although I agree with the Tree Officer that the existing trees on the front boundary are not good quality, the new front boundary should have more trees and hedging to soften it and make more sympathetic to the adjacent area.
- It is recommended to set the house further back, reduce the height, and reduce width of the side wings.

Transport Planner:

- The proposed crossover is sited on Parkside Avenue just to the east of the junction with Peek Crescent. The new vehicle cross over has improved visibility to that of the existing crossing sited to the east near to the bend Parkside Avenue.
- There is adequate area within the proposed car parking layout for cars to turn and approach the highway in forward gear.
- Recommends no objection subject to conditions.

5.12 The following representations were received following re-consultation period between 10th November 2020 and 26th November 2020.

External

Neighbouring Properties:

5.13 A further objection was received from no. 10 Peek Crescent noting the following points:

- The changes to the scheme are negligible and have not overcome our concerns relating to the siting of the house, the overdevelopment of the plot frontage, the extensive removal of mature trees and the adverse impact this will have on the street scene, conservation area and our amenity.
- The increase in vegetation does not compensate for the loss of 43 protected trees along the road frontage, as well as others on the plot.
- The proposal would still result in a completely different and open feel to this section of road, at odds with the existing 'sense of enclosure' that is considered a positive feature in the council's Character Assessment and indeed one of the very reasons why the site was included in the Conservation Area in the first place.
- The removal/relocation of the small single storey plant rooms (each measuring approximately 2.5m wide and set back from the front building line) on each side of this vast house makes no noticeable improvement to the scheme in massing terms.
- The proposed height of the central block would be 2.8m taller than the height of the existing house and taller than other buildings within the

immediate vicinity. We consider the proposal is still excessive in scale, bulk and massing and should not extend along the whole plot frontage.

- Concern that a heritage statement has not been submitted properly assessing the impact of the proposal on the significance of the Conservation Area and other nearby heritage assets.
- The combination of the siting, scale, bulk and massing, would still result in an over dominant development in the street scene that would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. The scheme also still has no regard to the council's Conservation Area Character Assessment document.
- We maintain that the excessive scale and number of windows would result in an adverse impact on our amenity. Even if the Separation Study drawing (5.11.20) is correct in terms of boundary tree heights and angles, the proposal would still result in a sense of perceived overlooking of our garden

5.14 A further objection was received from no. 3 Parkside Avenue raising the following grounds:

- The removal of a huge amount of mature trees with TPOs with limited plans to reinstate trees and the huge loss of privacy for 3 Parkside Avenue, 1 Parkside Gardens and 5 Parkside Avenue. Concern that the council is not pushing back on the removal of over 43 trees with TPOs. The "shrub border" alongside the boundary with 3 Parkside Avenue is lengthened by a small amount but there are no proposals for additional planting of mature trees to replace the loss of specimens protected by the MER18 TPO, or to maintain screening for neighbours and the "green" contributions visible from the street which the existing trees provide.
- The impact to the TPO protected beech trees at the bottom of 3 Parkside Avenue. The disregard for the root protection areas (RPAs) and the continuation of plans to develop a driveway over the RPAs. The driveway should be removed completely due to this issue.
- The addition of a new vehicular access point so close to the junction of Peek Crescent/ Parkside Avenue. The siting of the new access at the junction with Peek Crescent may be unsafe as cars heading east along Parkside Avenue do not slow down at this point and visibility for cars exiting the new driveway may be restricted
- The siting and sheer scale of the house in a conservation area and its lack of design sensitivity to the properties in the immediate vicinity. Whilst some minor amends have been made, we do not feel these go far enough. The huge design does not fit with the properties immediately surrounding it.

Parkside Residents Association:

- Maintains the view that the building is overly large and its massing and bulk will be too dominant in this setting. The plant rooms were relatively small and the frontages closest to Parkside Avenue remains unchanged. Accordingly the dominant profile of the new house and its negative impact on the street scene is largely unchanged.
- Maintain objection to the Loss of TPO trees and potential damage to beech Trees at the rear of 3 Parkside Avenue

- Maintains objection that vehicular access siting is unsafe.

Wimbledon Society:

5.15 Maintain objection to the loss of TPO trees along Parkside Avenue.

External

Council's Conservation Officer:

5.16 Acknowledges that increased vegetation is helpful but maintains objection that the dwelling is overly large detracting from the rural feeling of the Road.

Tree Officer:

5.17 The Tree Officer reviewed amendments made by the application to address previous concerns raised with regard to trees. The amendments made include:

- Relocation of western plant room to the rear of the building
- A decrease in area of hardstanding around the RPAs of the row of beech trees (G32) at the rear of no. 3 Parkside Avenue.
- Amendments to the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan

5.18 The Tree Officer is satisfied with the proposed amendments and raises no objection subject to conditions: F5, F8, F1 and F2.

6. POLICY CONTEXT

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

- Chapter 4 Decision-making
- Chapter 11 Making effective use of land
- Chapter 12 Achieving well-designed places
- Chapter 14 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- Chapter 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- Chapter 16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

London Plan (2016)

- Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
- Policy 5.12 Flood risk management
- Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage
- Policy 6.13 Parking
- Policy 7.4 Local Character
- Policy 7.5 Public Realm
- Policy 7.6 Architecture
- Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology
- Policy 7.15 Reducing and managing noise, improving and enhancing the acoustic environment and promoting appropriate soundscapes
- Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature

- Policy 7.21 Trees and woodlands
- Policy 8.3 Community Infrastructure Levy

Merton Core Strategy (2011)

- Policy CS 13 Open space, nature conservation, leisure and culture
- Policy CS 14 Design
- Policy CS 15 Climate Change
- Policy CS 16 Flood Risk Management
- Policy CS 20 Parking, Servicing and Delivery

Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014)

- DM O2 Nature Conservation, Trees, hedges and landscape features
- DM D1 Urban design and the public realm
- DM D2 Design considerations in all developments
- DM D4 Managing heritage assets
- DM F1 Support for flood risk management
- DM F2 Sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) and; Wastewater and Water Infrastructure
- DM T2 Transport impacts of development
- DM T3 Car parking and servicing standards

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of development

- 7.1 The principle of development relates to the loss of the existing dwelling in favour of a new replacement dwelling and whether there is any harm resulting on the Conservation Area. SPP Policy DMD4 notes the loss of a building that makes a positive contribution to a conservation area or heritage site, should also be treated as substantial harm to a heritage asset.
- 7.2 In this instance the dwelling is located in the Wimbledon North Conservation Area. The prevailing character of the area is suburban with large detached dwellings with generously sized gardens. Parkside Avenue has been subject to intensification over the past two decades with 20th century houses being replaced with larger detached dwellings. The proposed development follows this trend and would result in the demolition of an existing 1950s dwelling and replacement with a larger detached dwelling built in a traditional style. The existing dwelling is of limited architectural value with neutral contribution to the Conservation Area. As such, the demolition of the existing property is considered acceptable in favour of a replacement dwelling with a high quality design and satisfying all other planning on considerations outlined below.

Character and appearance of the Wimbledon North Conservation Area

- 7.3 London Plan policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8, Core Strategy policy CS14 and SPP Policies DMD2, DMD3 and DMD4 require proposals to conserve and enhance

heritage assets, as well as respect the appearance, scale, bulk, form, proportions, materials and character of the original building and their surroundings.

7.4 Also relevant is the Wimbledon North Conservation Area Character Assessment (January 2007) makes reference to the stretch of Parkside Avenue where the site is located. It notes:

- The stretch of Parkside Avenue north of Peek Crescent (where the site is located) laid out in the mid-1950s. It gave access to the development at Deepdale, Margin Drive and Windy Ridge Close.
- The area forms a contrast to the older part south of Peek Crescent in that it is narrower, partly curved and partly almost parallel to Parkside and Parkside Gardens. The short, curving stretch of road up to the plot at No. 7 has a real sense of enclosure, despite being mostly fronted by the substantial side/rear gardens of No. 5 and No. 10 Peek Crescent. This is mainly due to the tall, dense, evergreen planting along both frontages, with only glimpses through to the treed gardens.
- The buildings to the west side of the road are more modern than most in the Conservation Area, dating from the 1950s to around 2000. However, they are a mix of mostly well detailed, substantial houses on varied, wide plots, mostly set back from the road frontage but with a varied building line. There are generous spaces between and around the buildings, offering a sense of spaciousness, views of the well planted gardens, (including those to the rear of Parkside Gardens properties), and glimpses of the rear facades of buildings in Parkside Gardens.

7.5 The proposal involves reconfiguring the layout of the site, positioning the dwelling further to the south with the front elevation directly fronting Parkside Avenue.

7.6 The dwelling itself comprises a principle core central block with two projecting side wings. The central block would measure roughly 23m long by 11m deep comprising three storeys and a ridge height of 11.63m. The western side wing would measure roughly 11.8m by 9.4m deep with a ridge height of 7m. The eastern wing would measure roughly 11m wide by 7.7m deep with a ridge height of 7m. The extensions either side are designed as such to appear subservient to central block as these are lower in height and set further back from the street.

7.7 As noted above, the ridge height of main block would be 11.63m. This would be roughly 3.65m higher than the ridge height of the existing dwelling (eaves 2.88m higher). 3 Parkside Avenue located to the west of the site by comparison has a ridge height of 10.15m. 7 Parkside Avenue to the east has a ridge height of 10.5m. 10 Peek Crescent opposite the development has ridge height of 12.5m. Overall, the proposed building would have a comparable height to dwellings in the surrounding area.

7.8 With regard to layout, the dwelling would be set back from the street by 7m and there would be gaps of 4.26m and 4.42m between the side elevations with the east and west boundaries respectively. A U-shaped garden would be maintained to the north of the site with a max depth of 28m. Comprehensive re-landscaping is proposed including provision of semi-mature trees fronting

Parkside Avenue.

- 7.9 The architecture would be in a traditional 'Royal Victoria Style'. High quality materials are proposed, including clay roof tiles, lead dormers and red stock brick and painted hardwood sash windows. It also adopts ornamental features, including brick headers and stone coping.
- 7.10 The layout of the site would unquestionably change character of this part of Parkside Avenue from a street enclosed by vegetation with rear gardens either side into road with a more active street frontage. However, this change doesn't by default equate to a negative impact. The existing cypress trees fronting Parkside Avenue are not of any particular merit, noted as 'unattractive' by the Tree Officer. The set back of the front elevation from the street by 7m and comprehensive landscaping at the front with semi-mature Field Maple trees would create a suitable level of spaciousness a greenery that accords with the wider character of the Conservation Area. The architecture is traditional in nature and includes a high level of detailing and ornamentation which would assimilate with the traditional character of the Conservation Area. The dwelling would have a wide width, but the width of the site is generous. The use of two 1.5 storey wings either side of the main body of the dwelling help reduce the bulk and massing down and owing to their angled orientations helps follow the curve of the frontage of the site. The height of the dwelling would be comparable to no. 3 Parkside Avenue and no. 10 Peek Crescent in the nearby vicinity and therefore is not considered to appear incongruous.
- 7.11 The Conservation Officer's raised concern that the scale and size of the dwelling is too great and that greater vegetation is needed. Following their initial comments, the applicant has amended the landscape plan to increase the maturity of trees fronting Parkside Avenue. The applicant also repositioned the western plant room to the rear and removed the eastern plant room. Following the amendments the Conservation maintained her view that the scale of the build is too large. Officer have carefully considered this consultation response, however, officers remain satisfied that the proposal can be accommodated on site without causing harm to the Conservation Area.
- 7.12 In view of the above, Case Officers do not consider the proposal to result in material harm to the Character and Appearance of the Wimbledon North Conservation Area.
- 7.13 Whilst Officers acknowledge the Conservation Officers concerns, Officers do not consider the proposal to cause material harm to the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area for the reasons above in preceding paragraphs. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in respect of Policies DMD2, DMD3 and DMD4 in this regard.

Neighbour Amenity

- 7.14 Sites and Policies Plan Policy DM D2 seeks to ensure that the potential impact of new development has regard for neighbour amenity.
- 7.15 The dwelling is surrounded 8 properties in total. These include no. 3 Parkside Avenue, no. 1, 2 ,3 and 4 Parkside Gardens and no. 7 Parkside Avenue located to the east of the site. In addition, opposite the front of the dwelling is no. 2

Windy Ridge Close and no. 10 Peek Crescent. The impact on these properties are considered in turn below:

3 Parkside Avenue

- 7.16 The proposal would result in some change in outlook for no. 3 Parkside Avenue as the side elevation would appear visible from the rear of this property. There is not considered to be material harm however, as the side elevation of main three storey block most visible would be positioned approximately 16m from the boundary of no. 3. The side dormer window at second floor level would be obscure glazed preventing any harmful overlooking.

1, 2, 3 and 4 Parkside Gardens

- 7.17 There would be some increased inter-visibility between the rear of the property and the gardens of nos. 1, 2, 3 & 4 Parkside Gardens. There would be a separating distance between the proposed dwelling and the adjoining boundary of 1, 3 & 4 Parkside Gardens of approximately 5.5m, 19m and 27m respectively. The proposed dwelling is oriented as such so that the sightlines would be predominantly northwards towards Nos. 3 & 4. Taking this into consideration with the said separating distances, as well as screening from trees retained along the north western boundary there is not considered to be material harm to the amenity of these properties through increased overlooking, increased sense of enclosure or change in outlook.

7 Parkside Avenue

- 7.18 There would be some inter-visibility between the first and second floor of the proposed dwelling and the rear garden of no. 7 Parkside Avenue which borders the site to the east. There is roughly 18m between first floor window of the proposed gym and the side elevation of no. 7 (6m to the boundary) and a distance of 18.5m to the rear elevation of no.7. There would be a distance of 22.5m from closest first floor window on the central block to the rear elevation.
- 7.19 In assessing the any harm, one must consider these distances as well as the difference between the current and proposed relationship with the neighbour. The existing dwelling has a first floor roof terrace and a number of rear windows facing no. 7 and therefore an existing level of inter-visibility between the two properties is already present. The proposed rear facing windows would be positioned comparatively further away from the boundary and orientate themselves more northward when compared with the existing dwelling. As such, the new development is not considered to increase this overlooking over and above the existing situation. Overall, case officers do not consider there to be a harmful impact on the amenity of no. 7 through loss of outlook, overbearing sense of enclosure or diminished privacy.

2 Windy Ridge Close and 10 Peek Crescent

No. 10 Peek Crescent and 2 Windy Ridge Close are located on the opposite side of Parkside Avenue to the site.

The occupiers of no. 10 have raised concerns over the overall scale of the development, the loss of TPO trees along the front boundary and the potential for increased overlooking. No. 10 is orientated as such that the side elevation

and side garden boundary faces the application site. There is one window located in the northern side elevation of no. 10 which serves a stairwell. A row of trees is located along the northern side boundary of the garden measuring approximately 6m high. There would be some inter-visibility between the 2nd floor dormer windows serving bedrooms 5 and 6 and the rear garden of no. 10. However, this impact is reduced by the wall of vegetation along the boundary of no. 10. Furthermore the dormer windows would be 16.5m from no. 10's boundary and the road being in-between. As a result, officers do not consider there to be a harmful overlooking relationship. The proposed development would result in a change in outlook for no. 10. However, again this impact is not considered harmful considering the set back of the front elevation from the street and the provision of new trees and hedging along the boundary which will preserve as far practically possible the green character of the street. It should be noted that applicant has increased the maturity of vegetation along the boundary in response to concerns raised by neighbours.

Similarly No 2 Windy Ridge Close has expressed concern over the scale of the development and the loss of trees. This property is currently being developed in accordance with planning permission 18/P2565. It is orientated as such that the side elevation and side garden boundary would face the development. There would be some inter-visibility between the 1st and 2nd floor windows of the subject site toward the garden of. 2 Windy Ridge Close but taking into account the re-landscaping the front boundary and the distance between the no. 2's side boundary and the front elevation of the proposed dwelling of 16.5m, there is not considered to be a harmful impact on the amenity of no. 2.

- 7.20 Overall, whilst the proposal would open up the site and result in a greater outlook from windows and a larger dwelling on the site, the proposal is not considered to cause material harm to the amenity of adjacent neighbouring occupiers and is compliant with SPP Policy DMD2 in this respect.

Biodiversity and Trees

- 7.21 London Plan Policy 7.1 and Policy 7.21, Merton Core Strategy Policy CS1 and Sites and Policies Plan Policy DMO2 require development proposals to conserve and enhance biodiversity and trees.
- 7.22 A preliminary ecological appraisal written by Andrews Wildlife Consultants was submitted support the application. The appraisal assesses the site for potential for important protected species. Importantly the appraisal found there is limited potential for bat roosting. Three trees to be retained were found to have low roosting potential for bats. The report makes recommendations for the protection of hedgehogs, bats and reptiles which are attached as a condition to this planning permission to avoid harm to important wildlife.
- 7.23 With regard to trees, a blanket TPO has been applied to the site as it is recognised the tree coverage in this area contributes to the visual amenity of the Conservation Area. That said, the trees on site are of varying quality and value.
- 7.24 An Arboricultural Impact Assessment produced by Connick Tree Consultants was submitted to support the application. The tree report concludes the proposed development will have an impact upon 16 individual and 4 groups

trees within and adjacent to the site, out of the total 37 arboricultural features identified. These trees are as follows:

- 4 individual category 'B' trees identified as T25, T30, T31 and T33 require removal to facilitate development.
- 4 individual and 2 groups of category 'C' trees identified as T1, G14, G15, T24, T26 and T29 require removal to facilitate development.
- 7 individual and 3 groups of category 'C' trees and 1 individual category 'B' tree identified as T16, T17, T18, T19, T20, T21, T22, T27, G34, G36 and G37 which require removal due to ongoing issues and to allow for natural light to enter the development.
- 1 group of category 'B' trees, G32 can be retained. However, the planned landscaping features will encroach upon the trees RPA by up to a maximum of 24.4% on G32c only (17% hard standing and 7.4% structure foundation). All remaining trees will have an impact less than 20% and be due to new hard landscaping only.

7.25 The Council's Tree Officer has reviewed the proposal raises no objection subject to conditions. They note that whilst there is a high number of category B trees to be lost, they have provided a landscaping plan that shows a number of Field Maple trees located on the new front boundary. These will be a welcome replacement for the unattractive Cypress trees that currently border the site.

7.26 The Council's Tree Officer is satisfied the proposal would not harm the health and vitality of the row of Beech Trees (G32) at the rear of no. 3 Parkside Avenue. This follows amendments made by the applicant in response to a contesting report produced by Indigo Tree Consulting on behalf of the occupants of no. 3. The amendments included:

- Relocation of plant room to the rear of the proposed house, reducing the footprint of the building in the RPA of G32c.
- Increasing the depth of the proposed planting bed by a minimum of 1.5m along the boundary with No:5 thereby ensuring that the hard standing covers less than 20% of individual specimens RPA in line with section 7.4.2.3 of the BS 5837 :2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations.
- Soil amelioration to be undertaken to improve the remaining uncovered shrub bed which is mentioned in the revised AIA.

7.27 Taking into consideration above, the proposed development is considered acceptable in respect of trees and biodiversity subject to conditions being met.

Sustainability

7.28 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 in outlined in Chapter 5 of the London Plan (2016).

7.29 As a minor development proposal, the development is required to achieve a 19% improvement on Part L of the Building Regulations 2013 and water consumption should not exceed 105 litres/person/day.

- 7.30 A supporting sustainability statement indicates the proposal would produce a 25.1 % reduction in CO2 emissions satisfying the 19% requirement. No information on water has been provided.
- 7.31 A pre-occupation condition is attached requiring evidence be submitted to show that the development has achieved CO2 reductions of not less than a 19% improvement on Part L regulations 2013, and internal water consumption rates of no greater than 105 litres per person per day.
- 7.32 The development is considered acceptable in respect of sustainability subject to conditions met.

Archaeology

- 7.33 Merton Sites and Policy Plan DMD4 seeks to protect the significance of designated heritage assets including Archaeological Priority Areas.
- 7.34 The site is within a Tier 2 Archaeological Priority Area and the proposed development would involve significant ground disturbance. The Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service (GLAAS) were consulted for this application and no representation was received. Tier 2 is defined by historic England as a local area within which the GLHER holds specific evidence indicating the presence or likely presence of heritage assets of archaeological interest. No supporting archaeological information has been provided with this application. As such, a standard condition for a watching brief to be submitted to ensure any potentially important archaeological remains are protected.

Standard of Accommodation

- 7.35 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. The London Housing SPG and Policy DMD2 of the Council’s Sites and Policies Plan, it states that there should be 5m2 of external space provided for private outdoor space for 1-2 person dwellings and an extra 1sqm provided for each additional occupant.
- 7.36 The proposed development is for a large single dwelling with 6 double bedrooms and a generous sized garden. The development comfortably satisfies the internal and external space standards noted above.

Transport and Highways

- 7.37 London Plan Policy 6.13 (Parking), Adopted Merton Core Planning Strategy (2011) CS20 (Parking, Servicing and Delivery), Sites and Policies Plan (2014) DM T2 (Transport Impacts of Developments), DM T3 (Car Parking and Servicing Standards) require developers to demonstrate that their development would not adversely affect pedestrian and cycle movements, safety, the

convenience of local residents or the quality of bus movements and/or facilities; on street parking and traffic management and provision of parking to the council's current standards.

- 7.38 The proposal provides for three parking spaces to the west which will form the principle means of accessing the site and a single space to the east which is intended to be used on an intermittent basis. This would be adequate parking provision for the size of this development. The single space to the east will be served by an existing vehicle crossover whilst it is proposed to create a new vehicle crossover and area of hardstanding to serve the principle parking area to the west.
- 7.39 The Council's highways department have been consulted for application and they raise no objections to the proposal. The Transport Officer notes the new vehicle cross over has improved visibility to that of the existing crossing sited to the east near to the bend Parkside Avenue. No objections are raised to the siting of the new access.
- 7.40 The proposal is acceptable in respect of Merton SPP policy DM T2 (Transport Impacts of Developments), DM T3 (Car Parking and Servicing Standards).

Local Financial Considerations

- 7.41 The applicant will be liable to Community Infrastructure Levy.

8. CONCLUSION

- 8.1 The principle of development is considered acceptable as the proposal will replace a 1950s dwelling which currently makes a neutral contribution to the Conservation Area with a larger dwelling in high quality architectural style sympathetic to the Wimbledon North Conservation Area. Officers have closely analysed the design of the development in respect of character and appearance and consider the proposal acceptable in this respect. The proposal would not appear incongruous with its surroundings and whilst there would be a change to the character of Parkside Avenue, this change is not considered to cause material harm to the significance of the Conservation Area. There would be no undue harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties and is consider acceptable in respect of all other planning considerations noted above subject to conditions being met.

9. RECOMMENDATION

- 9.1 Grant planning permission subject to conditions

Conditions

1. **A1 Commencement** of development (full application)
2. **A7 Approved Plans:** The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PO1 (Rev D); PO2 (Rev A); PO3 (Rev B) PO4 (Rev B); EW01 (Rev D); EW02 (Rev A); Tree Retention and Protection Plan (171901/TRPP/Rev 2);

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. **B3 External Materials as Specified:** The materials to be used for the development hereby permitted shall be those specified in the application form and Drawing EW02 unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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. **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.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the area and the occupiers of neighbouring properties and ensure compliance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.15 of the London Plan 2016 and policy DM EP2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

5. **Obscure Glazing:** Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied, the second floor dormer windows in the east and west side elevations shall be glazed with obscured glass and shall be maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities and privacy of the occupiers of adjoining properties 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.

6. **Demolition and Construction Method Statement:** No development shall take place until a Demolition and Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the demolition and construction period.

The Statement shall provide for:

- 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 protect the amenities of future occupiers and those in the local vicinity.

7. **Construction Logistics Plan:** Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a Construction Logistics Plan 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.

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.

8. **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 of not less than a 19% improvement on Part L regulations 2013, and internal water consumption rates of no greater than 105 litres per person per day.

Reason: To ensure that the development achieves a high standard of sustainability and makes efficient use of resources and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: Policy 5.2 of the London Plan 2016 and Policy CS15 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011.

9. **Tree Protection:** The details and measures for the protection of the existing trees as specified in the hereby approved document 'Tree Development Report BS5837:2012 Arboricultural Impact Assessment' reference '171901/PRO/REV3' dated 16th November 2020 shall be fully complied with. The methods for the protection of the existing trees shall fully accord with all of the measures specified in the report and shall be installed prior to the commencement of any site works and shall remain in place until the conclusion of all site works.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing retained trees in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS13 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and 02 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

10. **F01 Landscape/Planting Scheme:** No development shall take place until full details of a landscaping and planting scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved before the commencement of the use or the occupation of any building hereby approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include on a plan, full details of the size,

species, spacing, quantities and location of proposed plants, together with any hard surfacing, means of enclosure, and indications of all existing trees, hedges and any other features to be retained, and measures for their protection during the course of development.

11. **F02 Landscaping (Implementation):** All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved landscaping plan in accordance with condition 9. The works shall be carried out in the first available planting season following the completion of the development or prior to the occupation of any part of the development, whichever is the sooner, and any trees which die within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased or are dying, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of same approved specification, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation. All hard surfacing and means of enclosure shall be completed before the development is first occupied.

12. **F8 Site supervision:** The tree works and measures set out in the approved document Tree Development Report BS5837:2012 Arboricultural Impact Assessment' reference '171901/PRO/REV3' dated 16th November 2020 shall be supplemented by the retention of an arboricultural expert to monitor and report to the Local Planning Authority not less than monthly the status of all tree works and tree protection measures throughout the course of the demolition and site works. A final Certificate of Completion shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority at the conclusion of all site works. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing retained trees in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS13 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DMO2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

13. **K2 Archaeology (Watching Brief):** No development [including demolition] pursuant to this consent shall take place until an on-site watching brief, which ensures the presence of a suitably qualified and experienced archaeologist during construction work, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. In the event of important archaeological features or remains being discovered, which require fuller rescue excavation, then construction work shall cease until the applicant has secured the implementation of a further programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to provide the opportunity to record the history of the site and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.8 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS14 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM D4 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

14. C02 No Permitted Development (windows and doors): Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no window, door or other opening other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed in the side elevations without planning permission first being obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities and privacy of the occupiers of nearby properties 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.

15. 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.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the area and the occupiers of neighbouring properties and ensure compliance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.15 of the London Plan 2016 and policy DM EP2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

16. E06 Ancillary Residential Accommodation: The first floor 'annexe' located within the western side wing of the development hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as 5 Parkside Avenue, Wimbledon, London, SW19 5ES

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of neighbouring residents, to prevent the unauthorised introduction of an independent use and to ensure compliance 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.

17. Informative: The implementation of the proposed vehicle crossover will be subject to a separate Vehicle Crossover Application with the Council.

18. Informative: No surface water runoff should discharge onto the public highway including the public footway or highway. When it is proposed to connect to a public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required (contact no. 0845 850 2777).

19. Informative: No waste material, including concrete, mortar, grout, plaster, fats, oils and chemicals shall be washed down on the highway or disposed of into the highway drainage system.

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
10th December 2020

Item No:

UPRN

APPLICATION NO.

DATE VALID

19/P4032

Address/Site

Pollards Hill Estate, Mitcham

(Ward)

Pollards Hill

Proposal:

INSTALLATION OF 180 BIN STORES AND 28 FOOD STORES WITH RECONFIGURATION OF PARKING SPACES (INCREASE OF 40 SPACES) ACROSS THE POLLARDS HILL ESTATE

Drawing Nos:

LOCATION_PLAN_001_REV_PL2, ASK 11,
F.1.01,
BERKSHIRE CLOSE_002_REV_PL2,
BRECON CLOSE_003_REV_PL4,
CAERNARVON CLOSE_002_REV_PL3,
GLAMORGAN CLOSE_002_REV_PL4,
HUNTINGDON CLOSE_002_REV_PL4,
KENT CLOSE_002_REV_PL4,
LINDSEY CLOSE_002_REV_PL4,
MONMOUTH CLOSE_002_REV_PL1,
MONTGOMERY CLOSE_002_REV_PL3,
RADNOR CLOSE_002_REV_PL2 &
SHROPSHIRE CLOSE_002_REV_PL3, M9045-APL072,

Vehicle Swept Path Analysis drawings:
BERKSHIRE CLOSE_003_REV_PL2,
BRECON CLOSE_004_REV_PL3,
CAENARVON CLOSE_003_REV_PL3,
CHESHIRE CLOSE_003_REV_PL3,
GLAMORGAN CLOSE_003_REV_PL3,
HUNTINGDON CLOSE_003_REV_PL3,
KENT CLOSE_003_REV_PL3,
LINDSEY CLOSE_003_REV_PL3,
MONMOUTH CLOSE_003_REV_PL1,
MONTGOMERY CLOSE_003_REV_PL3,
RADNOR CLOSE_003_REV_PL2 &
SHROPSHIRE CLOSE_003_REV_PL3.

Contact Officer:

Tim Lipscomb (0208 545 3496)

RECOMMENDATION

Grant Permission subject to conditions.

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- Heads of Agreement: No.
- Is a screening opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental Statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Statement been submitted: No
- Press notice: Yes (major application)
- Site notice: Yes (major application)
- Design Review Panel consulted: No
- Number of neighbours consulted: 876
- External consultations: Yes
- Flood Zone - No
- Conservation area: No
- Listed buildings: No
- Tree protection orders: No
- Controlled Parking Zone: No
- PTAL: 1a-2 (poor)

1. **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This application is being brought to the Planning Applications Committee for determination due to the nature and scale of the development and the number of objections.

2. **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 The site is located at Pollards Hill, a residential district between Mitcham and Norbury. The site is bounded by South Lodge Avenue / Recreation Way and Radnor Close / Lancaster Road. The majority of estate properties lie to the north of South Lodge Avenue.
- 2.2 The Pollards Hill estate was developed in the 1960's as a high density low rise scheme of 3 storey houses and flats. The scheme was laid out in a rectilinear pattern set around a series of squares, bounded by Recreation Way. The estate implements the principles of 'perimeter planning' whereby terraces are compactly zigzagging around the edge of a large open space. The estate includes a library and community centre, the library was extended and refurbished in 2009, with a new external envelope to the entire building.
- 2.3 This part of the estate is made up of 3 storey residential blocks of flat-roofed, terraced housing, many of which front onto courtyard parking.
- 2.4 The estate slopes down fairly steeply from its northern end towards South Lodge Avenue. Changes of level are accommodated through a series of ramps, steps and embankments to the perimeter of Donnelly Green and resident courtyards.
- 2.5 The estate has recently undergone improvement works by Moat Housing Association with new cladding and re-landscaped internal courtyard areas.
- 2.6 The flatted blocks on site are interspersed by a number of triangular shaped areas of green space (many of these are currently occupied by building materials and portacabins in relation to the wider estate regeneration works), with a larger recreation area to the central and southern part of the site.

- 2.7 There are trees of varying quality and maturity around the estate perimeter and within the parking courts off Recreation Way and Donnelly Green and more mature specimens towards the South Lodge Avenue.
- 2.8 The Pollards Hill Estate is surrounded by low-rise (two and three storey) residential development, which take the form of semi-detached houses and short terraces. The Pollards Hill Estate extends to the south of South Lodge Avenue, where the majority of properties have been redeveloped, several with over sailing mono-pitched roofs. The general architectural style is undistinguished post-war residential, with little overall coherence in terms of detail. To the north west of the Estate there are a number of larger scale community buildings, including a library, community centre, youth club and a parade of shops.
- 2.9 In terms of bin storage, the current arrangement is predominantly individual bins for each dwellings along with small communal bin stores within recessed areas in the existed terraced buildings. There are also some limited examples of communal bin storage within the car parking areas.
- 2.10 Bins for individual dwellings are currently kept in the recessed areas at the entrance door.
- 2.11 The existing integral, communal bin stores on site are often over-flowing and have been the subject of vandalism, graffiti and arson.

3. PROPOSAL

3.1 Summary of proposal:

- 43 freestanding bin stores (made up of a total of 180 bin modules and 28 food stores). This would displace 49 parking spaces.
 - An additional 89 car parking spaces on green space and within existing car parking area would be provided giving a total increase in parking spaces of 40.
 - No loss of trees.
- 3.2 The planning application seeks permission for the provision of a number of freestanding bin stores around the site, to be located in areas which previously accommodated car parking, or on the existing green wedges of land around the site. These freestanding communal bin stores would replace the existing individual bins for householders.
- 3.3 The proposal is for each “Close” that makes up the estate to be provided with 3-5 freestanding bin stores with refuse, recycling and food recycling containers, housed on concrete plinths. The bin stores themselves would be grey in colour, with a partly curved roof. The bins would be constructed from ‘Tuffplas™ Grey HDPE 100% Recycled’, a composite material with a woodgrain finish, on a steel frame. The bins are designed to be fire retardant.
- 3.4 Additional car parking (89 spaces) is to be provided on the green wedges around the site (due to the spaces to be lost, the total increase in parking spaces would be 40 across the site). The grassed green wedge areas would therefore be reduced in size to accommodate this increased parking provision.

- 3.5 A Ground Reinforcement System has been chosen for the creation of the new parking spaces, which are to be located on the green wedge areas - ECOGRID® E40, which is a system similar to 'grass-crete', allowing grass to grow through the base structure.
- 3.6 Bollards would be installed around the bin stores (Marshalls 915mm concrete bollards).
- 3.7 Dropped kerbs would be inserted in a number of positions to facilitate servicing and collection.
- 3.8 Berkshire Close:
- The erection of 2 separate bin stores.
 - Loss of 4 parking spaces.
- 3.9 Brecon Close:
- The erection of 3 separate bin stores.
 - 6 additional parking spaces proposed within the parking courtyard and on the existing green wedge.
- 3.10 Caenarvon Close:
- The erection of 4 separate bin stores.
 - 5 additional parking spaces proposed within the parking courtyard and on the existing green wedge.
- 3.11 Cheshire Close:
- The erection of 4 separate bin stores.
 - 13 additional parking spaces on green space.
- 3.12 Glamorgan Close:
- The erection of 5 separate bin stores.
 - 9 additional parking spaces within the parking courtyard and on the existing green wedge.
- 3.13 Huntingdon Close:
- The erection of 5 separate bin stores.
 - 2 additional parking spaces within the parking courtyard and on the existing green wedge.
- 3.14 Kent Close:
- The erection of 5 separate bin stores comprising the following:

- 7 additional parking spaces within the parking courtyard and on the existing green wedge.

3.15 Lyndsey Close:

- The erection of 6 separate bin stores comprising the following:
- 8 additional parking spaces within the parking courtyard and on the existing green wedge.

3.16 Monmouth Close:

- The erection of 1 bin store.
- 5 additional parking spaces on the existing green wedge.

3.17 Montgomery Close:

- The erection of 2 separate bin stores.
- 1 additional parking space within the parking courtyard.

3.18 Radnor Close:

- The erection of 4 separate bin stores to the roadside verge comprising the following:
- No change to existing parking layout.

3.19 Shropshire Close:

- The erection of 4 separate bin stores.
- Loss of 10 parking spaces.

3.20 Table to illustrate change in parking spaces around the site:

Address	Existing	Added	Lost	Balance	Change
Monmouth Close	0	5	0	5	+5
Lyndsey Close	39	12	4	47	+8
Kent Close	39	13	6	46	+7
Huntingdon Close	36	10	8	38	+2
Glamorgan Close	37	14	5	46	+9
Cheshire Close	2	13	0	15	+13
Caernarvon Close	47	9	4	52	+5
Brecon Close	50	10	8	52	+32
Montgomery Close	18	3	2	19	+1
Shropshire Close	54	0	10	44	-10

Berkshire Close	12	0	2	10	-2
Radnor Close	0	0	0	0	0
	334	89	49	374	+40

3.21 In support of the application, the applicant advises that there is currently a shortage of refuse storage on the estate. Refuse stores are currently recessed into areas located at the rear of each block and large commercial bins located. The capacity has found to be too small to meet Merton's requirements, including the introduction of recycling. In relation to this the designer, United Living, has looked into various options and has considered the following in the layout and design for the bin's stores:

- Most efficient way of distributing the locations of bins stores, which will have less impact to the residents and existing structures;
- Ease of access by council refuse lorries;
- Minimum effect to existing parking provisions to the whole estate.
- Increase refuse and recycling storage capacity
- Minimise fly-tipping

3.22 The waste collection service the existing houses on the site currently have is outlined below:

- 1 x food caddy bin
- 1 x paper/card bin
- 1 x general refuse bin
- 1 x purple/blue box for plastic, glass, cans and cartons
- 1 x green box

The current collection service is a once weekly collection service

3.22 The proposed collection service is as follows:

- 1 x food caddy bin - weekly
- 1 x paper/card – once every 2 weeks
- 1 x general refuse bin – once every 2 weeks
- 1 x purple/blue box for plastic, glass, cans and cartons- every 2 weeks
- 1 x green box - every 2 weeks

3.23 The application is accompanied by the following key supporting documents:

- Arboricultural Survey – submitted 22/10/2020
- Car Parking Survey Report
- Design and Access Statement – submitted 22/10/2020
- FAQ sheet
- Eco-grid details – submitted 22/10/2020
- Transport Assessment
- Tree description table – submitted 22/10/2020
- Typical bin store – CGI – submitted 22/10/2020

3.24 The application has been subject to two rounds of amended plans since the original submission. The first amendments sought to deal with the detailed positioning of bin stores and bollards as a number encroached onto highway land. The later set of amended plans sought to minimise the

impact on mature trees and also included more additional parking on green wedges around the site (instead of felling mature trees to provide space for the bin stores)

4. PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 Relevant planning history is summarised as follows:

14/P4165 - ALTERATIONS TO ELEVATIONS INCLUDING: NEW RENDERED CLADDING AND ROOF FINISHES; REPLACEMENT OF WINDOWS, BALCONY BALUSTRADES INCLUDING INSTALLATION OF DIVISION SCREENS AND RAILINGS; AND ASSOCIATED MINOR WORKS. Grant Permission subject to Conditions 30-12-2014.

15/P4305 - ERECTION OF 90 x RESIDENTIAL UNITS (CLASS C3), INVOLVING THE DEMOLITION OF 24 EXISTING RESIDENTIAL UNITS, ALTERATIONS TO THE ELEVATIONS OF RETAINED PROPERTIES AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW ESTATE ACCESS ROAD WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING COURTS AND CAR/CYCLE SPACES (CAR PARKING TO BE INCREASED FROM 310 SPACES TO 499 SPACES). NEW LANDSCAPING AND THE PROVISION OF WASTE STORAGE FACILITIES. Grant Permission Subject to Section 106 Obligation or any other enabling agreement. 20-11-2017

5. CONSULTATION

5.1 Press Notice, Standard 21-day site notice procedure and individual letters to neighbouring occupiers. Representations have been received from 43 address points, raising objection on the following grounds:

- Concerns regarding increased fly-tipping, vermin as bags of rubbish would be left around the bin stores when they become full.
- There is already a problem with fly-tipping and vermin and this proposal will worsen it, as it will send a signal that this is an acceptable place to leave rubbish.
- Visual impact of bin stores (ugly, unsightly and visually overwhelming). Bin stores should be discreetly cited, not displayed prominently.
- Visual impact is akin to a supermarket car park.
- The original character of the estate would be destroyed.
- The bins will be a target for graffiti
- Concerns that bins would not be maintained, emptied and cleaned regularly. Consequently, they will be centres of smells and offensive odours.
- Loss of outlook for residents.
- Bins should be cited further away from houses
- Noise disturbance from 24/7 use of the bin stores.
- The present refuse storage and collection system works perfectly well.
- Loss of valuable green space, mature trees and wildlife.
- Loss of valuable parking spaces and also informal parking spaces on verges and islands which would be removed.
- Suggestion that if the Council contractors have a problem getting round the corners of the various Closes that they use smaller vehicles so that the new bin stores are not necessary.

- Vehicular access will become more difficult with cars parked informally on the estate due to the lack of parking spaces.
- Devaluing of nearby residential properties
- Adverse impact on mental health and well-being
- Communal rubbish scheme was previously trialled at Shropshire Close and was removed as it did not work and resulted in fly-tipping.
- Similar bin stores have already been introduced on the Eastfields estate where these issues have ensued.
- Elderly and/or disabled people will struggle getting rubbish to the communal bins. Query whether an Equality Impact Assessment has been carried out?
- Bins would be difficult to access in icy weather carrying bags of rubbish.
- The majority of residents in the borough receive personal kerbside collection, why are we being treated differently?
- Recently a wooden enclosure has been erected around the bin store area in Shropshire Close- - it is being maintained and serviced far more regularly than would be possible for all the bin stores proposed (sometimes twice a day). This seems to be an attempt to disguise the failure of the Shropshire Close communal bin store experiment whilst the planning application is being considered. (Fly tipping continues to be a problem at Shropshire Close despite the recently erected enclosure and additional collections).
- Suggestion that stores be renovated and integral to the residential buildings with an access key given to each resident.
- If the application is approved there should be a reduction in Council Tax as residents will no longer benefit from rubbish being collected from their individual property.

5.2 A further objection was received following the submission of amended plans, objecting on the following additional grounds:

- Moat has not tried to reduce flytipping – secret cameras could be installed.

5.3 Steven Hammond MP asking that the views of his constituent is taken into account.

5.4 Siobhain McDonagh MP asking that the views of her constituents are taken into account.

5.5 In support of the application, the planning agent has set out the following:

Our application has considered the following factors:

- Due to the layout of the estate the bins located at the kerbside are sometimes difficult for the Waste collection service to make a collection.
- Many residents park their vehicles outside their properties which doesn't allow for space to the wheelie bins and hinders collection.
- Many houses have had garage conversions and are HMO's, others have enclosed porch areas reducing the frontage- this reduces the ability of houses to store rubbish within their properties until collection day.

- Having communal bins reduces the number and types of bins located outside an individual property therefore helping with the overall look of the area.
- Communal bins will help Merton Council meet their statutory recycling targets/ waste requirements.
- Communal bins will help promote social inclusion by providing equal access to convenient recycling for all residents.
- Communal bins will be collected weekly and householder bins would move to a fortnightly service, therefore by using the communal bin facility, the rubbish collection is maintained as once weekly for all property types.
- Some of the houses utilise the communal bin stores attached to the blocks- causing problems with overspill, collection/contamination /fires. Merton's proposed changes will exasperate the situation with the same number of bins for the houses for twice as long as at present and subsequent use of the bin stores for flats.

The applicant's proposed solution is a once weekly Communal for all homes.

5.6 Internal consultees:

5.7 LBM Tree and Landscape Officer:
Concerns raised in relation to loss of trees in the original submission.

Officer comment: The application has been amended and the proposal no longer results in the loss of any trees on site (whereas the original scheme proposed the loss of ten mature trees which make a valuable contribution to the character and quality of the area). Therefore, a re-planting condition would not now be necessary.

5.8 LBM Highway Officer:

No objection/comment on the plans

If required Merton can provide dropped kerbs at the applicant's expense to ease servicing of bin stores.

Any gates must not open over the public highway and any required dropped kerbs to facilitate access must be carried out by Merton Council.

(These comments are supported by the Council's Transport Planner)

5.9 LBM Waste Services:

Waste Services had worked with the applicant Moat Housing leading up to the submitted proposal. Several options were explored and the submitted proposal is deemed as the best option for the Pollards Hill Estate waste arrangement.

The submitted Design and Access Statement outlining the waste management arrangement is considered acceptable at this stage

- The submitted proposal shows that consideration has been given to the LBM Architect and New Build Guide.
- For the number of units, the proposed bin capacities are sufficient for once a week refuse and recycling collection service.

- Bin storage locations and vehicle swept path were considered and proposal is considered acceptable.

Waste services will work with developers at every stage to ensure the proposed waste arrangements are installed.

5.10 **External consultees:**

5.11 Metropolitan Police – Designing out Crime Officer:

The change in the layout and design of the bin stores from ‘refuse stores currently recessed in areas located at the rear of each block’ to the new proposed sites should be of benefit due to a greater chance of natural surveillance being provided.

The design and size of the bin stores should not provide the chance of seating and therefore the prospect of an antisocial gathering area. Also the stores and bins should be fire resistant.

There is no mention of what is to become of the existing recessed areas. These have the potential for criminal or ASB opportunities if left, and so these areas also need to be addressed.

Officer comment: The design of the bin store areas do not create opportunities for seating or loitering. The bins are of a fire resistant material. A condition is imposed to ensure that the existing bin stores are satisfactorily enclosed and ‘made good’. The agent has confirmed this is the intention and the condition will secure the relevant details.

6. POLICY CONTEXT

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

- 2. Achieving Sustainable development
- 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities
- 11. Making effective use of land
- 12. Achieving well-designed places
- 15. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

6.2 London Plan (2016)

- 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
- 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- 5.10 Urban greening
- 5.17 Waste capacity
- 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
- 6.13 Parking
- 7.2 An inclusive environment
- 7.3 Designing out crime
- 7.4 Local character
- 7.5 Public realm
- 7.6 Architecture
- 7.21 Trees and woodland

6.3 Merton Core Planning Strategy (July 2011)

- CS2 Mitcham Sub-Area
- CS11 Infrastructure
- CS13 Open Space, Nature Conservation, Leisure and Culture
- CS14 Design
- CS15 Climate Change

CS17	Waste Management
CS18	Active Transport
CS20	Parking, Servicing and Delivery

6.4 Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Map (July 2014)

DM D1	Urban design and the public realm
DM D2	Design considerations in all developments
DM O2	Nature Conservation, trees, hedges and landscape features
DM T1	Support for sustainable transport and active travel
DM T2	Transport impacts of development
DM T3	Car parking and servicing standards

6.5 Supplementary planning guidance.

London Sustainable Design and Construction - SPG 2014
 London Character and Context SPG - 2014
 Merton's Design SPG 2004
 London Borough of Merton Municipal Waste Management Strategy 2006 – 2021
 South London Waste Plan 2012
 Draft South London Waste Plan (2012-2036) (Initial consultation stage)
 LBM Waste and Recycling Storage Requirements (undated)
 Draft London Plan – Policy SI7 Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy

7. **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

7.1 Key Issues for consideration

7.1.1 The key issues in the assessment of this planning application are:

- Principle of development
- Design, visual impact, open space and trees
- Impact on residential amenity
- Designing out crime considerations
- Transport and highway considerations

7.2 Principle of development

7.2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework 2019, London Plan 2016 policy 5.17 and the Council's Core Strategy policy CS17 seek to increase recycling rates and ensure that well-designed waste storage facilities, that will include recycling, are incorporated for new development where appropriate.

7.2.2 The existing bin storage on the site is problematic for a number of reasons. In terms of communal integrated bin stores:

- The spaces are not large enough to accommodate the amount of refuse required which has led to over filling and over-spill of rubbish.
- The spaces are incorporated into the structure of existing residential buildings and fires have been an on-going concern.

7.2.3 In terms of bin storage for individual dwellings across the site, the vast majority of properties do not have ample space to accommodate the containers required (180 litre wheelie bin for refuse, 180 litre wheelie bin for recycling, 55 litre recycling box and 220 litre outdoor food bin). This has

resulted in what can be informally known as 'Bin Blight' whereby a proliferation of containers create clutter within the streetscene and detract from the character and amenities of the area. Due the sheer number of bin containers and the limited space for storage, it is difficult to accommodate these in an orderly neat manner despite the efforts of a number of residents to do so.

- 7.2.4 Therefore, officers acknowledge that in order to accommodate the refuse and recycling requirements of the Council going forward, additional bin storage across the site is required.
- 7.2.5 The principle of communal bin stores is accepted by officers, as there is insufficient space to provide for bin storage for individual properties across the estate.
- 7.2.6 A robust form of communal bin storage is, therefore, considered appropriate. However, unless communal bin storage is intensively monitored and regularly kept clean, it can be subject to waste spills and attract additional small-scale dumping / fly-tipping and vermin with negative visual amenity impacts. Therefore, the success of the scheme would depend heavily on rigorous management and maintenance.
- 7.2.7 The proposal is considered to be acceptable in principle subject to compliance with other Development Management policies.
- 7.2.8 The key issues will be the impact on the amenities of residents, the visual impact of the proposed bin stores (including encroachment into green space and loss of trees), designing out crime/Secure by Design considerations, access considerations and parking/highway considerations.

7.3 Design, visual impact, open space and trees

- 7.3.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that planning should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. London-wide planning policy advice in relation to design is found in the London Plan (2016), in Policy 7.4 - Local Character and 7.6 - Architecture. These policies state that Local Authorities should seek to ensure that developments promote high quality inclusive design, enhance the public realm, and seek to ensure that development promotes world class architecture and design.
- 7.3.2 Policy DM D2 seeks to ensure a high quality of design in all development, which relates 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. Core Planning Policy CS14 supports this SPP Policy.
- 7.3.3 It is noted that the opportunities for siting the proposed bin stores are restricted in terms of distances to dwellings and availability of space to accommodate the bin stores. Therefore, it is primarily the end of parking bays, some areas in the middle of parking bays and areas on green space which are identified for bin stores.
- 7.3.4 In general design and appearance terms, the bin stores proposed are considered to be acceptable. The bins would be substantial and would

stand at 1.85m in height, however, they would be spaced out around the estate, largely in areas already used for parking.

- 7.3.5 The bin stores would appear prominent in the streetscene, however, as a matter of judgement any limited visual intrusion is considered to be outweighed by the need for robust bin storage around the estate and the benefits derived from this to numerous residents.
- 7.3.6 Some of the proposed bin stores would be located on green space around the site. This space is not formally classified or given any policy protection under the Council's Sites and Policies Plan and comprises incidental open space that does not serve any formal recreational purpose. However, notwithstanding that, these spaces interspersed within the estate provide some visual relief and greening.
- 7.3.7 The limitations in terms of options for siting the bin stores are noted, given the need to be close to residential properties. It is noted that the applicant has made efforts to re-design the proposed layout to ensure that the mature trees within the car park areas are not lost.
- 7.3.8 Officers acknowledge that the proposals would alter the character of the area. However, on balance, the benefit of providing the bin stores and providing a refuse strategy for the estate is considered to outweigh any harm that may be considered to arise.
- 7.3.9 It is also of note that the site currently experiences fly-tipping and that the bin stores are intended to reduce the occurrences of this, which would improve the character of the area. In order to ensure good practice in terms of the use of the bin stores, it is important to have clear signage and sufficient storage space. With no clear signage or instructions communal bin stores can be susceptible to mis-use and contamination of recycling streams.
- 7.3.10 The current proposal has been planned to ensure that there is sufficient space for residents' requirements along with clear indications for the use of the bins and therefore, subject to proper on-going maintenance, there is no reason to indicate that the bin stores would suffer from mis-use or overflowing bins (as has been the case with the limited and more sporadic communal bin storage on the site currently).
- 7.3.11 Whilst not detailed explicitly in the submission, the existing recesses, which have been used to accommodate bin storage have a significant deleterious effect on the quality of the estate currently, with over-spilling rubbish, mismatching refuse containers and fire damage. The removal of these recessed areas will be of a benefit to the estate as a whole. This matter is intended to be dealt with by way of condition, to ensure that the recessed areas are sufficiently 'made good' and access is removed. The agent has indicated that the intention is to block off these recessed areas to prevent access and to ensure a satisfactory appearance.
- 7.3.12 The proposal is considered to strike a suitable balance between protecting the visual characteristics of the area and providing a much needed refuse strategy for the estate.
- 7.3.13 A number of issues are addressed below on 'the impact on residential amenity and environmental impact'

7.4 Impact on residential amenity and environmental impact

7.4.1 Policy DM D2 seeks to ensure that development does not adversely impact on the amenity of nearby residential properties and that the living conditions of existing and future occupiers are not unduly diminished.

7.4.2 It is noted that a number of objection letters have been received. A clear theme emerging from the objection letters is that there are significant concerns regarding the loss of the existing bin storage arrangements for individual households and a concern that the site would be subject to a much greater level of fly-tipping than it currently experiences.

7.4.3 Officers acknowledge that there are problems associated with communal bin storage as opposed to individual bin storage, due to a lack of individual responsibility for managing waste in communal waste areas.

7.4.4 In general, communal bin stores are often poorly managed. Once a bin store starts to look uncared for, people can be inclined to leave their waste either on the ground or in the wrong bins. Poorly maintained areas that smell, are contaminated by spills and generally not cleaned quickly can encourage anti-social behaviour and a lack of pride or care. It is important to maintain these areas to a high standard. It would appear that the communal bin store at Shropshire Close has not benefitted from an intensive management regime for the majority of the time it has been used.

7.4.5 The management and maintenance of the bin storage facilities will be critical in ensuring the success of the scheme.

7.4.6 The application details the position of bin stores in order to demonstrate that access is possible, however, in order to ensure that the rubbish/recycling scheme performs highly officers recommend that a pre-commencement condition to secure a Refuse and Recycling Operational Waste Plan (RROWP) to secure details of mitigation and management measures to include the following:

- Details of the frequency of collections.
- Schedule of on-going maintenance and cleaning.
- Fully accessible multi-channel communications and signage to support management and encourage desired recycling behaviours
- Contractual agreements with residents that include clear obligations on management of waste and use of facilities.
- Facilities and systems that support the collection and reporting of waste management information to help identify and address performance issues.
- Provision of communications and signage that is easily understood by different nationalities with varying proficiency in the English language.
- Contingency arrangements should be made in case the waste collector does not pick up waste, for example during the Christmas period. The estate managers should agree actual collection cycles and servicing arrangements with the waste collection authority as part of the condition discharge process.

7.4.7 In addition to effective on-going management and monitoring it will be necessary to ensure effective user engagement. Officers recommend a pre-commencement condition to secure a user engagement plan to cover the following matters:

- Users need to be clearly informed as to how to use the service that is provided. This includes what waste materials go where and how they should be presented. Instructions should be made available within the residential unit. Each time a new resident occupies a unit they should be provided with clear instructions and ideally a face to face induction. Depending on the waste management arrangements, user instructions may need to be tailored 'block by block' and include details of:
 - The location of bin store areas. (potentially including a map of the location of the bin store);
 - Materials that are accepted and not accepted in each type of bin;
 - Arrangements for depositing of any bulky waste.
 - Clear user instructions on the property website (if applicable);
 - Engagement by site management / facilities management staff.
- Details of signage in and around the container storage areas and within residential buildings. As a minimum all signs should:
 - be constructed from a durable material such as metal or rigid plastic;
 - be clear and use icons and images rather than words (English may not be the first language for some residents);
 - be appropriately located on or above waste/recycling containers, on the door of a container storage area etc.;
 - include information about food waste.

7.4.8 The layout and design of the proposed bin stores has the potential to result in a more effective refuse and recycling management system on site than currently exists. However, in order to ensure that the facility operates effectively officers recommend that details of the on-going management be secured by way of condition.

7.4.9 It is noted that there is a substantial level of objection to the proposed bin store arrangements. A large proportion of the objection letters cite concerns with the management of the bin stores and the potential for fly-tipping, vermin and other environmental issues that can be associated with communal bin storage. These concerns have been carefully considered and it is concluded that the effective management of the bin stores is critical to the success of the project. As set out above, a management program is intended to be secured by way of condition.

7.4.10 In addition, a number of residents have raised concern that they do not wish to change from individual bin storage to communal bin storage, for a variety of reasons. It is noted that a number of residents will have had the benefit of individual bin storage for a number of years and understandably do not wish to have to transport refuse from their door to a communal bin store. However, for the reasons set out by the applicant relating to the need for additional refuse/recycling receptacles, it is recognised that there is very limited opportunity for storing the required containers at each property and an estate wide approach is not objectionable in planning terms. For clarity, the applicant has confirmed that additional services will be made available for those with mobility issues (who cannot easily access the proposed communal bins), details of this will be secured by way of condition through the management program.

7.4.11 It is noted that the proposals do not include controlled access to the bin stores. Controlled access can be secured by way of condition that it ensures access to the bin

stores is by residents only. However, given the inherent difficulties in the practicalities of this arrangement, which include on-going management, provision of keys or fobs where it may not be realistic to assume that keys or codes would be reliably carried, it is considered that controlled access may not be beneficial to the effectiveness of the scheme.

7.4.12 Subject to condition, no overriding concern is raised in relation to the remainder of the proposals in terms of the impact on neighbouring amenity.

7.8 Transport, highway network, parking and sustainable travel.

7.8.1 Policy 6.1 of the London Plan (2016) states that the Mayor will support developments, which generate high levels of trips at locations with high levels of public transport accessibility and which improves the capacity and accessibility of public transport, walking and cycling. At a local level Policy CS.19 of the Core Planning Strategy states that the council will ensure that all major development demonstrates the public transport impact through transport assessments. Travel plans will also be required to accompany all major developments. Policy CS.18 promotes active transport and encourages design that provides attractive, safe, covered cycle storage, cycle parking and other facilities (such as showers, bike cages and lockers).

7.8.2 The application is accompanied by detailed vehicle swept path analysis drawings which shows that the proposed bin stores can be adequately accessed and no objection is raised in this regard.

7.8.3 The proposal would result in a significant uplift in car parking spaces across the site and whilst Transport for London guidance seeks to promote alternative modes of transport, given the very low PTAL rating of the site and the existing problems caused by overspill and informal parking across the estate, it is considered that the additional car parking spaces are warranted and justified and therefore officers raise no objection on this basis.

8. Conclusion

8.1 The requirement for recycling and food waste disposal through the Council's recent changes to refuse collection are such that the continued use of individual bin stores across the estate would exacerbate an existing problem with bin blight. Therefore, the need for a comprehensive refuse/recycling strategy is considered necessary.

8.2 It is noted that the proposals will result in a number of residents who currently have individual bin storage, to lose this benefit and be required to use the communal bins. However, it is noted that additional assistance will be provided for those with mobility issues.

8.3 The overall benefit to the appearance and function of the estate, along with the actual benefits of increasing recycling rates are such that on balance, officers recommend that permission be granted. Given the degree to which Moat Housing can manage communal facilities such as this across the wider estate the application of suitable safeguarding conditions relating to the management of the bin stores is considered to be pragmatic and enforceable.

Grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Time limit
2. Approved Plans
3. H04 Provision of Vehicle Parking including geo-grid installation
4. Non Standard Condition – Management program for use of bin stores (including collection timetables, maintenance, cleaning, assistance for those with limited mobility and signage etc.)
5. H14 Doors/Gates – not to open over highway land
6. Non Standard Condition – Scheme to make good existing recessed bin stores
7. D11 Construction Times

Informative: LBM Highways to carry out dropped kerb works.

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

10 December 2020

<u>UPRN</u>	<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>Item No: 10</u> <u>DATE VALID</u>
48086475	20/P0945	22/09/2020
Address/Site:	Land on south side of road Wyke Road Raynes Park London	
Ward:	Raynes Park	
Proposal:	Erection of 2 x part-3, part-4 storey buildings comprising 9 x self-contained dwellings with 8 off-street car parking spaces, highway works and associated landscaping. Proposals include a land transfer to re-provide 18 CPZ parking spaces.	
Drawing No.'s:	507 PL(0)100 Rev J; 507 PL(A)103 Rev J; 507 PL(A)104 Rev H; 507 PL(A)105 Rev H; 507 PL(A)106; 507 PL(H)103 Rev I; PL(H)104 Rev G; 507 PL(H)105 Rev F; 507 PL(H)106 Rev H; 507 PL(H)107 Rev F; PL(0)120 Rev D; PL(SK)01 Rev C; PL(0)110 Rev C; PL(A)110 Rev B; PL(H)110 Rev B; 19061 004 Rev C.	
Contact Officer:	Tony Smith (020 8545 3144)	

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to the completion of a S106 agreement and conditions.

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- S106: Yes
- 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: 181
- External consultations: 3
- Conservation area: No
- Listed building: No
- Tree protection orders: No
- Controlled Parking Zone: Yes (Zone RPE)
- Flood zone: No (but known for surface flooding)
- Town centre: Partially (western end within Raynes Park Town Centre)
- Site of importance for nature conservation (SINC): Yes
- Green corridor: Yes

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is being brought to the Planning Applications Committee for determination due to the number of objections received.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site is a section of land positioned along the southern side of Wyke Road, nestled between the road and a railway embankment which borders the site to the south. The site is narrow and elongated, running in an approximate southwest to northeast direction, it is approximately 200m in length and ranges from 2.5m in width at the southwest end, increasing to around 6.3-6.6m near the middle and reducing to approximately 5m at the north-eastern end. The site is currently vacant of development, the majority of the site comprises overgrown vegetation while the south-western end is used for informal parking; however, it is noted that this area is zoned as a 'no parking area'.
- 2.2 Wyke Road serves Langham Court and provides a connection between Langham Road and Pepys Road. Wyke Road (including the pavements on both sides) is on average, approximately 9m wide. The north side of the road is characterised by extensive vegetation and mature trees; there is also a mature street tree on the south side of the road immediately in front of the site. Along the southern side of Wyke Road, immediately in front of the site, are parking spaces which straddle the pavement – these spaces are part of a CPZ.
- 2.3 To the south of the site is a railway embankment which rises to a height of approximately 5-5.5m, immediately beyond which are railway tracks. To the north, of the north-eastern end of the site (across Wyke Road), is Langham Court, a part 5, part 6 storey block of flats. The main block of Langham Court is setback from the Wyke Road some 18m; at either end of Langham Court, two 5 storey wings extend toward Wyke Road to within a distance of 5-6m. To the north, of the south-western end of the site, are 3 storey blocks of flats, and a single storey car workshop at the south-western most point.
- 2.4 The site is a green corridor and a site of importance for nature conservation (SINC), owing to the fact it adjoins railway land. The site is located within a CPZ and has a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) ranging from 4 to 5 (0 being the lowest and 6b being the best). The southwestern end of the site is located within the Raynes Park town centre. While the site is not within a designated flood risk zone, it is known to suffer from surface water flooding. The site is not located within a conservation area and does not contain any heritage assets.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 Erection of 2 x part-3, part-4 storey buildings comprising 9 x self-contained dwellings with 8 off-street car parking spaces, highway works and land transfer to re-provide 18 CPZ parking spaces, and associated landscaping.
- 3.2 The proposal comprises two part-three, part-four storey buildings to be erected towards the eastern section of the site, opposite Langham Court. The buildings would have regular footprints, abutting the pavement to the front of the site and infilling the space to the rear boundary. The buildings would have a separation of 11.5m – 22m between them and a separation ranging from approximately 11.5 to 14.5m to the train tracks to the south. From the western block of flats to the closest residential property (Langham

Court) is approximately 16m at the closest point. From the eastern block of flats to Langham Court is approximately 15m at the closest point.

- 3.3 The buildings would be of a modern contemporary appearance, making use of a mixture of traditional London stock brickwork and patterned metal cladding and window surrounds, together with cantilevered elements, timber fins and green roofs. The blocks of flats would comprise regular window openings fronting the street with the front façades being detailed through sections of brickwork and cladding with the larger block being separated by a central column of vertical timber fins/glazing serving the stair core and ground floor lobby and refuse/cycle stores. The ground floors would incorporate timber fins along their length. Balconies would be situated to the ends of the buildings with
- 3.4 The buildings would provide for a total of 9 self-contained dwellings, each with private external amenity spaces. Access would be via a communal entrance on the ground floor facing the street. 8 private parking spaces would be provided for occupiers of the development along with hard and soft landscaping.

Unit	Type	GIA	Private Amenity
Flat 1	2 Bed / 4 Person	87m ²	13m ²
Flat 2	2 Bed / 4 Person	87m ²	13m ²
Flat 3	2 Bed / 4 Person	87m ²	13m ²
Flat 4	2 Bed / 4 Person	87m ²	13m ²
Flat 5	2 Bed / 4 Person	87m ²	13m ²
Flat 6	2 Bed / 4 Person	87m ²	13m ²
Flat 7	1 Bed / 2 Person	53m ²	13m ²
Flat 8	2 Bed / 4 Person	73m ²	13m ²
Flat 9	3 Bed / 6 Person	140m ²	13m ²

- 3.5 The proposal would require the removal of 18 on-street CPZ parking spaces to allow the introduction of a formal footway along this side of Wyke Road. The 18 spaces would be re-provided to the western end of the site with 15 perpendicular spaces served by a vehicle crossover together with 3 parallel on-street spaces.
- 3.6 The proposed buildings would have the following dimensions:

Apartment block 1

- Length: 32m ground floor, 42.5m upper floors
- Width: 5.7m
- Height: 14.9m

Apartment block 2

- Length: 25m
- Width: 4.5 – 5.6m
- Height: 15.3m

3.7 Amendments:

It should be noted that the application has been amended since submission, incorporating the following changes:

- Changes in design to break up massing and create active frontage
- Replacement of 5 bedroom dwellinghouse with a block of 3 flats
- Changes to CPZ parking layout and footway design

- Details of vehicles charging points for private parking

4. PLANNING HISTORY

The planning history of the site is detailed below:

- 4.1 86/P0867: Erection of two three storey blocks to provide 12 studio flats with 12 garages and 12 open parking spaces – Refused.

Reasons:

1) The proposed development would result in an unsatisfactory living environment for the occupiers of the flats by reason of excessive noise from the adjacent railway.

2) The site is not suitable or appropriate for residential development as proposed by reason of its narrow shape and close proximity to the railway embankment and the proposed three storey buildings would appear as a cramped and incongruous form of development out of character with the general pattern of development in this area.

- 4.2 87/P0686: Outline application for the erection of office buildings comprising 540 m. sq. of floor area together with the erection of 12 lock-up garages – Refused.

Reasons:

1) The proposed development would be contrary to Policy P4.20 of the Merton Borough Plan.

2) The site is not suited to office development as proposed by reason of its location within a predominantly residential area, the narrow shape of the site, and the poor working environment likely to arise so close to a busy railway.

3) By reason of the long, narrow shape of the site, the development by the erection of a building or buildings comprising 540 sq.m. of offices is likely to appear cramped and incongruous and out of character with the general pattern and layout of the surrounding area.

- 4.3 87/P1143: Outline application for the erection of buildings comprising 12 one person flats 12 parking spaces and 12 garages – Refused.

Reasons:

1) The proposal would result in an unsatisfactory living environment for the occupiers of the flats, by reason of excessive noise from the adjacent railway.

2) The site is not suitable or appropriate for residential development, by reason of its narrow shape and close proximity to the railway embankment and any new buildings would be likely to appear as cramped and incongruous forms of development, out of character with the general pattern of development in this area.

- 4.4 87/P1468: Erection of buildings to form a medical centre comprising surgeries for doctor dentist chiropodist and veterinary surgeon – Refused.

Reasons:

1) The erection of buildings comprising 400 m2 Medical centre on this long narrow site will appear cramped, incongruous and out of character with the general pattern and layout of development in the surrounding area.

2) The proposal would conflict with the views expressed by a Department of Environment Inspector in dismissing an appeal (APP/T5720/A/86/061201/P5) for residential development on this site.

3) Insufficient information has been provided to enable assessment of the parking provision in relation to the Local Planning Authority's requirements.

- 4.5 89/P0005: Outline application for the erection of office buildings comprising approximately 540 sq.m gross floor area together with the provision of car parking spaces – Granted.
- 4.6 89/P1199: Erection of a two-storey building comprising 612 square metres for use as offices together with the provision of 25 car parking spaces – Granted.
- 4.7 91/P0898: Use of site for the display and sale of motor vehicles – Refused.

Reasons:

1) The proposal is unacceptable in that the vehicle movements associated with the use would be prejudicial to the free flow of traffic and to highway safety contrary to Policy S.16 of the Unitary Development Plan Draft for Public Consultation.

2) The proposal would be likely to lead to an increase in the undesirable practice of kerbside parking in the locality which would be prejudicial to highway safety and damaging to the amenities of adjoining residents contrary to policies M.40 and S.16 of the Unitary Development Plan Draft for Public Consultation.

- 4.8 95/P0468: Erection of a two storey b1 office building with 12 off-street car parking spaces – Granted.
- 4.9 10/P2500: Erection of two-storey office building (class b1) with off-street parking and associated facilities – Undetermined.
- 4.10 13/P2080: Construction of a new car park including formation of a new vehicular crossover – Refused.

Reasons:

1) The proposed new formalised parking area, by virtue of its substandard layout and lack of management strategy, would result in development detrimental to pedestrian and highway safety and as such, is contrary to policy CS 20 of the London Borough of Merton Core Strategy - 2011.

2) The proposed new formalised parking area would result in development detrimental to a Green Corridor and Borough SINC and for which insufficient mitigation measures have been provided. As such, the proposed development is contrary to policy NE.8 of the London Borough of Merton UDP - 2003, policy CS 13 of the London Borough of Merton Core Strategy - 2011, policy 7.19 of the London Plan - 2011, and the National Planning Policy Framework - 2012.

- 4.11 15/P2530: Erection of 6 x 2 bed dwellinghouse arranged in 3 pairs of semi-detached units – Refused and appeal dismissed.

Reasons:

1) The proposed development would constitute a cramped form of development that would lack adequate amenity space provision and would provide a poor quality living environment contrary to policies DM D2 and DM EP2 of the Merton Sites and Police Plan (July 2014).

2) The proposed development would fail to contribute to meeting affordable housing targets and in the absence of a legal undertaking securing a financial

contribution towards delivering affordable housing off-site, would be contrary to policy CS8 of Merton's Adopted LDF Core Planning Strategy (July 2011).

Officers note that at paragraph 11 of the Inspector's decision letter it was observed that "in addition to the high noise levels there would be a near constant number of trains passing by within the day. At the time of my site visit I noted 11 trains passing the appeal site within a fifteen minute period. This is supported by the EAVA which noted 732 trains passing throughout the day time period".

The Inspector concluded "in my view, such a high frequency of trains with excessive noise levels would significantly detract from the occupier's enjoyment of their garden space". While the Inspector "found the proposal to be acceptable in some respects" they stated the following regarding the suitability of family sized units and their respective gardens: "for the reasons above I conclude that it would not provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers with regard to garden space and noise and disturbance within the garden. It would therefore be contrary to Policies DM D2 and DM EP2 of the SSSP".

At paragraph 14 the decision letter observes "high noise levels could be sufficiently mitigated in the day and night" before going on to conclude that "the proposed development would be significantly harmful to the living conditions of its future occupiers".

- 4.12 17/P0609: Construction of three, 3 storey apartment blocks comprising 9 x 1 bedroom flats – Refused.

Reason:

The proposals would fail to deliver a layout that would provide for the safety of pedestrians and other highway users other than by a significant loss of on street parking that would, in conjunction with the absence of a legal undertaking to restrict future occupiers from being eligible for parking permits in the surrounding Controlled Parking Zone, contribute significantly to parking pressure locally and to the detriment of the safe and efficient operation of the highway and those using it. The proposals would have an unacceptable impact on kerbside parking pressure locally, and the safe and efficient operation of the highway, contrary to policies 6.3, 6.10 and 7.2 of the London Plan (2016), policy CS 20 of the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011) and policies DM.D2 and DM.T2 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014).

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1 Public consultation was undertaken by way of site notice and letters sent to neighbouring properties and a second round of consultation was undertaken following amendments to the scheme. The outcome of the combined consultation is summarised as follows:
- 5.2 Objections were received from 105 individuals which raised the following concerns about the development:
- Loss of light
 - Loss of outlook / visual intrusion
 - Increased overlooking
 - Lack of privacy for ground floor units
 - Small amenity areas

- Increased congestion
- Historical flooding and drainage issues
- Concern of lighting on habitats
- Loss of trees and associated vista
- Land is too narrow for the development
- Unsuitable living conditions given noise and vibration from trains
- Excessive scale
- Inappropriate architectural forms
- Impact to green corridor
- Loss of wildlife/habitat/biodiversity
- Devaluation of surrounding properties
- Concern regarding the existing street tree
- Increased parking along road is not required
- Increased parking pressure
- Increased pollution
- Impact to future Crossrail 2 plans
- Emergency vehicle access

External comments were received which are summarised below:

The Wimbledon Society: Objection. Potential for Crossrail 2 and future land requirements. Green roof/walls would be welcomed. Small amenity areas for flats. Private parking would not be required due to PTAL and proximity to Raynes Park station. Potential for noise ingress. PV panels would reduce energy use. Privacy of ground floor rooms. Dwellinghouse living room would be dark.

Residents Association of West Wimbledon: Objection. The site is designated as a SINC and Green Corridor and would result in the loss of 25 trees. Removal of trees will impact upon wildlife. The dwellings and garden spaces would suffer noise due to proximity to railway. Privacy of ground floors and lack of bathroom window. Lack of appropriate architectural form. Loss of amenity to Langham Court through overlooking and visual intrusion.

Langham Court Residents' Association: Objection. Visual intrusion and loss of privacy, especially during winter. Loss of trees and impact to wildlife. Increase in air pollution. Impact of noise and vibration on upon future occupiers. Potential for Crossrail 2. Windows facing pavement. Inappropriate architectural forms. Private parking is not required due to PTAL and the CPZ spaces should be reduced.

Network Rail: Objection. The development would breach existing covenants on the land which restricts buildings within 1.5m of the boundary and requires approval from Network Rail for any works or erections of buildings on land. There is a right of entry for Network Rail to enter the property for maintenance, repair etc. and this would not be possible.

Tree Wardens Group Merton: Objection. Proposal extends into street tree canopy and root protection. Required pruning would damage the natural form of tree and increased costs. The trees to be removed could mature into high value trees. Unlikely that the one tree has Ash Die Back Disease. SINC will be harmed.

Merton Centre for Independent Living: Existing disabled parking should be moved to safer position. Suggestion for 2-3 disabled bays rather than 1. Bend in footway could cause issues for people with visual impairments. Suggestion to pedestrianise Wyke Road or make it a low traffic neighbourhood. Request for electric charging points for wheelchairs or mobility scooters. Safety vehicle crossovers and overhang of vehicles impeding footway. Width meets guidelines for disabled and mobility-impaired people but could be

increased in width. Concern of parking on pavements. Tree planting should not impact footway width. Impact on air quality from loss of trees. Dropped curbs should be flush. Concerns of Wyke Road and surrounding streets existing accessibility

Internal comments were received which are summarised below:

LBM Transport and Highways Officers: No objection. Advised that the development would provide adequate private and CPZ parking and would be unlikely to have a significant impact on the adjoining highway network. Advised that future occupiers should be restricted from obtaining parking permits for the CPZ and provided conditions relating to car and cycle parking, electric vehicle charging, construction logistics plan and refuse storage. Land transfer and works to the highway would need to be secured through a legal agreement, as well as a legal agreement to restrict occupiers from obtaining parking permits.

LBM Flood Risk Engineer: Advised that while the site is not located within a designated flood zone, it does suffer from surface water and sewer flooding. Found the drainage strategy to be adequate and recommended conditions for further details and restrictions on discharge of water.

LBM Environmental Health: Advised that the scheme could provide adequate protection from surrounding noise. Recommended conditions relating to noise mitigation, light spill, contamination and a construction method statement.

LBM Climate Change Officer: Advised that the scheme can achieve the relevant sustainability standards and that they should be secured by way of condition.

LBM Trees Officer: Advised that there is a street tree in close proximity to the proposal, albeit the root protection zone appears to be accounted for. The proposed planting scheme will make a positive contribution to the green amenities of the area. Advised conditions relating to the protection of existing trees and a full landscaping scheme.

6. POLICY CONTEXT

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

- 5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities
- 9. Promoting sustainable transport
- 11. Making effective use of land
- 12. Achieving well-designed places
- 14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- 15. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

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
- 5.1 Climate change mitigation
- 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- 5.10 Urban greening

- 5.11 Green roofs
 - 5.12 Flood risk management
 - 5.17 Waste capacity
 - 5.21 Contaminated land
 - 5.22 Hazardous substances and installations
 - 6.9 Cycling
 - 6.10 Walking
 - 6.12 Road network capacity
 - 6.13 Parking
 - 7.1 Lifetime Neighbourhoods
 - 7.2 An inclusive design
 - 7.3 Designing out crime
 - 7.4 Local character
 - 7.5 Public realm
 - 7.6 Architecture
 - 7.15 Reducing and managing noise, improving and enhancing the acoustic environment and promoting appropriate soundscapes
 - 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature
 - 7.21 Trees and woodlands
 - 8.2 Planning Obligations
 - 8.3 CIL
- 6.3 Merton Local Development Framework Core Strategy – 2011 (Core Strategy)
 Relevant policies include:
 CS 4 Raynes Park sub-area
 CS 7 Centres
 CS 8 Housing choice
 CS 9 Housing provision
 CS 11 Infrastructure
 CS 13 Open space and leisure
 CS 14 Design
 CS 15 Climate change
 CS 16 Flood risk management
 CS 17 Waste management
 CS 18 Transport
 CS 19 Public Transport
 CS 20 Parking servicing and delivery
- 6.4 Merton Sites and Policies Plan – 2014 (SPP)
 Relevant policies include:
 DM R1 Location and scale of development in Merton’s town centres
 DM H2 Housing mix
 DM D1 Urban Design
 DM D2 Design considerations
 DM EP 2 Reducing and mitigating noise
 DM O2 Nature conservation
 DM EP4 Pollutants
 DM T2 Transport impacts of development
 DM T3 Car parking and servicing standards
 DM T4 Transport infrastructure
- 6.5 Supplementary planning considerations
 London Housing SPG – 2016
 London Character and Context SPG -2014
 DCLG - Technical Housing Standards 2015

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 Material Considerations

The key issues in the assessment of this planning application are:

- Principle of development
- Need for additional housing
- Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the area
- Impact upon neighbouring amenity
- Standard of accommodation
- Transport, highway network, parking and sustainable travel
- Refuse storage and collection
- Sustainable design and construction
- Landscaping and impact upon trees and biodiversity
- Trees and landscaping
- Flood risk
- Site contamination

Principle of development

7.2 The National Planning Policy Framework 2019 and London Plan policies 3.3 & 3.5 promote sustainable development that encourages the development of additional dwellings at locations with good public transport accessibility. Policy 3.3 of the London Plan 2016 states that development plan policies should seek to identify new sources of land for residential development including intensification of housing provision through development at higher densities. Core Strategy policies CS8 & CS9 seek to encourage proposals for well-designed and conveniently located new housing that will create socially mixed and sustainable neighbourhoods through physical regeneration and effective use of space.

7.1 Officers acknowledge that the site offers an opportunity to be developed and that the earlier decisions raise both issues pertaining to the delivery of family housing in proximity to the railway lines and also various technical issues.

7.2 The 2015 scheme identified concerns regarding the likely poor quality of living environment, principally externally, for family sized dwellings with such concerns being supported by an inspector at appeal. The more recent scheme (17/P0609) addressed the issue of noise and family dwellings through the mix of smaller units, however, was refused for residential development due to the failure to provide for the safety of pedestrian and other highway users, other than through the loss of a significant amount of on-street parking within the CPZ. This, in conjunction with the lack of a legal undertaking to restrict future occupiers of the development from obtaining parking permits for the controlled parking zone, would contribute significantly to parking pressure locally together with the safe and efficient operation of the highway.

7.3 In order for the proposal to be acceptable, officers consider the scheme must successfully address the above. It should be noted that the applicant has engaged in discussions with Planning and Transport Officers at both pre-application and formal application stages in order to resolve traffic and parking issues further details of this are provided within the Transport & Parking section of the report below. Following amendments to the scheme to replace the large family dwellinghouse with higher density, smaller units, the scheme would also now address concerns on the suitability of family housing and associated garden spaces adjacent to the railway embankment.

7.4 The site is currently free of development, it is located within a residential area and has a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) ranging from 4 to 5 (0 being very poor and 6b being excellent). The site is an underutilised site which is considered to present

opportunities for a residential development and would result in an additional 9 residential units. The proposals would meet NPPF and London Plan objectives by contributing towards London Plan housing targets and the redevelopment of sites at higher densities within a sustainable location.

- 7.5 Given the above, it is considered that use of the land for more intensive residential purposes is acceptable in principle, subject to compliance with the relevant London Plan policies, Merton Local Development Framework Core Strategy, Merton Sites and Policies Plan and supplementary planning documents as detailed in the relevant sections below.
- 7.6 It is acknowledged that the scheme would not fall under a 'major' application given the number of units being below 10 and therefore there is not scope to require affordable housing at present. It is recognised that there may be the potential for the conversion of larger units into smaller flats, which would then bring the proposed occupancy to 10 units or more, and would normally trigger the requirement for a viability assessment. It is considered it would be reasonable to include a clause in the Section 106 that would require the submission of a viability and affordable housing assessment should the applicant seek to pursue any more units on the site.
- 7.7 Finally, it is noted that TFL and Network Rail have previously objected to development at the site on the basis that the site may be required for the delivery of Crossrail 2 in the future. Policies DM T4 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan and CS19 of Merton's Core Strategy seek to improve public transport and to safeguard land for the delivery of major public transport projects. However, there is an established procedure for safeguarding land for major transport projects and the site is not currently within a safeguarded area. Given there is no formal protection relating to the land for the delivery of Crossrail 2, the objections are considered to be unsubstantiated and it would be unreasonable to withhold planning permission for this reason. It is also noted that objections on the basis of a breach of covenant requirements have been made by Network Rail. Whilst planning permission may be granted, it is not an overriding right to build and other legal matters would need to be considered before any development can be undertaken. The applicant has been made aware of the covenants and is in conversation with Network Rail regarding these matters. As such, whilst there may be legal matters for the applicant to consider, these would not be a material planning consideration which should withhold the granting of permission.

Need for additional housing

- 7.8 Table 3.1 of the London Plan identifies that LBM has an annual housing target of 411 units, or 4,107 over the next ten years. However, this minimum target is set to increase significantly to 918 set out in the 'London Plan Examination in Public Panel Report Appendix: Panel Recommendations October 2019', due to be adopted next year. This significant increase will require a step change in housing delivery within the LBM.
- 7.9 The draft London Plan includes a significantly higher figure of 918 new homes annually. However, this is not yet adopted and full weight cannot be attributed to this figure.
- 7.10 Notwithstanding the fact that the Council has been able to meet current London Plan targets, against this evolving background, Officers consider that while the delivery of new dwellings via the optimisation of sites, this does not override the need for comprehensive scrutiny of the proposals to ensure compliance with the relevant London Plan policies, Merton Local Development Framework Core Strategy, Merton Sites and Policies Plan and supplementary planning documents.

- Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the area
- 7.11 Section 12 of the NPPF, London Plan policies 7.4 and 7.6, Core Strategy policy CS14 and SPP Policies DM D2 and DM D3 require well designed proposals which make a positive contribution to the public realm, are of the highest quality materials and design and which are appropriate in their context, thus they must respect the appearance, materials, scale, bulk, proportions and character of their surroundings. Paragraph 1.3.61 of the London Plan Housing SPG 2016 states that *fully optimising housing potential will necessitate high quality, innovative design to ensure new development successfully responds to challenges and opportunities presented on a particular site.*
- 7.12 The site is considered to be unique in that it is isolated from other development i.e. there is a railway embankment to the rear and there is no other development along the southern side of Wyke Road, thus it would not be 'read' together with surrounding buildings. There is therefore an opportunity to develop a unique design approach, appropriate to the unique characteristics of the site in this instance. It is within this context that the development should be considered. It is further noted that there is a part 5, part 6 storey art deco style building opposite the proposed development, namely, Langham Court.
- 7.13 The site is narrow and places a considerable constraint on the siting and massing of any development, with proposals required to extend close to the pavement to provide any meaningful buildings. Langham Court, opposite two of the blocks frames an open space with its set back main element and projecting wings towards the street. In the absence of a more traditional format of development on Wyke Road, the blocks resolve a number of design objectives pulling in different directions. It may be viewed as a continuation of framing the open space while at the same time not being of a bulk and scale that dominates the streetscene and the immediately adjoining pavement. When walking eastwards along Wyke road from the junction with Coombe lane, the flatted block would have little to reference in terms of design and massing on Wyke road itself, although the vehicle repair workshop abuts the pavement. It is considered that the design might reasonably be considered as completing this group of flats and provide a meaningful composition of buildings along the south side of Wyke Road
- 7.14 Given the aforementioned characteristics of the site, the surrounding development, the width of the Wyke Road and separation distances to Langham Court, it is considered that the site can comfortably accommodate buildings of the height proposed. It is noted that the bulk of the buildings are effectively broken up by the use of a recessed areas, a step down in building height, and a variety of materials, which provides a visual break in the building. The positioning and footprints of the proposed buildings are considered to make effective use of the site while allowing for an appropriate gap between the buildings. Given the above, and as a matter of judgement, Officers do not consider the development to be overbearing to the streetscene.
- 7.15 The scheme proposes a contemporary appearance, making use of a mixture of traditional London stock brickwork and patterned metal cladding and window surrounds, together with cantilevered elements, timber fins and green roofs. The design could add interest to the streetscene and deliver a good quality approach. The use of contrasting materials, recesses, horizontal separation between floors and a strong vertical alignment throughout the scheme successfully defines the individual façade elements, creating an interesting and high quality appearance with a strong vertical emphasis.
- 7.16 Whilst the proposal does not seek to replicate the surrounding development, it is considered to generally achieve a coherent, interesting and good quality design while also picking up important design principles to enclose space with Langham Court and

remaining subordinate as to not appear as overbearing. Given the development does not seek to create a single, isolated building, but rather an ensemble of two blocks, it is considered to achieve a semblance of its own character while harmonizing with its surroundings.

- 7.17 The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of the impact on the character of the area, in compliance with London Plan policies 7.4 and 7.6, Core Strategy policies CS13 & CS14 and SPP Policies DMD2, DMD3 and DMD4 in this regard.

Impact upon neighbouring amenity

- 7.18 London Plan policies 7.6 and 7.15 along with SPP policy DM D2 state 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 light spill/pollution, loss of light (sunlight and daylight), quality of living conditions, privacy, visual intrusion and noise.
- 7.19 Given the scale of the proposed development along with the separation distance to surrounding buildings, the proposal would comfortably pass the BRE “25 degree test” guidelines at the closest points of surrounding buildings. As such, the development would not be considered to result in undue visual intrusion or loss of daylight or sunlight.
- 7.20 The proposal is not considered to unduly impact upon neighbouring amenity in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy. Outlook to the rear would be toward railway land, to the sides would be within the site itself and to the front would be across Wyke Road, which is public space and separated sufficiently. Furthermore, it is recognised that there is considerable green screening in the form of mature trees to the front of Langham Court to provide an additional retention of privacy.
- 7.21 Subject to conditions, the proposal would therefore accord with London Plan policies 7.6 and 7.15 and Merton Sites and Policies Plan policy DM D2.

Standard of accommodation

- 7.22 Policies 3.5 and 3.8 of the London Plan 2016 state that housing developments are to be suitably accessible and should be of the highest quality internally and externally and should ensure that new development reflects the minimum internal space standards (specified as Gross Internal Areas) as set out in table 3.3 of the London Plan (amended March 2016) and the DCLG – Technical Housing Standards 2015.
- 7.23 Each of the proposed units would meet the minimum required GIA as set out in the Technical Housing Standards and would therefore comply with Core Strategy policies CS8 & CS9 and London Plan Policy 3.5. Furthermore, all of the units are serviced by windows and opening which are considered to offer suitable natural light, ventilation and outlook to prospective occupants in line with policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016), policy CS.14 of the Merton Core Planning Strategy (2011) and policy DM.D2 of the Merton Sites and Policies plan (2014). It is further noted that an acceptable level of privacy to each of the units would be maintained through the use of timber fins at ground floor to limit direct views into the unit, whilst still providing an appropriate outlook and access to light. A condition requiring further details on this is recommended to ensure the final design would be satisfactory to meet the above.
- 7.24 Given the proximity of the railway tracks, the consideration of noise and vibration and their potential to impact upon occupants of the scheme are of particular importance. Policies 7.6 and 7.15 of the London Plan and policy DM D2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan require developments to provide a suitable living environment for occupants in terms of noise. As such an Acoustic Design Statement was submitted

with the application to assess the impact of noise and vibration on the proposed development. The assessment was informed by noise levels measured at the site and found that the design of the development could achieve an internal acoustic environment that was within the relevant standards. In addition, it is recognised that the layout of the buildings places the hallway between the train tracks and the bedrooms, creating an additional level of noise mitigation to the most noise sensitive rooms, together with appropriate acoustic screening to the sides of balconies facing the railway.

- 7.25 LBM Environmental Health Officers have reviewed the proposals and find the approach and findings acceptable, however, recommend conditions requiring further details of the final scheme to be submitted and agreed prior to commencement to ensure that noise levels would be acceptable, particularly with regard to details of final mechanical ventilation systems. With regard to vibration, the assessment found that the potential for vibration would be below the threshold levels to require specific mitigation measures.
- 7.26 In accordance with the London Housing SPG, policy DMD2 of the Council's Sites and Policies Plan states that there should be 5sq.m of external space provided for 1 and 2 person flats with an extra square metre provided for each additional occupant. Each of the units would be provided with private external amenity spaces in the form of balconies at the ends of the buildings. The sizes of these spaces would exceed the minimum requirements as detailed above, and have been designed so as to minimise potential privacy issues between units.
- 7.27 As a whole, it is considered the proposal would offer an acceptable standard of accommodation to occupants.

Transport, highway network, parking and sustainable travel

- 7.28 London Plan policies 6.3 and 6.12, CS policies CS18 and CS20 and SPP policy DM T2 seek to reduce congestion of road networks, reduce conflict between walking and cycling, and other modes of transport, to increase safety and to not adversely effect on street parking or traffic management. London Plan policies 6.9, 6.10, 6.13, Core Strategy policy CS20 and SPP policies DM T1 and DM T3 seek to promote sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, electric charging points.
- 7.29 The LBM Transport Planner has reviewed this application and their comments are integrated into the assessment below.
- 7.30 The application site is within a CPZ and currently provide approximately 18 on-street car parking spaces along its length opposite Langham Court. This section of the road does not benefit from a formal footway due to the provision of said parking.
- 7.31 The previously refused planning application included reasons for refusal due to the failure to provide for the safety of pedestrian and other highway users, other than through the loss of a significant amount of this on-street parking within the CPZ. This, in conjunction with the lack of a legal undertaking to restrict future occupiers of the development from obtaining parking permits for the controlled parking zone, would have contributed significantly to parking pressure locally together with impeding safe and efficient operation of the highway.

Highway works and provision of CPZ parking

- 7.32 The proposals seek to address previous reasons for refusal through the re-provision of the 18 CPZ parking spaces, together with the introduction of a footway along the

edge of the site and the restriction of future occupiers from obtaining parking permits. The proposal would place 15 off-street and 3 on-street CPZ parking spaces to the west on land which would be transferred to the Council as dedicated highway land. Transport Officers find the proposed arrangement to be acceptable in terms of provision, size and layout. The parking bays are of a sufficient length and width to prevent the overhang of cars onto the footway and to allow normal movement when entering and exiting the highway. Swept path analysis also demonstrates that the retained parking bays on the opposite side of the street would not be impacted from proposed vehicle manoeuvres. The off-street spaces would be clustered in to groups of 5 spaces so as to reduce the length of the crossovers required and to maintain pedestrian safety through the inclusion of refuge points. The proposed footway which would run along the length of the site is considered to result in an appropriate and inclusive design due to its width and layout which provide an acceptable level of safety to disabled pedestrians. Conditions are recommended requiring further details of the above and their implementation and retention thereafter. These works would be also be secured through a Section 38 or 278 legal agreement with the Local Highway Authority; requiring all details to be agreed with the LHA, works to be undertaken by the Council, together with the developer agreeing to pay the associated costs of drawing up the agreement, the costs of the highway works and any monitoring fees.

7.33 Private parking

The proposal also includes 8 off-street vehicle spaces for the residents of the proposed dwellings. These are location between the buildings and are covered partially by the overhang of apartment block 1. Each of the spaces would have electric vehicle charging points. The proposed number and layout of the private parking is considered satisfactory and a condition is recommended requiring this to be implemented and retained thereafter. In order to safeguard parking pressure in the local area, it is also recommended to prevent future occupiers from obtaining parking permits for the CPZ which would be secured via a Section 106 legal agreement. As such, it is considered parking pressure would not be unduly impacted.

7.34 London Plan policy 6.9 and the London Housing SPG standard 20 require that developments provide dedicated, secure and covered cycle storage, with 1 space per one bedroom units and 2 spaces for all other sized units. The proposal would provide storage for cycles within the ground floor bin and bike stores of each building. It is considered the arrangement and capacity is acceptable and a condition is recommended requiring the implementation and retention of this.

7.35 Local residents raised concerns with the tight nature of the street and potential disruption from works. In order to ensure that construction does harmfully impact the normal operation of the highway, a condition is recommended requiring the provision of a demolition & construction method plan prior to works commencing.

Refuse storage

7.36 Appropriate refuse storage must be provided for developments in accordance with policy 5.17 of the London Plan and policy CS 17 of the Core Strategy.

7.37 The plans indicate dedicated refuse storage areas within each of the buildings for residents which are conveniently located and appropriate in size for the proposed occupancy. It is considered this arrangement would be acceptable and a condition will be included requiring the implementation and retention of the refuse stores.

Landscaping and impact upon trees and biodiversity

7.38 The site is a designated SINC and green corridor. NPPF section 15, London Plan policies 7.5, 7.19 and 7.21, CS policy CS13 and SPP policies DM D2, DM O2 seek to

ensure high quality landscaping to enhance the public realm, protect trees that significantly improve the public realm, to enhance biodiversity, encourage proposals to result in a net gain in biodiversity and to discourage proposal that result in harm to the environment, particularly on sites of recognised nature conservation.

- 7.39 The proposal would involve the protection of the London Plane street tree, which is considered to be 'high quality'; 24 category C and 1 category B tree would be removed which are considered to be of a poor quality. The scheme would incorporate new soft landscaping to areas not covered by buildings or parking spaces including trees, shrubs and/or hedges and grassed areas.
- 7.40 A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal has been undertaken for the site which found that some level of habitat would be lost as a result of the development; however, the green corridor would be maintained and the loss of habitat could be offset by the use of green roofs and replacement planting. In addition, the appraisal made a number of recommendations for the protection of species and for the enhancement of the biodiversity value of the site, these included: the removal of any non-native invasive species by a suitably qualified and licensed contractor; the use of green roofs and living walls; the protection of the London Plane street tree; the retention of the scrub and tree lines; to design any lighting in such a way as to not impact upon bats; to install bat boxes; to undertake a badger update survey; to retain as many trees as possible and to only remove trees outside of bird breeding season; to avoid disturbing deadwood piles with the potential to support stag beetles, or where necessary, to relocate deadwood piles to a suitable location; to use local native species in the landscaping scheme. LBM Tree Officers have reviewed the proposals and consider the methodology, findings and recommendations of the appraisals to be fair and reasonable and it is recommended to secure them by way of conditions.
- 7.41 An arboricultural impact assessment has also been provided as part of the application which outlays the scope of the works required including the removal/protection of certain trees. Additionally, a landscaping report/design has been provided. It is considered to the proposed landscape design would be sufficient and there would be opportunity to provide a good quality of landscaping to the site whilst adequately protecting the canopy and root of the mature tree. As such, a series of conditions are recommended to ensure that the development would have an acceptable impact on the biodiversity of the site and the retained trees and to ensure a high standard of proposed landscaping.
- 7.42 Subject to the aforementioned conditions, it is considered that the proposal would not unduly impact upon trees, ecology or biodiversity and it is considered that the landscaping scheme would make a positive contribution to the streetscene and green network.

Flood risk

- 7.43 NPPF policy 14, London Plan policy 5.12, policy CS16 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and Policies DMF1 and DMF2 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan seek to ensure developments are suitable in terms of drainage and impacts to flood risk on site and the surrounding areas.
- 7.44 The site is not designated as at risk from fluvial flooding, however, LBM Flood Risk Engineers note that the front of the site is at a high risk of surface water flooding and there has been historical flooding in this location. The site is currently undeveloped, being mostly made up of soft landscaping. The proposal would in would incorporate permeable paving and a SuDs system to reduce flood risk at the site. LBM Flood Risk Officers have reviewed the proposals and have raised no objection in this regard,

subject to conditions requiring further drainage details prior to the construction of the development.

Climate change, sustainable design and construction

- 7.45 London Plan policy 5.3 and CS policy CS13 & CS15 seek to ensure the highest standards of sustainability are achieved for developments which includes minimising carbon dioxide emissions, maximising recycling, sourcing materials with a low carbon footprint, ensuring urban greening and minimising the usage of resources such as water.
- 7.46 As per CS policy CS15, minor residential developments are required to achieve a 19% improvement on Part L of the Building Regulations 2013 and water consumption should not exceed 105 litres per person per day. Climate Change officers recommend to include a condition and informative which will require evidence to be submitted that a policy compliant scheme has been delivered prior to occupation.

Site contamination

- 7.47 London Plan Policy 5.21 and SPP policy DM EP4 state that developments should seek to minimise pollutants, reduce concentrations to levels that have minimal adverse effects on human or environment health and to ensure contamination is not spread.

Given the site's proximity to railway tracks and its existing use, LBM Environmental Health Officers were consulted with regards to contamination and remediation. Environmental Health Officers have reviewed the application and raise no objection to the scheme subject to conditions being attached requiring an investigation into potential contamination, and if necessary, a remediation scheme to be agreed and complied with prior to construction.

8. CONCLUSION

- 8.1 The site has an extensive planning history with various residential schemes having been resisted. Changes in planning policy since the first refusal in 1986 have seen a significant increase in pressure to deliver housing, and to explore innovative design solutions. Officers have interpreted the last appeal decision as signalling a resistance to more conventional family housing on the site but not necessarily non-family housing. Officers are therefore of the opinion that a non-family housing development is acceptable in principle given it would contribute toward London's housing stock and it is on an empty site which is within a residential area with excellent public transport links. The proposal has addressed reasons for refusal relating to the re-provision of existing controlled parking zone spaces without impacting upon the normal use of the highway and parking pressure locally.
- 8.2 The development is considered to respond well to the challenges and opportunities of the site; despite the numerous constraints of the site, creative solutions have been found which are considered to address all material planning considerations to a high standard. The development is considered to be high quality and to make a positive contribution to the streetscene. The development is not considered to unduly impact upon neighbouring amenity. The proposal would offer high quality living standards for prospective occupants. Subject to legal agreements, the proposal would not unduly impact upon the highway network, including parking pressure. The proposal would achieve suitable refuse provisions. It is considered that the proposal would achieve appropriate sustainable design and construction standards. The proposal would appropriately mitigate any impact upon biodiversity and provide a high quality landscaping scheme.

- 8.3 The proposal is considered to accord with the relevant National, Strategic and Local Planning policies and guidance and approval could reasonably be granted in this case. It is not considered that there are any other material considerations which would warrant a refusal of the application.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

Section 106 and 38/278 legal agreement:

1. Restrictions to prevent the future owner/occupiers of the development from being issued on-street parking permits within the surrounding Controlled Parking Zones;
2. The developer meeting the Council's costs for any work (both legal work and street works) associated with dedication of land as highway for the re-provision of 18 CPZ spaces, making adjustments to on street parking and footway arrangements, and, where necessary, pavement alignment and associated signage, along the south side of Wyke Road.
3. Affordable housing – viability review mechanisms if within 12 months of substantial completion permission is sought for any additional dwellings on the site
4. The developer agreeing to meet the Council's costs of preparing [including legal fees] the Section 106 Obligations [to be agreed by developer];
5. The developer agreeing to meet the Council's costs of monitoring the Section 106 Obligations [to be agreed by developer]

Conditions:

- 1) Standard condition [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.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 (as amended) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2) Standard condition [Approved plans]: The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: [Refer to the schedule on page 1 of this report].

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 3) Standard condition [Materials]: 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 timber fin screening, window frames and doors (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 protect the privacy of future occupiers in order 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) Standard condition [Refuse storage]: 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.

Reason: To ensure the provision of satisfactory facilities for the storage of refuse and recycling material and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 5.17 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS17 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM D2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

- 5) Standard condition [Cycle storage]: The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the 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.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory facilities for cycle parking are provided and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 6.13 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS18 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM T1 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

- 6) Non-standard condition [Sustainability]: No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until evidence has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority confirming that the development has achieved CO2 reductions not less than a 19% improvement on Part L of the Building Regulations 2013 and internal water usage of not more 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.

- 7) Amended standard condition [Demolition & Construction Method Statement]: No development shall take place until a Demolition and Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and is approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority to accommodate:

- Parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
- Loading and unloading of plant and materials
- Storage of construction plant and materials;
- The erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate
- Wheel cleaning facilities
- Measures to control the emission of dust, dirt, smell and other effluvia;
- Measures to control the emission of noise and vibration during construction/demolition
- Non road mobile machinery compliance
- A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works

The approved details must be implemented and complied with for the duration of the demolition and construction period.

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, 6.14 & 7.15 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM T2 & DM EP2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

- 8) Standard condition [Timing of construction]: 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.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the area and the occupiers of neighbouring properties and ensure compliance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.15 of the London Plan 2016 and policy DM EP2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

- 9) Standard condition [Vehicle parking]: The private vehicle parking areas (including electric vehicle charging points) shown on the approved plans shall be provided before first occupation of the flats hereby approved and shall be retained for parking purposes for 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.

- 10) Non-standard condition [Contamination]: A desktop study shall be undertaken to consider the potential for contaminated-land.

A) The completed desktop study shall identify any unacceptable risks to health and the built environment and shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the development other than demolition commences.

B) In the event that potential contaminants are identified by the study then a detailed remediation scheme for their removal in order to bring the site to a suitable state for the intended use shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

C) The applicant shall verify in writing that any detailed remediation scheme as may be approved by the local planning authority has been completed prior to the first occupation of the development.

Reason: To protect the health of future users of the site in accordance with policy 5.21 of the London Plan 2016 and policy DM EP4 of Merton's sites and policies plan 2014.

- 11) Non-standard condition [Remediation]: If remediation works are required pursuant to condition 10, they shall be completed and a verification report, demonstrating the effectiveness of the remediation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of the development.

Reason: To protect the health of future users of the site in accordance with policy 5.21 of the London Plan 2016 and policy DM EP4 of Merton's sites and policies plan 2014.

- 12) Non-standard condition [Drainage Scheme]: No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a detailed scheme for the provision of surface and foul water drainage has been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The drainage scheme will dispose of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) at the agreed runoff rate (no more than 1l/s, with no less than 52.5m³ of attenuation volume), in accordance with drainage hierarchy contained within the London Plan Policy (5.12, 5.13 and SPG) and the advice contained within the National SuDS Standards.

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

- 13) Non-standard condition [Permeable paving and green roof]: Prior to the commencement of development, the detailed design and specification for the permeable paving and green roofs shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The design shall be carried out as approved, retained and maintained by the applicant in perpetuity thereafter.

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

- 14) Amended standard condition [Tree protection]: The details and measures for the protection of the existing trees as specified in the approved document shall be complied with. The methods for the protection of the existing trees shall fully accord with all of the measures specified in the report and shall be installed prior to the commencement of any site works and shall remain in place until the conclusion of all site works.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing trees in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS13 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and 02 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

- 15) Standard condition [Site supervision]: The details of the Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan shall include the retention of an arboricultural expert to supervise, monitor and report to the LPA not less than monthly the status of all tree works and tree protection measures throughout the course of the construction period. At the conclusion of the construction period the arboricultural expert shall submit to the LPA a satisfactory completion statement to demonstrate compliance with the approved protection measures.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing retained trees in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS13 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DMO2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

- 16) Standard condition [Landscaping]: No development shall take place until full details of an updated landscaping and planting scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as

approved before the commencement of the use or the occupation of any building hereby approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include on a plan, full details of the size, species, spacing, quantities and location of proposed plants, together with any hard surfacing, means of enclosure, and indications of all existing trees, hedges and any other features to be retained, and measures for their protection during the course of development.

Reason: To enhance the appearance of the development in the interest of the amenities of the area, to ensure the provision sustainable drainage surfaces and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies 5.1, 7.5 and 7.21 of the London Plan 2016, policies CS13 and CS16 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2, DM F2 and DM O2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

- 17) Standard condition [Foundations]: No work shall be commenced until details of the proposed design, materials and method of construction of the foundations to be used within 10m of the existing retained trees shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing retained trees in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS13 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DMO2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

- 18) Non-standard condition [Ecological and biodiversity measures]: The development hereby authorised shall be carried out in accordance with the avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures recommended/proposed and follow the sequence of events set out in the submitted in the submitted 'Preliminary Ecological Appraisal', and those measures shall be in place prior to the first occupation of the development, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To mitigate and offset the impact of the development and to ensure a net gain in biodiversity and improvements to the visual amenity of the area, in accordance with NPPF section 15, London Plan 2016 policies 7.5, 7.19 and 7.21, Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 policy CS13 and Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014 policies DM D2 and DM O2.

- 19) Non-standard condition [Badger update survey]: Development shall not commence until a badger update survey has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All works shall be carried out in accordance with any details, measures, and recommendations of the approved survey and shall remain in place for the duration of the construction period, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the planning authority.

Reason: It is necessary for the condition to be discharged prior to the commencement of development to protect ecology of the site and to accord with NPPF section 15 and Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014 policy DM O2.

- 20) Non-standard condition [Lighting strategy]: Prior to the installation of any external lighting, an external lighting strategy shall be submitted in writing for approval to the Local Planning Authority. No works which are the subject of this condition shall be carried out until the scheme has been approved and those works shall be carried in accordance with the approved details. Page 60

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the area and the occupiers of neighbouring properties, to protect nature conservation in the area and to avoid an adverse impact on the operation of the adjacent train network, in accordance with policies DM D2 and DM EP4 and DM O2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

- 21) Non-standard condition [Noise levels]: Noise levels, (expressed as the equivalent continuous sound level) LAeq (15 minutes), any plant noise associated with the development shall not exceed LA90-10dB at the boundary with the nearest residential boundary not associated with the development.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the area and the occupiers of neighbouring properties and ensure compliance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.15 of the London Plan 2016 and policies DM D2, DM D3, DM EP2 and DM EP4 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

- 22) Non-standard condition [Noise mitigation]: Due to the potential impact of the surrounding locality on the residential development, a final scheme for protecting residents from noise shall be submitted to, agreed and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the development commencing. The scheme is to include 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 approved scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure a suitable living environment for occupants of the development and to comply with policies 7.6 and 7.15 of the London Plan 2016 and policy DM D2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

Informatives:

- 1) INFORMATIVE
In accordance with paragraphs 38 and 39 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019, The London Borough of Merton takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. The London Borough of Merton works with applicants or agents in a positive and proactive manner by suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome; and updating applicants or agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application. In this instance, the application has been amended following concerns from Officers and the Planning Committee considered the application where the applicant or agent had the opportunity to speak to the committee and promote the application.
- 2) INFORMATIVE
Carbon emissions evidence requirements for Post Construction stage assessments must provide:
- Detailed documentary evidence confirming the Target Emission Rate (TER), Dwelling Emission Rate (DER) and percentage improvement of DER over TER based on 'As Built' SAP outputs (i.e. dated outputs with accredited energy assessor name and registration number, assessment status, plot number and development address); **OR**, where applicable:
 - A copy of revised/final calculations as detailed in the assessment methodology based on 'As Built' SAP outputs; **AND**

- Confirmation of Fabric Energy Efficiency (FEE) performance where SAP section 16 allowances (i.e. CO2 emissions associated with appliances and cooking, and site-wide electricity generation technologies) have been included in the calculation
- 3) **INFORMATIVE**
Water efficiency evidence requirements for Post Construction Stage assessments must provide:
- Detailed documentary evidence representing the dwellings 'As Built'; showing:
 - The location, details and type of appliances/ fittings that use water in the dwelling (including any specific water reduction equipment with the capacity / flow rate of equipment); and
 - The location, size and details of any rainwater and grey-water collection systems provided for use in the dwelling; along with one of the following:
 - Water Efficiency Calculator for New Dwellings; **or**
 - Written confirmation from the developer that the appliances/fittings have been installed, as specified in the design stage detailed documentary evidence; **or**
 - Where different from design stage, provide revised Water Efficiency Calculator for New Dwellings and detailed documentary evidence (as listed above) representing the dwellings 'As Built'
- 4) **INFORMATIVE**
No surface water runoff should discharge onto the public highway including the public footway or highway. When it is proposed to connect to a public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required (contact no. 0845 850 2777).
- 5) **INFORMATIVE**
No waste material, including concrete, mortar, grout, plaster, fats, oils and chemicals shall be washed down on the highway or disposed of into the highway drainage system.
- 6) **INFORMATIVE**
Demolition of buildings and tree felling should avoid the bird nesting and bat roosting seasons. Anyone who takes, damages or destroys the nest of any wild bird whilst that nest is in use, or who kills, injures or disturbs bats, obstructs access to bat roosts or damages or disturbs bat roosts, even when unoccupied by bats, is guilty of an offence under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Buildings and trees should be inspected for bird nests and bat roosts prior to demolition or felling by an appropriately qualified person. If bats are found, Natural England should be contacted for advice.
- 7) **INFORMATIVE**
This permission creates one or more new units which will require a correct postal address. Please contact the Street Naming & Numbering Officer at the London Borough of Merton:

Street Naming and Numbering (Business Improvement Division)
Corporate Services
7th Floor, Merton Civic Centre
London Road
Morden
SM4 5DX
Email: street.naming@merton.gov.uk

- 8) **INFORMATIVE**
Highways must be contacted regarding costings for carriageway widening/formation of footway and new crossings proposed. (includes dedication of land to public highway). All works on the public highway are to be carried out by L B Merton and to Merton's specification. (Contact Martin Smith on 0208-5453136).

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee: Planning Applications

Date: 10th December 2020

Subject: Planning Appeal Decisions

Lead officer: Head of Sustainable Communities

Lead member: Chair, Planning Applications Committee

Recommendation:

That Members note the contents of the report.

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 For Members' information recent decisions made by Inspectors appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government in respect of recent Town Planning Appeals are set out below.
- 1.2 The relevant Inspectors decision letters are not attached to this report but can be viewed by following each individual link. Other agenda papers for this meeting can be viewed on the Committee Page of the Council Website via the following link:

[**LINK TO COMMITTEE PAGE**](#)

DETAILS

Application Number: 19/P3276

Appeal number: APP/T5720/W/19/3242324

Site: 58 New Close, Colliers Wood SW19 2SY

Development: conversion of existing house into 5 x self-contained flats (2 x 1 bed, 2 x 2 bed, 1 x 3 bed).

Appeal Decision: DISMISSED

Date of Appeal Decision: 13th November 2020

[**LINK TO DECISION**](#)

Application Number: 19/P4266

Appeal number: APP/T5720/W/20/3250706

Site: Abbey Wall Works, Station Road, Colliers Wood SW19 2LP

Development: demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of site to provide a part three, part five and part six storey block of 66 flats and a commercial unit (204 sqm) at ground floor level (comprising flexible A1 (excluding supermarket), A2, A3, B1, & D1 uses) and an associated landscaping, bin/cycle storage, parking, highway works and alterations to listed wall

Appeal Decision: **ALLOWED**

Date of Appeal Decision: 2nd November 2020

[LINK TO DECISION](#)

Application Number: 20/P0211

Appeal number: APP/T5720/W/20/3254983

Site: 10F Kings Road, Wimbledon SW19 8QN

Development: Formation of vehicular crossover and conversion of front garden into hardstanding

Appeal Decision: **ALLOWED**

Date of Appeal Decision: 11th November 2020

[LINK TO DECISION](#)

Application Number: 20/P1550

Appeal number: APP/T5720/D/20/3257457

Site: 416 Durnsford Road, Wimbledon Park SW19 8DZ

Development: Erection of a single storey rear extension

Appeal Decision: **ALLOWED**

Date of Appeal Decision: 9th November 2020

[LINK TO DECISION](#)

Application Number: 20/P0299

Appeal number: APP/T5720/D/20/3255869

Site: 19A Russell Road, Wimbledon SW19 1QN

Development: Erection of a two storey extension

Appeal Decision: DISMISSED

Costs Decision: REFUSED

Date of Appeal Decision: 9th November 2020

[LINK TO DECISION](#)

[COSTS DECISION](#)

Application Number: 19/E0279 (Enforcement appeal)

Appeal number: APP/T5720/C/19/3237112

Site: 76 Shaldon Drive, Morden SM4 4BH

Breach: Use of outbuilding as self-contained residential unit

Appeal Decision: DISMISSED (enforcement notice upheld)

Date of Appeal Decision: 04th November 2020

Alternative options

- 3.1 The appeal decision is final unless it is successfully challenged in the Courts. If a challenge is successful, the appeal decision will be quashed and the case returned to the Secretary of State for re-determination. It does not follow necessarily that the original appeal decision will be reversed when it is re-determined.
- 3.2 The Council may wish to consider taking legal advice before embarking on a challenge. The following applies: Under the provision of Section 288 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990, or Section 63 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, a person or an establishment who is aggrieved by a decision may seek to have it quashed by making an application to the High Court on the following grounds: -
 1. That the decision is not within the powers of the Act; or

2. That any of the relevant requirements have not been complied with; (relevant requirements means any requirements of the 1990 Act or of the Tribunal's Land Enquiries Act 1992, or of any Order, Regulation or Rule made under those Acts).

1 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN OR PROPOSED

- 1.1. None required for the purposes of this report.

2 TIMETABLE

- 2.1. N/A

3 FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1. There are financial implications for the Council in respect of appeal decisions where costs are awarded against the Council.

4 LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1. An Inspector's decision may be challenged in the High Court, within 6 weeks of the date of the decision letter (see above).

5 HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1. None for the purposes of this report.

6 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1. None for the purposes of this report.

7 RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1. See 6.1 above.

8 BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 8.1. The papers used to compile this report are the Council's Development Control service's Town Planning files relating to the sites referred to above and the agendas and minutes of the Planning Applications Committee where relevant.

Committee: Planning Applications Committee

Date: 10th December 2020

Agenda item:

Wards: All

Subject: PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - SUMMARY OF CURRENT CASES

Lead officer: HEAD OF SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES

Lead member: CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION, HOUSING AND
TRANSPORT COUNCILLOR MARTIN WHELTON

COUNCILLOR LINDA KIRBY, CHAIR, PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Contact Officer Ray Littlefield: 0208 545 3911
Ray.Littlefield@merton.gov.uk

Recommendation:

That Members note the contents of the report.

1. Purpose of report and executive summary

This report details a summary of casework being dealt with by the Planning Enforcement Team and contains figures of the number of different types of cases being progressed, with brief summaries of all new enforcement notices and the progress of all enforcement appeals.

Current Enforcement Cases:	470	¹ (468)	New Appeals:	(0)	(0)
New Complaints	33	(32)	Instructions to Legal	1	(0)
Cases Closed	29		Existing Appeals	2	(2)
No Breach:	21		<hr/>		
Breach Ceased:	8		TREE ISSUES		
NFA ² (see below):	0		Tree Applications Received	73	(135)
Total	29		% Determined within time limits:	41%	
New Enforcement Notices Issued			High Hedges Complaint	0	(0)
Breach of Condition Notice:	0		New Tree Preservation Orders (TPO)	1	(0)
New Enforcement Notice issued	0	(0)	Tree Replacement Notice	0	
S.215: ³	1		Tree/High Hedge Appeal	0	(0)
Others (PCN, TSN)	2	(3)			
Total	0	(0)			
Prosecutions: (instructed)	0	(0)			

Note (*figures are for the period from (4th November 2020 to 1st December 2020*). The figure for current enforcement cases was taken directly from M3 crystal report.

¹ Totals in brackets are previous month's figures

² confirmed breach but not expedient to take further action.

³ S215 Notice: Land Adversely Affecting Amenity of Neighbourhood.

2.0 New Enforcement Actions

193 London Road, CR4 2JD. This is concerning a s215 notice served on untidy land. A s215 notice was issued on 1st December 2020. This notice requires compliance at the end of February 2021 requiring the Land to be tidied up / cleared.

283 Galpins Road CR7 6EY. This is concerning a s215 notice served on untidy land. A s215 notice was issued on 23 December 2019. This notice required compliance at the end of February 2020 requiring the Land to be tidied up / cleared. Site visit arranged.

31 Edgehill Road, Mitcham, CR4 2HY. This is concerning a raised platform/garden that has been raised by approximately 90cm. An enforcement notice has been served to remove the raised platform and reduce the garden level by 90cm. The notice would have taken effect on 18/12/19, with a compliance date of 18/03/20, however an appeal has been submitted and is underway.

193 London Road CR4 2TJ. This is concerning untidy land to the side and rear of 193 London Road. An initial site visit was carried out, multiple letters have been sent to the property asking for compliance and for them to contact the Council to confirm a compliance schedule of works. Correspondence from the owner has been received. A further visit was made to confirm the site has not been tidied. The Land is actively being cleared.

155 Canterbury Road, Morden, SM4 6QG. This is concerning an outbuilding in the rear garden that has had a retrospective planning application refused. An enforcement notice has been served on the property for the outbuilding to be demolished, the notice would have taken effect on 9th December 2019 and the compliance period would have been two months. However it has now been appealed to the Planning Inspectorate. The appeal was dismissed by Decision letter dated 19th August 2020. The compliance date i.e. Demolish the unauthorised rear outbuilding is 19th December 2020.

208 Bishopsford Road, Morden, SM4 6DA. This is concerning the erection of a single storey rear extension onto an existing extension on the ground floor. A Planning Enforcement Notice has been issued requiring the demolition of the Extension. The Notice was issued on 4th October 2019, the Notice came into effect on 10th November 2019 with a compliance period of 3 months, unless an appeal was made before 10th November 2019. An appeal was submitted but rejected by the Planning Inspectorate as it was received by The Planning Inspectorate one day late. Compliance date was 10th February 2020. Further action is under consideration. A new planning application for a reduced structure is to be submitted.

The former laundry site, 1 Caxton Road, Wimbledon SW19 8SJ. Planning Permission was granted for 9 flats, with 609square metres of (Class B1) office units. 22 flats have been created. A Planning Enforcement Notice was issued on 11th October 2018 requiring either the demolition of the development or building to the approved scheme. The Notice took effect on 18th November 2018 with a compliance period of 12 calendar months. An appeal was made but subsequently withdrawn the following day. The owner decided to comply with the approved permission and is in the process of returning some the residential units back to their authorised office use. Bath and shower units have been removed; the office units are currently being advertised for let. The garage flat is no longer being used for residential and is in the process of being returned to a garage. Planning Application 19/P1527 for Discharge of Conditions has been submitted and is currently being considered. Revised scheme re-submitted and is currently under consideration.

Works are underway to expose the depth and boundary of the foundations in order to confirm an alternative landscaping scheme is feasible. A further scheme is under consideration. A finale inspection is to be undertaken as the requested works / Landscaping has now been carried out.

6 CARTMEL GARDENS, MORDEN SM4 6QN: (Notice 2) This is regarding a side extension not built in accordance with approved plans and being used as a self contained unit of accommodation. A planning Enforcement Notice was subsequently issued on 24th September 2019 and took effect on 24th October 2019. The Notice

requires the cessation of the use of side extension as separate self-contained unit, and the removal of all those fixtures and fittings that facilitate the unauthorised use of the extension including the permanent removal of the facilities in use for cooking facilities, kitchen unit, sink, worktop, appliances, and food preparation areas. This Notice has a compliance period of 3 calendar months. An appeal was submitted but subsequently withdrawn. A second Notice was subject of an appeal now determined.

Some Recent Enforcement Actions

7 Streatham Road, Mitcham, CR4 2AD

The Council served two enforcement notices on 6th June 2019, requiring the outbuilding to be demolished and to clear debris and all other related materials. The second enforcement notice is for an unauthorised front, side and rear (adjacent to Graham Road) dormer roof extensions. An appeal was lost for the dormers to be considered permitted development, the notice requires the owner to demolish the unauthorised front, side and rear roof dormer extensions (adjacent to Graham Road) and to clear debris and all other related materials. Both Notices came into effect on 8th July 2019 unless appeals were made before this date. No appeals were lodged.

The compliance date of the Enforcement Notice relating to the outbuilding to be demolished and to clear debris and all other related materials has now passed without compliance. The second enforcement notice was not complied with and now prosecution proceedings are being undertaken.

The plea hearing has now taken place at Lavender Hill Magistrates Court, where the defendant pleaded not guilty and the second hearing is due on the 14th January 2020.

A second hearing was held on 14th January 2020, and adjourned until 4th February 2020 in order for the defendant to seek further legal advice.

The defendant again appeared in court and pleaded not guilty, a trial date was set for 21st May 2020. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic this has been postponed. The case has been listed for a 'non-effective' hearing on Tuesday 14 July 2020, where a new trial date will be set.

This was postponed until another date yet to be given. The Council has now instructed external Counsel to prosecute in these matters.

The next 'non-effective' hearing date is 2nd October 2020. This date has been re-scheduled to 27th November 2020. This has again been re-scheduled to 4th January 2021.

6 CARTMEL GARDENS, MORDEN SM4 6QN: (Notice 1) This is regarding a side extension not built in accordance with approved plans. A planning Enforcement Notice was subsequently issued on 24th September 2019 and would have taken effect on 24th October 2019. The notice requires the demolition of the rear extension. This Notice has a compliance period of 3 calendar months. An Appeal was electronically submitted. This Appeal has now been determined by Decision letter dated 23rd June 2020. The Appeal was dismissed and the Enforcement Notice upheld. The compliance period is 3 months from the date of the Decision letter. Direct action is now under consideration.

183A Streatham Road CR4 2AG. An Enforcement Notice was issued on 1st May 2019 relating to the erection of a rear balcony to the existing rear roof dormer of the property. The Notice requires demolishing the rear balcony to the existing rear roof dormer and restoring the property to that prior to the breach. The Notice would have taken effect on 4th June 2019, with a compliance period of 2 months. An Appeal to The Planning Inspectorate has been made. The appeal was determined by Decision letter dated 18th March 2020. The appeal was dismissed with a slight variation of the wording of the enforcement Notice. The Enforcement Notice had a 2 months compliance period. A further site inspection found that the Enforcement Notice has been complied with.

47 Edgehill Road CR4 2HY. This is concerning a rear extension not being built to the dimensions provided on the prior approval application. A Planning Enforcement Notice was subsequently issued requiring the demolition of the single storey rear extension. The Notice would have taken effect took effect on 16th September 2019, with a compliance period of 3 calendar months. An Appeal has started. This Appeal has now been determined by Decision letter dated 16th July 2020. The appeal was allowed and the Enforcement Notice quashed.

33 HASSOCKS ROAD, LONDON. SW16 5EU: This was regarding the unauthorised conversion from a single dwelling into 2 x self contained flats against a refusal planning permission. A planning Enforcement Notice was subsequently issued on 10th September 2019 and would have taken effect on 15th October 2019. This Notice has a compliance period of 3 calendar months, unless an appeal is made to the Planning Inspectorate before the Notice takes effect. An Appeal has been submitted, and has started. The appeal site visit was postponed, by The Planning Inspectorate. This Appeal has now been determined by Decision letter dated 17th July 2020. The Appeal was dismissed and the Enforcement Notice upheld. The Notice was varied and the time for compliance extended from 3 months to 6 months from the date of the Appeal Decision letter. However, minor costs were awarded to the appellant for extra work and or time that had been spent on the appeal that were not needed.

76 Shaldon Drive, Morden, SM4 4BH. An enforcement notice was served on 14th August 2019 relating to an outbuilding being used as a self-contained unit. The notice requires the removal of all kitchen facilities, fixtures, fittings, cooker, worktops, kitchen units. The notice takes effect on 16th September 2019, with a compliance period of 1 month. An Appeal has been electronically submitted, This Appeal has now started. The date of the Planning Inspectors site visit was 20th October 2020.

Existing enforcement appeals

2

Appeals determined

0

New Enforcement Appeals

0

3.4 Requested update from PAC

None

4. Consultation undertaken or proposed

None required for the purposes of this report

5 Timetable

N/A

6. Financial, resource and property implications

N/A

7. Legal and statutory implications

N/A

8. Human rights, equalities and community cohesion implications

N/A

9. Crime and disorder implications

N/A

10. Risk Management and Health and Safety implications.

N/A

11. Appendices – the following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report Background Papers

N/A

12. Background Papers