

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 19 JULY 2018

APPLICATION NO. **DATE VALID**
18/P1356 20.03.2018

Address/Site Land at 1A Kenley Road, Merton Park, SW19 3JJ

(Ward) Merton Park

Proposal: Demolition of the existing garage and the erection of a single storey dwellinghouse

Drawing Nos; Site location plan and drawings; A(20)_E01 Rev B & A(20)P01 Rev B

Contact Officer: Leigh Harrington (020 8545 3836)

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
- Design Review Panel consulted: No,
- Number of neighbours consulted: 16
- Press notice – No
- Site notice – Yes
- External consultations: Nil
- Archaeological Priority Zone – No
- Controlled Parking Zone - Yes
- Number of jobs created: N/A

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application has been brought before the Committee due to the level of public interest.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site is an L shaped area of former garden space located at the rear of 84 Mostyn Road although the site has been described as 1A Kenley Road. It is currently occupied by a single storey detached garage with access out onto Kenley Road. The area is characterised by interwar suburban

residential development with a number of detached garages being situated along this stretch of Kenley Road. The site is not located within a Conservation Area, an Archaeological Priority Zone or a flood risk area and has a PTAL of 2 (Low).

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The proposal involves demolition of the existing 3.59m high garage and the erection of a new detached 1 bedroom dwelling house with access via Kenley Road.
- 3.2 This is the sixth application for a house on this site and this application has been amended since its original submission following the advice of officers. Access to the property would now be through a pedestrian gate set within a close boarded fence that reflects the existing boundary treatment on the site. Refuse and secure cycle storage would be provided each side of the front courtyard. The front door opens into an open plan combined living/dining/kitchen area with windows facing the courtyard. The bathroom would be centrally located with the double bedroom set to the rear with sliding doors leading out to the rear garden.
- 3.3 Externally the house would be finished in black timber cladding with a 3.65m high fibre slate roof that has now been revised so that it has two elements, a gable to the Kenley Road elevation with hipped end to the rear and a gable facing the amenity space and hipped section to the rear of that both, separated from each other by glazed panels. The house has been 'pulled away' from the neighbour's garden at 86 Mostyn Road by 2m and the site offers 60sqm of garden space.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 17/P4077 Planning permission refused for the demolition of the existing garage and the erection of a new detached 1 bedroom dwelling house with access via Kenley Road.

Reason. The size, siting and design of the proposed dwellinghouse would result in a negative impact on the amenity of future occupants in terms of poor outlook, a lack of sunlight and daylight resulting in an over reliance on artificial light and a substandard outdoor amenity space, whilst appearing unduly dominant and out of context and character with the existing Mostyn Road/Kenley Road urban landscape and would be contrary to policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, policies CS 13 & CS14 of the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011), policy DM D2 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014).

- 4.2 16/P2484 Planning permission refused and appeal dismissed for the demolition of the existing garage outbuilding and the erection of a new 1 bedroom house.

Reason. The size, siting and design of the proposed dwellinghouse would result in a negative impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents in terms of visual intrusion, loss of privacy, increased noise and disturbance whilst appearing unduly dominant and out of context and character with the existing Mostyn Road/Kenley Road urban landscape and would be contrary to policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015, policies CS 13 & CS14 of the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011), policy DM D2 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014).

- 4.3 15/P2866. Planning permission refused for the demolition of the existing garage and the erection of a new detached 2 bedroom dwelling house.

Reasons. The proposed dwellinghouse by reason of its size, siting and design would result in a poor internal layout with poor outlook and poor levels of sunlight to the detriment of the amenities of future occupiers, and with the potential to impact negatively on the amenities of neighbouring residents in terms of noise, disturbance and visual intrusion, appearing unduly dominant and out of context and character with the existing pattern of development in Mostyn Road/Kenley Road and would be contrary to policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015, policies CS 13 & CS14 of the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011), policy DM D2 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014) and Standard 3.1.1 of the London Housing SPG 2012.

And

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 the delivery of affordable housing off-site would be contrary to policy CS.8 of the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011).

- 4.4 15/P0043. Application for demolition of garage and erection of new 2 bed dwellinghouse withdrawn by applicant
- 4.5 12/P0626 Planning permission granted for erection of a single storey side and rear extension.
- 4.6 12/P0624 Lawful development certificate issued for the erection of a hip to gable roof extension and rear dormer roof extension with 2 x rooflights to front roof slope.
- 4.7 11/P3534 Planning permission refused for the erection of a two storey side extension, rooflights on the front and side roof slopes, rear dormer roof extension and a single storey rear extension.

Reasons. The proposed two storey side extension by reason of design, size and siting, would be harmful to the visual amenities of the area and the appearance of the streetscene, arising from the loss of an important visual break between neighbouring pairs of dwellings, contributing to a potential terracing effect, and by failing to respect the detailing of the host dwelling or complementing the character of this part of the Mostyn Road streetscene. The proposals would therefore be contrary to policies BE16, BE22 and BE.23 of the Unitary Development Plan (October 2003) and the Council's SPG - Residential Extensions, Alterations and Conversions (November 2001).

- 4.8 08/P3267 Planning permission refused for demolition of existing garage and construction of a new 2 storey, 3 bedroom house on land to the rear of 82 and 84 Mostyn Road with one off street parking space accessed from Kenley Road. Refused and appeal dismissed.

Reasons The proposed house, by reason of design, siting, bulk and massing, would;

(a) by visually incongruous and fail to respect the design, siting and materials of surrounding buildings or complement the character of the adjoining townscape and would detract from the visual amenities of the Kenley Road streetscene; and

(b) would be unduly dominant and visually intrusive resulting in the loss of outlook to the detriment of the amenities of the occupants of 82, 84 and 86 Mostyn Road.

And

The proposals would therefore be contrary to policies BE.15, BE.16 and BE.22 of the Merton Unitary Development Plan (2003).

The proposed development would generate additional pressure on educational facilities in the area. In the absence of a legal agreement securing a financial contribution toward education provision the proposal would fail to offset its impact, and would be contrary to policies C.13 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (October 2003) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: Planning Obligations (2006).

- 4.9 08/P0654 Application for erection of 3 bedroom house in rear garden fronting Kenley Road with one off street parking space. Withdrawn by applicant.

5. CONSULTATION

5.1 The application has been advertised by means of a site notice and letters sent to 16 neighbouring occupiers. In response to the consultations on the originally submitted plans objections were received from 11 neighbouring occupiers raising the following concerns:

- Overbearing due to scale, siting and materials.
- It will be higher than the existing garage and therefore visually intrusive.
- Out of character with the 1920s & 30s brick built houses.
- Materials are modern and unattractive with negative impact architecturally.
- Gates will allow views of the building.
- Risk of flooding; although not in a flood zone it will reduce the capacity for water drainage.
- Foundations will cause damage to tree roots.
- This will set a precedent.
- Increase residential density and reduce garage capacity.
- Impact this already congested section of Kenley Road.
- Pose a risk of subsidence for neighbours.

5.2 The John Innes Society.

- We agree with the (Planning) Inspector; adding a dwelling on this site would appear at odds with this part of Kenley Road and have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area.
- It would conflict with the requirement to respect the local context and enhance local character with regards to the massing of surrounding buildings and existing street patterns.
- The Inspector said another house would be likely to affect the living conditions of neighbouring properties and both they and future occupiers of the proposal would suffer loss of privacy, noise and disturbance.
- There are no gates on this application and so it will be visible from the street.
- The proposed house is so cramped it will not provide satisfactory living standards.
- This application is no better than the previous refusals.

5.3 The revised design was re-consulted upon and 8 neighbours responded;

- Although not visible from the street it is still visible from our first floor windows
- Will put additional stress on street parking
- The small size means it won't make a noticeable difference to housing capacity but will be to considerable detriment of neighbours
- Bringing the house forward just makes it more conspicuous

5.4 The John Innes Society.

- The revisions make no difference to the previous reasons for refusal.

- Moving footprint closer makes it more conspicuous
- Plans make even more unsatisfactory living conditions; it's less a house and more a bed in a shed.
- The garden should be permeable
- There should be a condition requiring the proposals to be permit free.

5.5 Trees officer. No objection to the proposals subject to the inclusion of conditions requiring the provision of a replacement tree and landscaping details to be approved.

5.6 Merton Parking Services were consulted and advised that demand for permits in CPZ zone MP1 was such that 1 or even 2 vehicles would make no noticeable difference to parking capacity and resultant pressure in the CPZ.

6 POLICY CONTEXT

6.1 NPPF 2012.

Section 6. Delivering a wider choice of high quality homes.

Paragraph 49. Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Paragraph 53. Local planning authorities should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area.

Section 7. Requiring good design.

Paragraph 60. Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

6.2 London Plan 2016.

Relevant policies: 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), 5.3 (Sustainable design and construction), 5.7 (Renewable energy), 5.13 (Sustainable drainage), 7.5 (Public realm), 7.6(Architecture) & 7.21 (Trees and woodlands).

6.3 Merton Core Planning Strategy 2011.

Relevant policies in the CS8 (Housing choice), CS 13 (Open Space, Nature conservation), CS 14 (Design), CS 15 (Climate change) & CS 20 Parking, Servicing & delivery

6.4 Merton Sites and Policies Plan 2014

Relevant policies. DM D1 (Urban Design and the public realm), DM D2 (Design considerations in all developments), DM F1 (Flood risk management), DM EP 2 (Reducing and mitigating noise), DM H2 (Housing mix), DM 02 (Trees, hedges and landscape features), DM T2 (Transport impacts of development) & DM T3 (Car parking and servicing standards).

6.5 Other guidance. DCLG Technical standards 2015

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 The main planning considerations in this case relate to the principle of development, the scale and design of the new house, the impact on occupier and neighbour amenity, parking

7.2 Principle

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012, London Plan 2016 policy 3.3 and the Council's Core Strategy policy CS9 all seek to increase sustainable housing provision where it can be shown that an acceptable standard of accommodation will also provide a mix of dwelling types. The Council's Core Strategy policy CS13 provides a more detailed framework for assessing this form of infill development stating (CS.13 (e)) Any proposals for new dwellings in back gardens must be justified against the: local context and character of the site, biodiversity value of the site, value in terms of green corridors and green islands, flood risk and climate change impacts

7.3 Currently Policy CS. 9 within the Council's Adopted Core Strategy and policy 3.3 of the London Plan state that the Council will work with housing providers to provide a minimum of 4,107 additional homes [411 new dwellings annually] between 2015 and 2025 with the Draft London Plan seeking a significant increase in this figure. Thus, while proposal will provide a small new family house boosting the supply of housing, more detailed consideration of the proposals is required, with adopted policy criteria and other considerations addressed below.

7.4 Local context and character and impact on the street scene.

Single storey outbuildings, some of which are visible in the context of the streetscene, are a characteristic of this suburban area. The existing garage is 3.59 m high to the ridge and the replacement house would be 3.65m to the ridge and therefore only 6cm higher than the existing situation. This amended proposal would now be set back behind a close boarded fence of the same height as the existing fencing along this section of Kenley Road. Consequently it is considered that when viewed from the street, although 2m closer to the pavement and 2.45m wider than the existing garage the proposed house will be sufficiently screened from view so as not be visually intrusive or have a negative impact on the street scene or character of the wider area.

7.5 Whilst previous applications have been refused and appeals dismissed because of the impact on the street scene, in those instances either the proposed house was two storey or the provision of off street parking meant that the house was readily visible from the street. By reducing the height to only 6cm higher than the garage and being set behind fencing officers consider that the applicant has addressed previous concerns relating to impact on the street scene.

7.6 Local context and character and design.

London Plan policies 7.4 and 7.6, Core Strategy policy CS14 and SPP policies DM D1 and DM D2 require well designed proposals to utilise materials and design that will respect the siting, rhythm, materials and massing of surrounding buildings as well as complementing, responding to and reinforcing, local architectural character, locally distinctive patterns of development as well as the character and local distinctiveness of the adjoining townscape. Whilst para 60 of the NPPF seeks to promote local distinctiveness it also advises not to attempt to impose architectural styles or stifle innovation.

7.7 The new house has been designed to sit as low as possible on the site to reduce its visual impact and the roof design has been amended in order to break up the roof form to give the impression of two outbuildings rather than one larger structure. The proposed materials are considered to reflect the modern design of the proposal whilst lending themselves to creating an outbuilding feel to the design so that it would sit better in its location than something of a more traditional bungalow design. Officers consider that these factors serve to minimize the visual impact of the proposals whilst providing a well designed attractive dwellinghouse.

7.8 Impact on neighbour amenity.

London Plan policy 7.6, and Sites and Policies Plan policy DM D2 require proposals not to have a negative impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers through loss of light, overshadowing, outlook, privacy, visual intrusion or disturbance.

7.9 Loss of light;

The amended scheme has now moved the proposals 2m away from the boundary with the neighbours at 86 Mostyn Road and arranged the roof design so that it slopes away from both that neighbouring garden and the garden at 1 Kenley Road. These factors are considered by officers to address previous concerns relating to visual intrusion, loss of light and overshadowing.

7.10 Loss of privacy;

The proposal is for a one storey house enclosed by 2m high fencing and therefore there would be no overlooking of neighbouring properties. Whilst the Inspector previously raised concerns relating to potential overlooking that was in relation to a proposal with rooms at first floor level, those circumstances do not relate to the application now before members.

7.11 Noise and disturbance

Although the John Innes Society state that the Inspector decided the proposals would cause harm from noise and disturbance the decision letter actually states “Given the proximity of the appeal site to Kenley Road, and the potential for domestic activities within the existing land and buildings of the area, harmful levels of noise and disturbance are unlikely to arise”. Officers consider it would be unreasonable to resit the proposals on the basis of increased noise and disturbance.

7.12 Standard of accommodation.

Core Strategy policy CS 9 calls for the provision of well-designed housing and The DCLG Technical Standards and the London Plan policy 3.5 set out a number of required design criteria for new residential developments including room and space standards. This 60 sqm. proposal provides a 1 bedroom 2 person unit which exceeds the minimum required Gross Internal Area requirements of 50 sq.m. for such a property. SPP policy DM D2 requires the provision of a 50 sq.m. private amenity space configured in a single usable space and this proposal provides 60 sq.m. of amenity space. Previous iterations of the proposals involved subterranean gardens and gardens below the minimum standard. This proposal satisfactorily addresses those previous issues.

7.13 Biodiversity and Trees.

Core strategy policy CS13 and SPP policy DM O2 seek to protect landscape features such as trees and for biodiversity to be considered when assessing proposals for development on gardens. Within the site the Council’s arboricultural officer has recommended a replacement tree be provided to improve amenity and privacy on site. Conditions are also recommended that would require a tree protection scheme for the two street trees whereby they would be enclosed in box hoardings during the construction phase. It is also recommended that a condition be imposed requiring an arboricultural Impact Statement be approved detailing an inspection trench for the root system and if needed details of a foundation system that ensured no harm to the tree root system.

7.14 Parking and Access

Core Strategy policy CS 20 and policy DM T2 in the Sites and Policies Plan require developers to demonstrate that their development will not adversely affect safety, the convenience of local residents or on street parking and traffic management. Originally the scheme involved providing an off street parking space but that meant leaving the front of the site open to the street and thereby more noticeable. The amended scheme currently before members removes the parking space. There were objections from neighbours that this proposal would add to parking issues and traffic congestion in the area. However parking services have confirmed that parking permits in the area are under subscribed and an early morning site visit by officers determined that there were six empty resident bays within 100m of the site. Consequently it is considered that the proposals will not

make a noticeable impact on parking or traffic in the area nor is there any justification in making the proposals permit free.

7.15 Flood risk

London Plan (policies 5.12, 5.13) and Merton's development management policies DM F1 and F2 require schemes not to increase the risk of flooding in an area and to be designed so that they are resilient to the impacts of surface water flooding. The site is located in Flood Zone 1 and is therefore not in an area at risk from flooding rivers or surface waters. The councils flood risk manager raised no objections to the proposals subject to a condition requiring details of a drainage strategy to be approved.

8. SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

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

8.2 In order to ensure that the development is policy compliant a condition to that effect requiring CO2 reductions of not less than a 19% improvement on Part L regulations 2013, and internal water usage rates of not more than 105 litres per person per day is recommended.

9. CONCLUSION

9.1 The proposal will provide a new house for which there is an identified need within the borough and London at large. Applications have been refused previously because of concerns relating to the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the local area and the impact on neighbour amenity. The design of the proposal has been amended so that the new house would be largely screened from the street by the close boarded fencing and the roof devised to look like two small buildings with the consequence that the impression is that of garage or similar outbuildings to reflect the existing situation rather than a dwellinghouse. The house has been positioned to reduce the impact on neighbour amenity with the roof design being such that it slopes away from the neighbours further reducing any impact on the amenity whilst the ground level positioning of the windows mean that privacy issues of are no longer considered harmful to neighbour amenity.

9.2 There are not considered to be any issues relating to flooding and there is adequate capacity for on street parking in the vicinity.

9.3 In view of these factors officers consider that the proposals are acceptable and will not have a negative impact on the appearance and character of the local area or upon neighbour amenity, parking or flood risk and the proposal is therefore recommended for approval subject to appropriate conditions.

RECOMMENDATION. Grant planning permission subject to planning conditions.

1. (Standard A1 Commencement of works).
2. (Standard A.7 In accordance with plans); Site location plan and drawings; A(20)_E01 Rev B & A(20)P01 Rev B
3. (Standard B1 External materials to be approved); No construction 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 window frames and doors, windows and tiles (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 2015 and policies DM D2 and D3 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014
4. (Standard B5 Boundary treatments to be approved); No construction shall take place until details of all boundary walls or fences including methods for the temporary security of the site during construction 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. 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 2015, policy CS14 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D1 and D2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.
5. (Standard 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 2015 and policy DM EP2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.
6. (Standard H9 Construction Vehicles). The development shall not commence until details of the provision to accommodate all site workers', visitors' and construction vehicles, loading /unloading and storage arrangements of construction plant and materials during the construction process have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details must be implemented and complied with for the duration of the construction process.

Reason; To ensure the safety of pedestrians and vehicles and the amenities of the surrounding area and to comply with the following Development Plan

policies for Merton: policies 6.3 and 6.14 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM T2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

7. C6 Refuse storage details to be approved and implemented.
8. H6 Secure cycle storage details to be approved and implemented
9. Tree Protection: No development other than demolition shall occur until a Tree protection & Arboricultural method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The statement shall include details of hoardings to be erected around the mature Horse Chestnut tree & the adjacent Indian Horse Chestnut sapling opposite the site, details of a hand dug inspection trench to evaluate the extent of the root network and, if deemed necessary by the LPA, methods for the construction of a foundation system to ensure the protection of those tree roots. These protection methods shall be retained and maintained for the duration of the building 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. F1 Landscaping. (Amended) No construction shall take place until full details of a landscaping and planting scheme including the provision of a replacement garden tree has been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA and these works shall be carried out as approved before the occupation of the building hereby approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPAS. The details shall include on a plan, full details of the size, species, spacing, quantities and location of the proposed plants, together with any hard surfacing and means of enclosure.
11. F2 Landscaping. Implementation
12. No permitted development (extensions) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no extension, enlargement or other alteration of the dwellinghouse other than that expressly authorised by this permission, including the erection of any outbuildings shall be carried out without planning permission first obtained from the Local Planning Authority. Reason; The Local Planning Authority considers that further development could cause detriment to the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties or to the character of the area and for this reason would wish to control any future development 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.
13. External lighting. Any external lighting shall be positioned and angled to prevent any light spillage or glare beyond the site boundary. 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: policies DM D2 and DM EP4 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

14. Hardstanding The hardstanding hereby permitted (to the front of the house) shall be made of porous materials, or provision made to direct surface water run-off to a permeable or porous area or surface within the application site before the development hereby permitted is first occupied or brought into use. Reason; To reduce surface water run-off and to reduce pressure on the surrounding drainage system in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 5.13 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS16 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy F2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

15. H 3 Reinstatement of dropped kerb

16. No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a 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 LPA. Before these details are submitted an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) to ground, watercourse or sewer in accordance with drainage hierarchy contained within the London Plan Policy 5.13 and the advice contained within the National SuDS Standards. Where a sustainable drainage scheme is to be provided, the submitted details shall:

- i. provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay (attenuation provision of no less than 13m³) and control the rate of surface water discharged from the site to greenfield runoff rates (no more than 5l/s), and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;
- ii. include a timetable for its implementation; and
- iii. provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption authority and any other arrangements.

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.

17. 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 usage rates 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 2015 and Policy CS15 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011

Informatives:

1. 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
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. 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).
4. Planning permission does not confer or imply to confer approval for the applicant or anyone appointed by the applicant to carry out works on the highway. The applicant is advised to notify in writing, and secure approval from, the Council as Local Highway Authority in advance of installing the tree protection hoardings required by Condition 9.
5. NPPF informative.

[Click here](#) for full plans and documents related to this application.

Please note these web pages may be slow to load