

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 15 NOVEMBER 2018

APPLICATION NO.
18/P2066

DATE VALID
23/07/2018

Address/Site

2 Vectis Gardens, Tooting, SW17 9RE

(Ward)

Graveney

Proposal:

CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND SIDE EXTENSION WITH DORMER WINDOW TO THE PROPERTY AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF 1 X SELF CONTAINED FLAT ABOVE THE SIDE EXTENSION

Drawing Nos

Site location plan, 2-15, 2-16 and 2-17.

Contact Officer:

Tim Lipscomb (0208 545 3496)

REASON FOR LATENESS: Owing to an administrative error this report has been published late. At the request of the Chair of Planning it is now published so that this item can be determined in a timely fashion. The item was notified on the agenda frontsheet at the correct time.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant Permission subject to conditions.

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- Heads of Agreement: Not required
- 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: 5
- External consultations: No
- Controlled Parking Zone: Yes (Zone GC)

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is being brought to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Kirby.
- 1.2 A decision on the application was deferred at the previous meeting of the Planning Applications Committee on 18 October 2018. The Committee voted to defer the item to the next meeting so that Officers can re-examine the parking to the front of the property and the lack of amenity space for the one bedroomed flat.
- 1.3 Officers have contacted the applicant who has indicated that they would like the application to be determined as originally submitted.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site is an end of terrace, two storey dwelling on the eastern side of Vectis Gardens. The site forms part of an existing terrace of three dwellings (1A, 1 & 2 Vectis Gardens). The site has an area of approximately 195sqm.
- 2.2 It is noted that the house originally formed part of a semi-detached pair of houses. A new dwelling was constructed adjacent to 1 Vectis Gardens, creating a terrace row (under application ref. 92/P0501).
- 2.3 The existing terrace dwelling has three bedrooms. There is a single storey garage attached to the side of the property with a distance of 4.8 metres separating the side elevation of the existing property from the side property boundary. A second detached single storey garage on land belonging to 1 Vectis Road is located nearby with the two garages separated a pedestrian access to the rear of neighbouring properties.
- 2.4 The site is not located in a conservation area. The building is not listed. The application site lies with Flood Zone 2 (the rear part of the site only). The site lies within a Controlled Parking Zone. The area has a PTAL of 1b (poor).

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two-storey side extension, with rear facing dormer window and a 3m deep single storey rear extension to the existing dwelling, following demolition of the existing garage.
- 3.2 The proposed two-storey extension would form an extension to the existing dwelling at ground floor level and would create a separate 1 bedroom flat at first and second floor level (second floor within the roof space).

- 3.3 Construction materials would match the existing.
- 3.4 Rubbish/recycling storage and cycle storage would be provided to the frontage of the site.
- 3.5 The proposed plans show space for two cars to park parallel to the highway.
- 3.6 The existing garden would be retained for the host dwelling with no external amenity space allocated to the proposed dwelling.
- 3.7 The proposal would provide the following accommodation:

Unit	Number of bedrooms/people	GIA (sqm)	External amenity space
Retained and extended 2 Vectis Gardens	3 bed/5 person*	140.2	In excess of 50sqm
Proposed new flat	1 bed/2 person	59.65	None

* The host dwelling is shown to be extended to form a 4 bedroom unit. However, bedroom 1 has a floor area of just 4sqm, with a width less than 2.15m. Therefore, this room cannot be considered as a habitable bedroom for the purposes of the London Plan. The dwelling is therefore considered on the basis of being a 3b/5p unit. It is noted that this bedroom is existing currently and therefore there is no justification to request amendments to the size of this room.

- 3.8 The proposal would effectively convert the existing dwellinghouse into two separate flats. The host dwelling, No.2 Vectis Gardens, would be horizontally split with the new flat, as the ground floor of the entire building would be part of the host dwelling. Therefore, the hoist dwelling would not remain a dwellinghouse but would be classified as a flat. Therefore, no permitted development rights would apply following the conversion.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 15/P1905 - DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING GARAGE AND THE ERECTION OF A NEW END OF TERRACE BUILDING WITH FLOOR SPACE ON FOUR LEVELS (A NEW BASEMENT, GROUND FLOOR, FIRST FLOOR AND WITHIN THE LOFT SPACE) TO PROVIDE 2, TWO

BEDROOM MAISONETTES WITH TWO SEPARATE ENTRANCES TO THE FRONT ELEVATION. Refuse Permission 10-07-2015 for the following reason:

The proposal would fail to provide an acceptable standard of residential accommodation for future occupiers arising from the provision of inadequate internal space for normal living activities; inadequate provision of natural sunlight, daylight and outlook to the basement living space and failure to demonstrate that adequate flood mitigation measures will be provided to safeguard future occupiers in this area at risk from flooding, contrary to policy 3.5 of the London Plan (March 2015), policies DM D2 and DM F1 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014), and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Residential Extensions, Alterations and Conversions (November 2001).

The submitted application has failed to demonstrate that the excavation; sequencing; and management of the works to form the basement will not be harmful local amenity; failed to demonstrate that the works will not have an unacceptable impact on ground water and surface water movements and failed to demonstrate how the proposal will achieve the London Plan emissions reduction targets contrary to policy DM D2; DM F1; of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014), policy CS15 of the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy and policy 5.2 of the London Plan 2015.

The design and appearance of the proposed building including the bulk and massing of the top floor and the front roof terrace would represent overbearing and visually intrusive features that would fail to respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area contrary to policy CS.14 of the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy and policy 7.4 of the London Plan (March 2015) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Residential Extensions, Alterations and Conversions (November 2001).

- 4.2 16/P2832 - DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING GARAGE AND ERECTION OF A 2 STOREY SIDE EXTENSION TO END OF TERRACE DWELLING TO CREATE NEW FAMILY ROOM FOR 2 VECTIS GARDENS AT GROUND FLOOR AND A NEW 1 X 1 BEDROOM FLAT ON THE FIRST FLOOR AND WITHIN LOFT WITH REAR ROOF DORMER. Grant Permission subject to Conditions 30-01-2017.
- 4.3 16/P4717 - ERECTION OF A HIP TO GABLE AND REAR ROOF EXTENSION WITH JULIETTE BALCONY AND INSTALLATION OF 3 x ROOFLIGHTS TO FRONT ROOF SLOPE. Grant Permission subject to Conditions 30-01-2017.
- 4.4 17/P1323-APPLICATION FOR A LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT CERTIFICATE FOR THE PROPOSED ERECTION OF A SINGLE

STOREY REAR EXTENSION. Issue Certificate of Lawfulness 08-05-2017.

5. CONSULTATION

5.1 Standard 21-day site notice procedure and individual letters to neighbouring occupiers. One letter of representation have been received, objecting on the following grounds:

- It would be better to construct a family sized dwelling on this site.
- The plans may be open to the separation of the existing dwelling into flats causing noise and disturbance by multi occupancy when it is finished.
- Overdevelopment of the site and will result in overcrowding in this small road.
- Concerns over parking pressure and concern that parking spaces shown on plans do not have adequate space.
- Overshadowing to No.1 Vectis Gardens as a result of the proposed rear extension.

5.2 LBM Climate Change Officer:

No objection subject to condition.

5.3 LBM Highways:

No objection or requirements.

5.4 LBM Transport Planning:

Observations:

The Site is located within CPZ GC Zone, which is active between 08:30 and 18:30 Monday to Friday restricting parking for permit holders only between those times.

The proposal provides 2 off street parking spaces.

The proposal is unlikely to generate more than one further vehicle and therefore there is no need to exempt future residents of the proposed development from applying for a parking permit.

Cycle parking:

The London Plan and London Housing SPG Standard 20 (Policy 6.9) states all developments should provide dedicated storage space for cycles at the following level:

- 1 per studio and one bed dwellings; and
- 2 per all other dwellings

In order to meet the standards set out in the London Plan provision the proposal would require one cycle space (secure & undercover).

Recommendation: Raise no objection subject to:

- Car parking as shown maintained.
- Cycle Parking (secure & undercover)

Supplementary comments following deferral at Planning Committee on 18/10/18.

The layout shows two cars (4.8m length) parked parallel to the footway. There is inadequate depth to park at right angles to the kerb. However the two cars can be parked in an angular fashion which allows cars to drive into or out of the spaces in satisfactory manner.

Smaller cars of 4.0m length can be parked at right angles to the kerb line.

5.5 LBM Flooding and drainage officer:

No objection, no requirements.

5.6 Environment Agency:

Advise that EA Standing Advice should be followed.

6. POLICY CONTEXT

6.1 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
- 5.13 Sustainable drainage
- 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
- 6.9 Cycling
- 6.13 Parking
- 7.2 An inclusive environment
- 7.4 Local character
- 7.6 Architecture
- 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature
- 8.2 Planning obligations
- 8.3 Community infrastructure levy

London Plan Housing SPG (March 2016)

6.2 LDF Core Planning Strategy (July 2011)

CS8	Housing Choice
CS9	Housing provision
CS11	Infrastructure
CS14	Design
CS15	Climate Change
CS16	Flood Risk Management
CS18	Active Transport
CS20	Parking, Servicing and Delivery
CS21	Open Space, Nature Conservation, Leisure and Culture

6.3 Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Map (July 2014)

DM O2	Nature Conservation, Trees, hedges and landscape features
DM D2	Design considerations in all developments
DM D3	Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
DM EP2	Reducing and mitigating noise
DM F1	Support for flood risk management
DM F2	Sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) and; Wastewater and Water Infrastructure
DM T1	Support for sustainable transport and active travel
DM T2	Transport impacts of development
DM T3	Car parking and servicing standards
DM T5	Access to the road network

6.4 Other guidance:

Merton's Design SPG 2004
NPPG 2014

7. **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

7.1 The main planning considerations concern the principle of development, provision of housing and mix, impact on the character of the area, standard of accommodation, neighbouring amenity, highway, traffic and parking considerations, flooding/drainage and sustainability issues.

Principle of development

7.2. 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 The proposed conversion of the existing single dwelling into two residential units is acceptable in principle since a residential unit of at least

3 bedrooms would be re-provided as part of the development, thereby there would be no loss of family housing, in line with policy CS14.

- 7.4 It is important to note the planning history at the site as it is a material consideration in the current assessment. In terms of physical built form, a fully integrated two-storey extension, to be used as an independent dwelling, has been granted permission under application ref. 16/P2832 and therefore, the acceptability of the two-storey extension is established by the granting of this permission. The single storey extension proposed has previously been issued a certificate of lawfulness under application ref. 17/P1323.
- 7.5 Therefore, given the existence of these granted/issued applications, it would be unreasonable to raise objection on elements of the scheme that have previously been approved.
- 7.6 The key differences between the previously permitted scheme under application ref. 16/P2832 and the current scheme are as follows:
- The current scheme includes a dormer window to the rear of the host dwelling. This dormer window is currently in existence, having been permitted under application ref. 16/P4717.
 - The current scheme includes a proposed single storey extension, which has previously had a certificate of lawfulness to confirm that it is permitted development, under application ref. 17/P1323.

Other than these changes, the two schemes are identical.

- 7.7 In terms of policy changes since the previous approval, the NPPF has been revised and continues to focus on the sustainable delivery of houses. The publication of the NPPF 2018 does not materially change the assessment process for this proposal.

Provision of housing and mix

- 7.8 The National Planning Policy Framework (2018) requires the Council to identify a supply of specific 'deliverable' sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing with an additional buffer of 5% to provide choice and competition.
- 7.9 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 and 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. Merton LDF Core Strategy policies

CS8 & CS9 also seek to encourage proposals for well-designed and located new housing that will create socially mixed and sustainable neighbourhoods through physical regeneration and effective use of space.

- 7.10 LB Merton's housing target between 2011 and 2026 is 5,801 (Authority's Monitoring Report 2016/17). While a robust five years supply has been identified, 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). The application site is on brownfield land and is in a sustainable location adjacent to other existing residential properties.
- 7.11 The benefit of providing 1 additional unit must be weighed against the planning merits of the proposal.
- 7.12 The proposed development would have a density of 102 units per hectare and 410 rooms per hectare. It is of note that the immediately surrounding area has a density of approximately 52 dwellings per hectare and 207 habitable rooms per hectare. The London Plan provides a density matrix to act as a guide indicating suitable levels of density depending on the characteristics of the area. The site is PTAL 1b, within a suburban area, wherein Table 3.2 of the London Plan advises that a range of 35-65 units per hectare and 150-200 habitable rooms per hectare.
- 7.13 Residential density is one factor to consider in the assessment, it is primarily used to assess the acceptability of large housing schemes and can be an unreliable, crude guide when assessing the appropriateness of smaller infill development. Therefore, whilst density is a factor in the assessment process, greater weight should be given to how the development fits in with the character of the area in visual terms.
- 7.14 The current proposal intends to add to the existing building and the resultant density is not the overriding factor in the assessment. The impact on visual and residential amenity will a more important factor in the assessment of the acceptability of the proposal.
- 7.15 Policy DM H2 sets out a requirement for housing mix based on the housing needs of the borough. The policy requires an even proportion of one, two bed and three bedroom units. Historically there has been an under provision of family sized units (3 beds and above). The scheme proposes a new one bedroom unit only. However, given the limited scope for adding floorspace to the building, it is considered that the provision of an additional one bedroom flat would be acceptable in planning terms.

7.16 The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of density and housing mix. This is consistent with the view taken under application ref. 16/P2832.

Character of the Area

7.17 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. The regional planning policy advice in relation to design is found in the London Plan (2015), 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.

7.18 Policies DMD2 and DMD3 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. Core Planning Policy CS14 supports this SPP Policy. Policy DMD2 also seeks to ensure that trees are protected from adverse impacts from development.

7.19 The proposed development would result in a very similar external appearance to that previously granted under application ref. 16/P2832 and would not have a greater impact on the character of the area than the scheme previously approved.

7.20 Equally, the single storey extension would otherwise be permitted development and therefore it would not be reasonable to raise objection to this element of the proposals. However, in any event, this element of the extensions is to the rear and is not visually prominent or out of keeping with the character of the area.

7.21 The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of visual amenity and the character of the area and is considered to comply with Policies DM D2 and DM D3 in this regard.

Standard of accommodation

7.22 London Plan Policy 3.5 states that all new housing developments should be of the highest quality internally, externally and in relation to their context. In order to ensure that such development provide an adequate level of internal amenity, Table 3.3 of the London Plan sets out the minimum floor areas which should be provided for new housing.

- 7.23 Sites and Policies Plan Policy DM D2 seeks to ensure good quality residential accommodation with adequate levels of privacy, daylight and sunlight for existing and future residents, the provision of adequate amenity space and the avoidance of noise, vibration or other forms of pollution.
- 7.24 Table 3.3 of the London Plan (2016) requires a minimum gross internal area (G.I.A) of 58sqm for a 1 bedroom/2 person dwelling set over two floors.
- 7.25 The existing three bedroom dwelling which would be extended to the side would be provided with a total floor area of 140.2sqm. This exceeds the 93sqm London Plan floor area requirement for a 3 bedroom, five person dwelling.
- 7.26 The new one bedroom flat on first and second floors would have a floor area of 59sqm, which meets the London Plan requirements for a 1 bedroom, 2 person dwelling (over 2 storeys) of 58sqm.
- 7.27 The plans show that the rear garden area of over 50sqm is to be allocated entirely to the family size dwelling. The garden area is of sufficient size and dimensions to provide future residents with appropriate private amenity space in accordance with the above standards.
- 7.28 Whilst a modest amount of amenity space would normally be required for all flats (5sqm under London Plan standards), the upper storey flat is not a family sized unit. An adequate living area has been provided, and it is considered that the absence of outdoor private amenity space in isolation would not warrant a refusal. It is of note that the unit would be double aspect, with good outlook and provides in excess of the minimum GIA standards of the London Plan. On this basis, the standard of accommodation is considered to be acceptable.
- 7.29 This is consistent with the approach taken under application ref. 16/P2832. The permission can still be implemented and officers would highlight that to refuse permission on the grounds of the absence of amenity space would be inconsistent with the earlier decision and, in the event of an appeal, would be likely to expose the Council to the risk of an application for costs on the basis that it has acted unreasonably.

Neighbouring Amenity

- 7.30 Policy DM D2 seeks to ensure that development does not adversely impact on the amenity of nearby residential properties.
- 7.31 The proposed two-storey element of the proposals has been previously

found to be acceptable in terms of the impact on neighbouring amenity and has previously been granted permission (application ref. 16/P2832). It is noted that there are no side facing windows at the adjacent property, No.1 Vectis Road, which would be affected by the proposed two-storey extension. In addition, the two-storey extension would not project beyond the rear building line of No.1 Vectis Road and, as such, it is considered that there would not be a materially harmful impact. This is consistent with the view taken under application ref. 16/P2832.

- 7.32 In terms of the impact on the other adjacent property, No.1 Vectis Gardens: The rear roof extension closest to the boundary has previously been permitted (16/P4717) and it would not be reasonable to revisit this element of the proposals. In any event, the provision of a rear facing dormer window in a residential suburban area is generally held to not result in materially harmful overlooking to neighbouring properties. The proposed dormer window, to the two-storey extension, would have a similar impact to the existing dormer window and would not result in any additional materially harmful overlooking.
- 7.33 The proposed single storey extension, would, if constructed in isolation, be permitted development. The proposed extension is 3m in depth and 3m in height. The proposed extension is to the immediate southeast of No.1 Vectis Gardens and as such would have some minor impact in terms of morning sunlight. However, the limited rear projection of 3m is not considered to result in material harm to the amenities of the neighbouring property.
- 7.34 The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of the impact on neighbouring amenity.

Highway, traffic and parking considerations

- 7.35 Core Strategy Policy CS 20 considers matters of pedestrian movement, safety, servicing and loading facilities for local businesses and manoeuvring for emergency vehicles as well as refuse storage and collection.
- 7.36 Core Strategy Policy CS 18 promotes active means of transport and the gardens of the houses provide sufficient space for the storage of cycles without the need to clutter up the front of the development with further cycle stores.
- 7.37 The scheme proposes the provision of two off-street parking spaces to the frontage of the site. The Transport officer has reviewed the parking layout following deferral at the last meeting of the Planning Applications Committee. The layout on the submitted plans shows two cars (4.8m

length) parked parallel to the footway. There is inadequate depth to park at right angles to the kerb. However the two cars can be parked in an angular fashion which allows cars to drive into or out of the spaces in satisfactory manner. Smaller cars of 4.0m length can be parked at right angles to the kerb line.

- 7.38 It is also noted that the exact same parking layout has been approved under application ref. 16/P2832 and therefore is established as being an acceptable layout. Planning permission 16/P2832 can still be implemented and officers would highlight that to refuse permission on the grounds of the proposed parking layout would be inconsistent with the earlier decision and, in the event of an appeal, would be likely to expose the Council to the risk of an application for costs on the basis that it has acted unreasonably.
- 7.39 The provision of two off-street parking spaces would meet London Plan maximum standards.
- 7.40 An overly prescriptive condition regulating the alignment of the parking of vehicles is considered unnecessary and would be difficult to enforce. An informative is recommended simply to encourage the occupiers of the dwellings to park at an angle to the footway so as to avoid vehicles overhanging the footway is recommended.
- 7.41 In terms of cycle parking, this is provided to the frontage of the site and is considered to be acceptable.
- 7.42 The Council's Transport Planner has advised that there is no requirement to restrict the issuing of parking permits at the site as the proposal is unlikely to generate more than one further vehicle and parking pressure in the locality is not at such a high capacity that the addition of one small dwelling would have a significant impact on parking capacity in the area.
- 7.43 The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of parking and highway impacts.

Refuse and recycling

- 7.44 Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy (2011) states that the Council will seek to implement effective traffic management by requiring developers to incorporate adequate facilities for servicing to ensure loading and unloading activities do not have an adverse impact on the public highway.
- 7.45 The application shows that a refuse/recycling storage/collection area would be provided to the frontage of the site and this would be sufficient.
- 7.46 The proposal would therefore, comply with Policy CS17 of the Core

Planning Strategy 2011.

Sustainable design and construction

- 7.47 New buildings must comply with the Mayor's and Merton's objectives on carbon emissions, renewable energy, sustainable design and construction, green roofs, flood risk management and sustainable drainage. The most relevant London Plan policies are 5.1 (Climate Change Adaptation), 5.2 (Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions) and 5.3 (Sustainable Design and Construction) which seek to minimise energy usage and reduce carbon dioxide emissions.
- 7.48 Policy CS15 sets out minimum sustainability requirements for development proposals.
- 7.49 The application is accompanied by supporting information in relation to sustainable construction.
- 7.50 The Council's Climate Change Officer has considered the proposals and concludes that subject to a suitably worded condition the proposed development would meet the relevant targets.
- 7.51 The proposal complies with Policy CS15 of the Core Planning Strategy 2011 and Policy 5.3 of the London Plan.

Flooding considerations

- 7.52 Core Planning Strategy CS16 Flood Risk Management and SPP Policy DM F1 requires that new development mitigate the impact of flooding in Merton. The submitted application involves building works within Flood Zone 2, which covers part of the rear garden.
- 7.53 It is of note that the applicant has provided supporting documents in relation to flooding impacts and the EA has previously reviewed these documents and raised no objection to the development (under application 16/P2832). However, it is of note that the current scheme includes a single storey extension whereas the previous scheme did not and therefore covers a greater ground surface area. The Environment Agency has responded to the current application and advise that the EA's standing advice can be applied to the scheme.
- 7.54 The EA standing advice deals mainly with finished floor levels in relation to anticipated flood levels. The proposed finished floor levels would be well above the 1 in 100 or 1 in 1000 year climate change flood levels and as such, no concern or objection is raised in this regard.

- 7.55 The application has satisfactorily demonstrated that it would be acceptable in flooding terms, as per the previous application 16/P2832.

Response to representations

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

- There is a need for family housing in the borough. However, the housing mix policy is not applicable for the addition of a single dwelling and therefore there is no policy base to insist on additional family housing on the site.
- Any further subdivision would require planning permission and as such control would be maintained by the LPA.

8.0 SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

- 8.1 The proposal does not constitute Schedule 1 or Schedule 2 development. Accordingly, there are no requirements in terms of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).

9.0 MAYORAL COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY

- 9.1 The proposed development is liable to pay the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy, the funds for which will be applied by the Mayor towards the Crossrail project. The CIL amount is non-negotiable and planning permission cannot be refused for failure to agree to pay CIL.

10.0 MERTON'S COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY

- 10.1 Merton's Community Infrastructure Levy was implemented on 1 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 except for affordable housing.

11.0 CONCLUSION

- 11.1 The principle of development is considered to be acceptable.
- 11.2 The proposal is considered to be acceptable in planning terms and would provide one additional dwelling to add to the Borough's housing stock. The

scheme would represent an infill scheme that complements the character of the area and provides a reasonably good standard of accommodation.

- 11.3 In addition, the majority of the development proposed has been previously found to be acceptable and granted planning permission. To refuse on the basis of inadequate amenity space and an unsatisfactory parking layout would be inconsistent with the earlier decision that could still be implemented.
- 11.3 Therefore, the recommendation is to grant permission subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION

Grant Permission Subject to Conditions:

Conditions:

1. A.1 Time Limit
2. A.7 Approved Plans
3. B2 Materials to match
1. C.7 Implementation of Refuse and Recycling
5. H04 Provision of vehicle parking
6. H.9 Construction Vehicles
7. L2 Energy and water usage.
8. Cycle Parking (implementation)
10. No demolition or construction work in connection with this permission shall be carried out outside the hours of 08.00 and 18.00 on Mondays to Fridays inclusive, 08.00 to 13.00 on Saturdays and there shall be no such work carried out on Sundays or Public Holidays.

INFORMATIVE:

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. **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

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

Please note these web pages may be slow to load

This page is intentionally left blank