

## **PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE** **13<sup>th</sup> February 2020**

<b><u>APPLICATION NO.</u></b>	<b><u>DATE VALID</u></b>
19/P4326	03/12/2019
<b>Address/Site</b>	51 Princes Road, Wimbledon, SW19 8RA
<b>Ward</b>	Trinity
<b>Proposal:</b>	Alterations and extensions to existing building including change of use of doctor's surgery to residential (5 x 2 bed flats) and associated landscaping, parking, cycle storage and bin storage
<b>Drawing Nos</b>	PL01 Rev E, PL02 Rev C, PL03 Rev A and 0020PL04 Rev D
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	Stuart Adams (0208 545 3147)

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

**GRANT Planning Permission subject S106 agreements and conditions.**

### **CHECKLIST INFORMATION.**

Heads of agreement: - Permit Free  
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 – 56  
External consultations – No.  
PTAL score – 6a  
CPZ – VOs

---

#### **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The application has been brought before the Planning Application Committee for consideration due to the number of objections received and the application being called in by Councilor Ormrod.

## 2. **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 The application site comprises a two storey end of terrace building located on the south side of Princes Road on the south-west corner of the junction with Trinity Road, Wimbledon. The building is currently vacant, however it was formerly used as a doctors practice. The building has been extended with a large single storey rear extension. Car parking is provided on both the Princes Road and Trinity Road street frontages.
- 2.2 The application site is located adjacent to the South Park Gardens Conservation Area.

## 3. **CURRENT PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 Alterations and extensions to existing building including change of use of doctor's surgery to residential (5 x 2 bed flats) and associated landscaping, parking, cycle storage and bin storage.

Unit	Dwelling type (bedroom (b)/ persons-bedspaces (p))	GIA (sq m)	London Plan standard
Flat 1	2b4p	75	70
Flat 2	2b4p	70	70
Flat 3	2b3p	62	61
Flat 4	2b3p	61	61
Flat 5	2b3p	61	61

## 4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 19/P2165 - Demolition and change of use from existing doctors surgery and erection of two storey building comprising 6 residential flats (3 x 1 and 3 x 2 bedroom flats) including associated car parking, bicycle storage, bin storage and landscaping – Refused on

The proposed development by reason of its design, height, massing, detailing and siting would be an overly bulky and dominant form of development resulting in an overdevelopment of the site, which falls to respect the character and appearance of the Princes Road and Trinity Road street scenes, general pattern of development within the area and would fail to preserve or enhance the setting of the adjacent South Park Gardens Conservation Area, contrary to Policies DM D2 (Design Considerations in all developments) and DM D4 (Managing heritage assets) of Merton's Adopted Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014), CS14 (Design) of Merton's adopted Core Planning Strategy (July 2011) and Policy

7.4 (Local Character) of the London Plan (2016).

&

The proposed development, located in an area with a PTAL score of 6a (very good), would generate additional pressure on parking in the area, and in the absence of a signed legal agreement securing a 'car free' agreement, the proposal would be contrary to contrary to Policies DM T1 (support for sustainable transport and active travel), DM T3 (Car parking and servicing standards) of Merton's Adopted Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014) and CS20 (Parking, Servicing and Delivery) of Merton's Adopted Core Planning Strategy (July 2011).

&

The proposed development by reason of its design and layout would fail to achieve a high standard of residential accommodation as a result on communitive shortfalls in cycle parking, bin storage, lack of private amenity space, lack of natural bathroom ventilation and overlooking/loss of privacy to the bathroom of flat 1. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of future occupiers contrary to policies DM D2 (Design considerations in all developments) and DM T1 (support for sustainable transport and active travel) of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan CS 14 (Design) and CS 18 (active Transport) of Merton's Core Planning Strategy (July 2011).

&

The applicant has failed to demonstrate that there is no viable demand for any other community uses on the site. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy DM C1 Community facilities of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014) and CS 11 Infrastructure of Merton's Core Planning Strategy (July 2011).

- 4.2 19/P0160 - Change of use from existing doctors surgery to residential accommodation (7 flats) involving construction of part two/part three storey extension at front/side of existing building – Withdrawn
- 4.3 15/P0009 - Change of use from existing doctors surgery to residential accommodation (7 x 2 bedroom flats) involving construction of part two/part three storey extension at front/side of existing building – Refused on 13/03/2015 for the following reasons:

The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the loss of the existing

doctor's surgery would not create, or add to, a shortfall in provision for the specific community uses and that there is no viable demand for any other community uses on the site. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy DM C1 Community facilities of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014) and CS 11 Infrastructure of Merton's Core Planning Strategy (July 2011).

&

The proposed building due to its design, height, siting, massing and bulk would result in an overly dominate, incongruous and uninspiring addition to the street scene, creating a sense of enclosure and harming the visual amenities of the street scene by failing to relate positively and appropriately to the design, siting, rhythm, scale, proportion, height, materials and massing of surrounding buildings and existing street patterns, historic context of the surrounding area and would therefore fail to either conserve or enhance the setting of the adjacent South Park Gardens Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies DM D2 Design considerations in all developments of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan, DM D3 Alterations to existing buildings, DM D4 Managing heritage assets and CS 14 (Design) of Merton's Core Planning Strategy (July 2011).

&

The proposed two bedroom flat (flat 2) would result a cramped form of development, failing to achieve an adequate standard of accommodation with poorly designed internal layouts resulting in narrow living spaces, limited quality amenity space and poor outlook and light from the main habitable room (combined living area). The proposal would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of future occupiers contrary to policies DM D2 Design considerations in all developments of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan, CS 14 (Design) of Merton's Core Planning Strategy (July 2011 and the Mayor of London's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (Nov 2012) and The London Housing Design Guide (August 2010).

&

The proposed two bedroom flat (flat 3) would fail to achieve an adequate standard of accommodation with limited quality amenity space and poor outlook and light from both bedrooms. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of future occupiers contrary to policies DM D2 Design considerations in all

developments of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan and CS 14  
(Design) of Merton's Core Planning Strategy (July 2011.)

- 4.4 14/P1235 - Change of use from existing doctors surgery to residential (6 x 2 bedroom flats and 1 x 3 bedroom house) involving construction of part two/part three storey extension at front/side of existing building and formation of basement – withdrawn
- 4.5 10/P0878 - Application for a discharge of conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, and 9 attached to LBM planning application 04/P2630 dated 12/05/2005 relating to the construction of part two/part three storey extension at front/side of existing building involving the formation of basement and internal alterations - discharged - 29/04/2010
- 4.6 04/P2630 - Construction of part two/part three storey extension at front/side of existing building involving the formation of basement and internal alterations - Grant - 12/05/2005
- 4.7 04/P1817 - Construction of part two/part three storey extension at front/side of existing building involving the formation of basement and internal alterations – Withdrawn
- 4.8 89/P1078 - Alterations and erection of a single storey front and side extension - Grant - 12/11/89
- 4.9 MER485/67 - Erection of single storey rear extension and use in connection with change of use of ground floor to group Doctors practice - Grant - 3/8/67
- 4.10 MER349/67 - Use of ground floor of house as doctors surgery - Grant - 11/5/67

5. **CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 The application has been advertised by site notice procedure and letters of notification to the occupiers of neighbouring properties.
- 5.1.1 In response to the consultation, 5 letters of objection have been received. The letters raise the following objections (based on the original set of plans):
- Over-development of the site
  - Too big in terms of the scale, design, mass and bulk of the proposed development and adverse impact on the existing street scene.
  - The existing building lines in Trinity Road and Princes Road are not respected.

- The proposal makes the flawed comparison with the family home at 62 Princes Road.
- Over-dominant
- Reduce right to light
- Loss of privacy and overlooking
- Visual intrusion
- Noise from bin storage via the alleyway
- Noise and disturbance from an increased number of people living in such close proximity to existing dwellings.
- Set precedent
- Unit 5 appears to be incredibly restricted, especially bedroom 2 and the kitchen dining space, which are both under the sloping roof. Should be changed to a 1 bedroom flat
- The kitchen layouts and space available for food preparation and storage is very inadequate.
- Many bedrooms appear very small and would require occupants to have only the bare minimum of furniture and beds no bigger than a standard double.
- Overshadowing
- Damp issues with bathrooms having no ventilation
- Removal of hedge and overlooking from car parking spaces to bedroom.

5.1.2 Following amendments to the plans. 3 letters of objection received. The letters raise the following points:

- The removal of 1 car parking space will mean an increase in pressure on local on street parking.
- The removal of the 5<sup>th</sup> flat should be done in tandem with the removal of the 5<sup>th</sup> parking space.
- Original objections still stand
- The Valuation Surveyor letter looked at the property solely from outside does not address refusal reason 4 of the previous application. The applicant still fails to demonstrate that there is no viable demand for any other community use on the site.
- 4 parking spaces for 5 flats will not be sufficient to cater for the parking demands of 17 residents.
- Severe impact on highway safety
- Increased traffic congestion on Trinity Road.
- The development will drastically worsen the visibility for oncoming traffic at the junction of Trinity Road and Princes Road, increasing the risk of accidents.

## 5.2 Transport Planning

### Observations

- 5.2.1 The application site has a PTAL rating of 6a, which means it has excellent access to public transport.
- 5.2.2 CPZ: The streets in the vicinity of the Site fall in the W3 Controlled Parking Zone with restrictions in place between 8:30am and 11pm Monday through Saturday and between 2pm and 6pm on Sunday.

### Car Parking:

- 5.2.3 Previous use as a surgery had the benefit of off street vehicle access on to both Trinity Road and Princes Road.
- 5.2.4 The amended plans shows 4 off street parking spaces for the proposed 5 units. The car parking layout as shown is satisfactory. 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.

### Safety

- 5.2.5 The parking spaces off Trinity Road and Princes Road is unlikely have a significant impact on the free flow of traffic on both roads. There will be less traffic movement due to the proposal compared to a surgery, which would have generated continuous flow of traffic during the day.
- 5.2.6 Those cars that would wish to turn towards Broadway would need to undertake similar precautionary measures as existing. The proposed two spaces are unlikely to have a detrimental impact on the Princess Road.

### Cycle Parking

- 5.2.7 The cycle store has been moved to the north east of the site off Trinity Road which overcomes the previous objection to visibility splays.
- 5.2.8 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;
  - 2 per all other dwellings and
- 5.2.9 In order to meet the standards, set out in the London Plan, the proposal should provide 9 long term cycle parking spaces (secure & undercover).

Refuse:

5.2.10 It is proposed to provide allocated refuse storage area to the rear of the property accessed via the side alley.

5.2.11 Waste collection points should be located within 30 metres of residential units and within 20 metres of collection vehicles.

5.2.12 Recommendation: Raise no objection 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.
- Parking maintained as shown on plan.
- Condition requiring cycle parking.
- Condition requiring Refuse collection.

6. **POLICY CONTEXT**

6.1 Adopted Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014)

DM H2 Housing Mix

DM H3 Support for affordable housing

DM D2 Design Considerations in All Developments

DM D3 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings

DM D4 Managing Heritage Assets

DM.EP2 Reducing and Mitigating Noise

DM T1 Support for sustainable transport and active travel

DM T2 Transport impacts of development

DM T3 Car parking and servicing standards

DM C1 Community facilities

6.2 Adopted Core Planning Strategy (July 2011)

CS8 - Housing Choice

CS9 - Housing Provision

CS11 – Infrastructure

CS14 - Design

CS15 - Climate Change

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),



- 3.8 (Housing Choice),
  - 5.1 (Climate Change Mitigation),
  - 5.3 (Sustainable Design and Construction).
  - 7.3 (Designing Out Crime)
  - 7.4 (Local Character)
  - 7.6 (Architecture)
  - 7.8 (Archeology and Heritage)
- 6.4 Other  
National Planning Policy Framework 2019  
National Planning Practice Guidance 2014  
Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act – 2004  
London Plan 2016 - Housing SPG 2016  
Draft London Plan 2018  
Draft Local Plan 2020

## 7. **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 7.1 The main considerations regarding this development are the design and appearance of the proposed building in relation to the wider setting, impact on the amenities of the residential neighbours, loss of doctors surgery, standard of residential accommodation, traffic and highways,

### 7.2 **Principle of Development**

- 7.2.1 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.

#### Residential

- 7.2.2 The requirement for additional homes is a key priority of the London Plan which seeks to significantly increase the ten year minimum housing target across London from 322,100 to 423,887 (in the period from 2015 to 2025), and this equates to an associated increase in the annual monitoring target across London to 42,389. The minimum ten year target for Merton is 4,107, with a minimum annual monitoring target of 411 homes per year. Paragraph 58 of the 2018 NPPF emphasised the Governments objective to significantly boost the supply of homes.
- 7.2.3 The planning application seeks to create 5 new residential units which will make a modest contribution to meeting housing targets and provides a good range 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.

### Change of Use

- 7.2.4 The property original was a single dwellinghouse. The original planning use of the building therefore came under a Class C3 use. The proposal seeks to reintroduce a more intensive residential use in the building. In principle, the conversion of the building back to its original use is considered acceptable, subject to the loss of the former community use (currently vacant).

### 7.3 **Loss of Community Facility**

- 7.3.1 Planning policy DM C1 Community facilities of Merton's adopted Sites and Policies Plan seeks to ensure the provision of sufficient, accessible, well-designed community facilities.

The policy states:

- b) Any redevelopment proposals resulting in a net loss of existing community facilities will need to demonstrate that:
- i. the loss would not create, or add to, a shortfall in provision for the specific community uses; and
  - ii. that there is no viable demand for any other community uses on the site.

The planning policy justification for DM C1 Community facilities states that:

"As stated in Merton's Core Planning Strategy policy CS 11 Infrastructure, community and social infrastructure covers a wide range of facilities from healthcare, children's play, services for the elderly and disabled, libraries and museums, public toilets and places of worship as defined in the London Plan. The council will require new development to ensure facilities are easily accessible, well connected and will resist the net loss of these facilities".

### Loss of community facilities

"There may be circumstances where the redevelopment of an existing viable community facility will bring about other benefits in the area. In such instances the council will seek to ensure that suitable replacement community facilities for which there is demand are included as part of the proposals, either on the site or nearby".

"Applications proposing a loss of a community facility will have to show that full and proper marketing has been undertaken to demonstrate that community uses (D1 Use Class) are no longer viable on the site. Applicants will have to demonstrate that:

- the site has been marketed for 30 months unless otherwise agreed with the council;
- all opportunities to re-let the site have been fully explored;
- the site has been marketed using new (on the internet) and traditional marketing tools available; and
- the site has been marketed at a price which is considered reasonable (based on recent and similar deals or transactions)".

### Health

"Redevelopment or change of use of sites used for health facilities should not result in inadequate provision or poor accessibility to healthcare for residents. Locations for new health developments should be in accessible locations that are well served by public transport, commensurate with the numbers of trips the facility is expected to generate and the need to locate facilities throughout the borough".

- 7.3.2 The planning application submission demonstrates that alternative health facilities has already been provided off site at the nearby community health facility (Patrick Doody Clinic in Pelham Road). Therefore, the proposed development is considered to be compliant with part b) i of planning policy DM C1 (Community facilities) of Merton's adopted Sites and Policies Plan as the proposal would not create, or add to, a shortfall in provision for the specific community uses.
- 7.3.3 The applicant has demonstrated that there would be no shortfall in provision of a community use as required by planning policy DM C1 (Community facilities) of Merton's adopted Sites and Policies Plan.
- 7.3.4 Planning policy DM C1 (Community facilities) of Merton's adopted Sites and Policies Plan also states that marketing evidence is required to demonstrate that there is no other viable community use for the site. The applicant has provided no marketing evidence with the application, however, the applicant has provided a valuation letter from Harding Chartered Surveys which highlights the poor layout of the building (small rooms and lack of amenity space) and the high cost to bring the building up to modern standards. In this instance, officers are in agreement that the site would offer limited scope for an alternative community use, particularly given the constraints of the site, building and lack of amenity space.

7.3.5 In conclusion, there has been no loss of a community facility as this has already been provided elsewhere in the local vicinity. The proposal would also convert the building back into a residential use as originally intended. Whilst there is no direct marketing evidence, there is no loss of a community use and the scheme offers a number of planning benefits, including a well design building and much needed new residential units. Therefore, in this instance the lack of marketing is not considered to outweigh the other planning benefits to warrant refusal of planning permission or sufficient grounds to defend this matter at appeal given the circumstances discussed above.

#### 7.4 **Design**

##### *History*

7.4.1 There has been a number of planning application to redevelop the site. A number of recent applications have either been refused permission or withdrawn. The current state of the building remains vacant and has recently been occupied by squatters.

7.4.2 It should be noted that planning permission 04/P2630, granted in 12/05/2005 was for the construction of part two/part three storey extension at front/side of existing building involving the formation of basement and internal alterations in connection with improved health facilities. In terms of the design of the building approved under this permission, it was significantly different to the current scheme. However, it must be stressed that the approval was based on enhance community facilities. Nevertheless, the 2005 permission is considered to be a material planning consideration in the assessment of the current application before members of the planning committee.

##### *Design*

7.4.2 The overarching principle of national and local planning policy is to promote high quality design. Planning policy DM D2 (Design considerations in all development) of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan states that amongst other considerations, that proposals will be expected 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.

7.4.3 In terms of the surroundings, the application site is predominately surrounded by traditional two storey terrace or semi-detached houses along Trinity Road and residential streets parallel with Trinity Road. The

- application site is also located adjacent to the South Park Gardens Conservation Area (opposite side of Princes Road). The proposed design is now considered to have a positive impact on the street scene and character of the area and would therefore overcome concerns relating to design.
- 7.4.4 Officers and the applicant has spent considerable time ensuring that the traditional design approach of the new building replicates the form and detailing of the adjoining terrace and surrounding terraces. Planning conditions requiring full details of building materials and detailing will ensure that the development contributes positively to the terrace and creates a well designed bookend.
- 7.4.5 The proposed building would move forward of the Trinity Road building line, however the proposed building would respond to the building on the opposite corner of Princes Road. Therefore, it is considered that there would be no harm to the visual amenities of the street scenes, particularly given the existing context and the retention of suitable soft landscaped open space to the rear and side of the building. It should also be noted that the 2005 approval (04/P2630) had a much larger building form/height on the street corner and was in fact closer to the Trinity Road street scene compared to the current proposal. Therefore, the current scheme is considered to be an improvement on that previous decision.
- 7.4.6 The proposal would also improve the visual amenities of the area by removing the large and unsightly areas of hard standing to the front and side of the building. Following amendments to the scheme, the applicant has introduced a good amount of soft landscaping on the site, which is considered to override the currently negative hard standing elements on the site.
- 7.4.7 The design of the building includes 4 car parking space to the front and side of the building, however, the proposal retains a reasonable balance between hard and soft landscaped areas. An on-site car parking space was removed during the course of the application in order to provide suitable bin and cycle storage. The new communal cycle storey has been placed in the former car parking space, which will encourage cycle use given its close proximity to the buildings entrance. The applicant has provided details of the proposed cycle store in the front garden which is considered to be high quality and of a low height in order to reduce its presence when viewed from the street scene. A new boundary wall, gate and planting bed have also been added to the frontage which will help screen the cycle store and provide a defined boundary to the site.
- 7.4.8 All bin storage has been located to the rear of the site. This would be accessed via the rear alleyway and would ensure that that these storage

areas have a limited impact on the visual amenities of the street scene. An objection have been received in regards to noise from the bin storage, however it must be noted that the development is a modest sized development (only 5 flats) in a highly urban area. The bins are located predominately to the flank of 18 Trinity Road and to the rear of adjoining neighbouring rear gardens. It is noted that naturally there would be some noise activity from the use of the bins, however this would only be for a short period of time and would not be materially different (increased noise) than how other bins would be used in the vicinity (normally located in front gardens).

#### South Park Gardens Conservation Area

- 7.4.9 The proposed development would achieve a high quality design that responds positively to the character and appearance of the street scenes. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would preserve the setting of the adjacent South Park Gardens Conservation Area.

#### 7.5 **Neighbour Amenity**

##### 49 Princes Road

- 7.5.1 The adjoining neighbour to the west remains in its original form externally, but has been converted into two flats.
- 7.5.2 The proposed building would extend beyond the rear wall of this neighbouring property at ground, first and roof levels.
- 7.5.3 The proposed single storey element is considered to be a modest sized extension being 2.675m deep by 2.7m in height. As a standalone extension, this would be smaller than a permitted development extension; therefore, it is considered that there would be no undue loss of amenity.
- 7.5.4 The two storey rear extension would project 5.9m beyond the neighbour, however the extension would be inset 2.314m from the side boundary and 5.610m from the rear boundary. In addition, the extension has been designed with a low eaves level (5.265m), which would sit below the eaves line of the main roof. The ridge level would be set well away from the neighbour (6.1m from the side boundary).
- 7.5.5 The proposed extension would sit to the east of the neighbouring property. Given the southern orientation of the site, some morning sun light would be affected, however, it should be noted that the proposal would include the removal of the existing full depth single storey rear extension and two storey rear extensions. The neighbouring ground and first floor flat would still receive unaffected light levels in the afternoon as a result of the

development given the orientation of the site. It is therefore considered that there would be no undue loss of light to warrant refusal of planning permission.

- 7.5.6 A number of rear facing windows are proposed at each level, however these are directed towards the rear garden of the application site. This is a common arrangement in a terrace situation and therefore there would be no undue loss of privacy or overlooking. A planning condition preventing side-facing windows in the upper levels without further planning permission being required would ensure that there would be no overlooking of the neighbouring property and garden.
- 7.5.7 It should also be noted that the proposal is considered to be an improvement when compared to the extension approved under 04/P2630. Unlike this 2005 permission, which included a full depth two storey rear extension (noted with a catslide roof), the proposed rear extensions would not project the full depth of the site. It should be noted that the proposed would result in the removal of the full depth rear extension and therefore the proposal would create a sense of openness to the rear of the site.
- 7.5.8 Given the design, size of the extension and the level of separation from the neighbouring boundaries it is considered that the proposed development would not result in undue loss of this neighbours amenity.

#### 62 Princes Road

- 7.5.9 This neighbouring property is located on the opposite concern of Princes Road. The property has recently been extended with a two storey side extension and rear extensions. The proposed building would be located on the opposite of the street, therefore the neighbours are separated by the public highway and there would remain a good level of separation to ensure that there would be no undue loss of amenity.

#### 18 Trinity Road

- 7.5.10 This neighbouring property is located directly to the rear of the application site. The neighbour is situated at a right angle to the application site, therefore there are no concerns with loss of light or privacy.

### 7.6 **Standard of Residential Accommodation**

- 7.6.1 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.

- 7.6.2 In terms of the quality of the accommodation, the proposed flats would meet or exceed the London Plan Gross Internal Area minimum standards; each room would be capable of accommodating furniture and fittings in a suitable manner. Each habitable room would have adequate levels of outlook and natural light.
- 7.6.3 The two ground floor flats would have direct access to private amenity space, which exceeds London Plan Space Standards. The three upper floor flats would have no direct access to private amenity space. Whilst this is unfortunate, lack of private amenity space for upper floor flats is not uncommon in these situations as this can often lead to adverse impact on neighbours from overlooking. In this instance, the lack of private amenity space for the upper floor flats would not warrant refusal of planning permission. It should also be noted that South Park Gardens open space, which has ample outdoor space, is within a short walking distance of the application site.

#### Housing Mix

- 7.6.4 Planning policy DM D2 (Housing Mix) seeks to create socially mixed communities, catering for all sectors of the community by providing a choice of housing with respect to dwelling size and type in the borough. London Plan Policy 3.8, seeks to promote housing choice and seek a balance mix of unit sizes in new developments, with particular focus on affordable family homes. Family sized accommodation is taken in the London Plan and LBM policy to include any units of two bedrooms or more.
- 7.6.5 The borough level indicative proportions concerning housing mix (as set out below) will be applied having regard to relevant factors including individual site circumstances, site location, identified local needs, economics of provision such as financial viability and other planning contributions.

*Table in Planning policy DM D2 (Housing Mix) of Merton's Sites and policies plan 2014*

Number of Bedrooms	Percentage of units
One	33%
Two	32%
Three +	35%

Proposal – 5 x 2 bedroom flats



Number of Bedrooms	Percentage of units
Two	100%

7.6.6 The proposed housing mix of the site, whilst not meeting the Council percentage ratio set out in Policy DM H2 (Housing Mix), are only indicative targets. The proposal is a modest sized development where meeting housing mix targets is often problematic due to constraints of sites. The proposed housing mix would still offer 100% family type accommodation (2 bedroom or more) which is welcomed. Further, the site is close to a town centre location where smaller flats would likely be occupied by couples or independent people, who want good access to the town centre amenities and public transport. The proposed two bedroom flats are considered acceptable.

## 7.7 **Traffic and highways**

### Car Parking

7.7.1 The site is located within a CPZ and has a PTAL rating of 6a, indicating a very good level of accessibility to public transport. The amount of expected vehicle movements to and from the site and trip generation are likely to be low given the modest size of the development and therefore it is not anticipated that this would create adverse harm to traffic conditions in and around the area.

7.7.2 The development would provide 4 car parking spaces onsite. The level of car parking would provide suitable off street car parking to meet the needs of future occupiers. In terms of additional overspill onto the surrounding streets, the Council would require that the development be subject of a permit free development secured via legal agreement.

7.7.3 The Councils Transport Planner has confirmed that they have no objection to the application on highway safety grounds.

### Transport Planner comments (car parking and safety)

#### Car Parking

7.7.4 Previous use as a surgery had the benefit of off street vehicle access on to both Trinity Road and Princes Road.

7.7.5 The amended plans shows 4 off street parking spaces for the proposed 5 units. The car parking layout as shown is satisfactory.

7.7.6 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.

### Safety

7.7.7 The parking spaces off Trinity Road and Princes Road are unlikely to have a significant impact on the free flow of traffic on both roads. There will be less traffic movement due to the proposal compared to a surgery, which would have generated continuous flow of traffic during the day.

7.7.8 Those cars that would wish to turn towards Broadway would need to undertake similar precautionary measures as existing. The proposed two spaces are unlikely to have a detrimental impact on the Princess Road.

### Cycle Parking

7.7.9 The London's Plan states that each 2 bedroom flats should have a minimum of 2 long stay cycle spaces. In addition, there should be 1 short stay space. Therefore, the proposal should have at least 11 cycle spaces.

7.7.10 The applicant has shown 10 long stay cycles spaces and 2 short stay spaces on the submitted plans. The level of proposed cycle parking would therefore exceed London Plan minimum standards. The ground floor flats would have their own cycle storage within their own rear gardens which are easily access from Trinity Road. The communal cycle store (6 cycles) for the three upper floor flats is located in the front garden. This is considered to promote the use of cycling travel, as this is conveniently located within close proximity of the building entrance.

## 7.8 **Sustainability**

7.8.1 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.

7.8.2 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

7.8.3 The applicant has not submitted an energy statement, but the Design and

Access Statement states that the proposal takes into account the technical standard expected of a new build property by meeting and where possible exceeding current building regulations requirements and installing renewable energy technologies where practical as well as reducing its carbon emissions and water consumption. The applicant has therefore committed to sustainable principles. Therefore, the application would be subject to the following planning condition on any approval:

“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

## 8 **Local Financial Considerations**

- 8.1 The proposed development is liable to pay the Merton and Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), the funds for which will be applied by the Mayor towards the Crossrail project. Merton's Community Infrastructure Levy was implemented on 1<sup>st</sup> 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.

## 9. **Sustainability and Environmental Impact Assessment Requirements**

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

## 10. **CONCLUSION**

- 10.1 The proposed development will provide 5 new residential dwellings. The design of the development is considered to be of high quality in terms of appearance and accommodation being proposed. The proposed building

would respect the context of the site and would have no undue impact upon neighbouring amenity, trees or highway considerations. The proposal is considered to be an enhancement over the previous planning approval and would bring the site back into use. 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 agreements.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

### GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION

Subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement covering the following heads of terms:-

1. Designation of the development as permit-free and that onstreet parking permits would not be issued for future residents of the proposed development.
2. 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. C.02 Permitted development (windows)
7. C07 Refuse & Recycling (Implementation)
8. D11 Construction Times
9. Landscaping
10. H07 Hardstanding

11. H07 Cycle Parking to be implemented
12. H14 Garages doors/gates
13. 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
14. Construction Management Plan
15. Car Parking as shown on plans

#### Planning 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
- 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'

2. 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.

---

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