

## PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

29 April 2021

<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>DATE VALID</u>	<u>Item no:</u>
20/P2774	03/09/2020	
<b>Address/Site</b>	3 Hamilton Road, South Wimbledon, SW19 1JD	
<b>Ward</b>	Abbey	
<b>Proposal:</b>	ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR AND SIDE INFILL EXTENSION AND EXACAVATION OF A BASEMENT LEVEL EXTENSION WITH INSTALLATION OF 1 x LIGHT WELL GRILLE TO FRONT OF PROPERTY AND 1 x GLAZED TO REAR.	
<b>Drawing Nos</b>	6777/SK04 Revision C, 6777/SK03 Revision C, 2019-023-401, 2019-023-402, 2019-023-403, 2019-023-404, 2019-023-405, 6777/SK12 Revision B, 6777/SK11 Revision B, Report on a Site Investigation (Ref: 20/11866/GO), 2019-023-LP, 2019-023-406, Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) & Mitigation 3 Hamilton Road, Wimbledon, London SW19 1JD (Project Ref: QFRA 1679, Date: 05/05/2020), ENGINEERING DESIGN & IMPACT STATEMENT FOR BASEMENT DEVELOPMENT at 3 Hamilton Road London SW19 1JD August 2020), 6777/SK01 Revision B, 6777/SK02 Revision C, Arboricultural Impact Assessment Method Statement & Tree Protection Plan (to BS:5837 2012) Ref: TH 2734	
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	Charlotte Gilhooly (020 8545 4028)	

---

### RECOMMENDATION

**GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions**

---

### CHECKLIST INFORMATION.

- Conservation Area- No
- Area at risk of flooding - No
- Local Development Plan site proposal designation - None
- Controlled Parking Zone - Yes
- Trees - Yes
- Listed Building - No

- Is a Screening Opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental Statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Statement been submitted: No
- Press notice: No
- Site notice: No
- Design Review Panel consulted: No
- Number of neighbours consulted: 4

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This application has been brought to the Planning Applications Committee for determination due to the nature and number of objections received. It should be noted the application was originally heard at Planning Committee on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2021. Members raised concern regarding the impact on a street tree at the front. Having considered all of the information before them, Members' were minded to defer the application pending submission of an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Survey to be carried out by the applicant. Since the February Planning Committee meeting, an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan has been carried out by the applicant and was subject to a re-consultation with neighbours.

## **2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 The application site comprises a two storey terraced dwelling which is located on the east side of Hamilton Road in South Wimbledon. Hamilton Road is residential in character made up of largely symmetrical traditional properties. The current property is a single family dwelling which has four bedrooms with an existing rear roof extension. The building is not located within a Conservation Area and nor is it listed. There is a tree in the rear garden and a street tree near to the site. There are no further constraints on the site.

## **3. CURRENT PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a rear and side infill single storey extension and a basement which would extend across the footprint of the existing house and underneath the proposed rear extension. The proposal would be made up of the following dimensions:
- Single storey rear and side infill extension: 5m wide, 10.86m deep on the south side and 4m deep on the north side, with an eaves height of 2.37m and a maximum roof height of 3.05m.
  - Basement: 4.87m wide, 3.37m high and 23.30m in length.
  - Light well front elevation: 2.21m deep and 4.95m wide.
  - Lightwell rear elevation: 1.6m deep and 4.09m wide

Materials include bricks to match existing, slate roof tiles, timber framed sliding sash windows and powder coated aluminum doors.

- 3.2 *Amended Plans:* The scheme was amended on 17/11/20. This was in response to the Flood Risk Officer's comments below who requested more thought was given to creating a waterproof membrane around the proposed basement.

#### 4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

- 20/P0217: APPLICATION FOR A LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT CERTIFICATE IN RESPECT OF THE PORPOSED ERECTION OF A REAR ROOF EXTENSION ABOVE OUTRIGGER. ISSUE CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS 12-03-2020.
- 20/P0212: REPLACEMENT OF REAR ROOF EXTENSION. GRANT PERMISSION SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS 12-03-2020.

#### 5. **CONSULTATION**

##### 5.1 EXTERNAL

Consultation letters were sent to neighbouring properties. Between September 2020 and November 2020, 21 representations have been received raising objection and 9 providing comment which are summarised below:

- Concern over structural stability of property. Many of the houses in this road are over 100 years old, built in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century and not designed for basements.
- Concern on the impact the basement will have on flooding, drainage and impact to the water table.
- The proposed basement and lightwell is out of character for the street and will set a precedent.
- Concern over potential damage to tree as a result of the basement
- The construction process will cause significant disruption for residents especially as the road is a no through road/
- The proposed lightwell will be visible from the front elevation due to the short front gardens in the road. Screening will not be possible. As such it will have a detrimental impact on the character of the area.
- I have lived here for 74 years. Loft extensions are acceptable in this road but basements – no. We should be taking note of what David Attenborough is telling us all.
- The applicant has not yet displayed a site notice.
- The buildings in Hamilton Road were not designed with basements in mind. The proposals could cause damage to the other terrace of houses in this road.
- There have been no other basements in Hamilton Road.

- Construction vehicles will have a detrimental impact on parking in the area as parking is already at capacity.
- The size of the basement is inappropriate and not safe for the area.
- Will there be a traffic management plan? The construction of the basement will cause considerable stress as a result of noise, vibration and dust for residents.
- The proposal is unsustainable.
- The proposal will have a detrimental impact on residents mental health, particularly during the pandemic when many people are working from home.
- Residents insurance premiums will increase as a result of the proposal.
- There is a history of subsidence in the area and my property and 7 Hamilton Road has already had to be underpinned.

*Officers Response:*

*If the application is approved, applicant will need to submit a Building Control application to ensure the works are constructed safely and structurally sound.*

Since the application was deferred at the Planning Committee in February, two more representations have been received which are summarized below :

- The proposal will set a precedent for the area which is not in keeping with the character of the site and surrounding area.
- The proposal is not appropriate for this road.
- Previous applications at 16 and 101 Hamilton Road were refused so I do not see how this application is different?

## 5.2 INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

### Council's Structural Engineer

I have now reviewed the Impact Design Statement along with the Geotechnical report, and the drawings. It demonstrates that the proposed basement works can be undertaken safely without adversely affecting the stability of the highway.

Should you be minded to recommend approval, we would advise that the following conditions are placed on the decision notice and the works shall not commence until these conditions have been discharged by the Council.

- a) Detailed Construction Method Statement and construction/excavation sequence produced by the respective Contractors responsible for the underpinning, excavation and construction of the basements. This shall be reviewed and agreed by the Structural Engineer designing the basement.
- b) Design calculations, drawings, propping and de-propping sequence of the temporary works supporting the highway and adjoining properties, required to

facilitate excavation and underpinning.

- c) Design calculation and drawings (plan and sections) of the underpinned retaining wall and the light well retaining wall. The design has to be undertaken in accordance with Eurocodes. We would recommend using full height hydrostatic pressure and at-rest soil pressures for the design of all retaining walls and a minimum highway loading surcharge of 10 KN/m<sup>2</sup> and 20 KN/m<sup>2</sup> if the adjacent highway has abnormal load traffic movement.
- d) Movement monitoring report produced by specialist surveyors appointed to install monitoring gauges to detect any movement of the highway/neighbouring properties from start to completion of the project works. The report should include the proposed locations of the horizontal and vertical movement monitoring, frequency of monitoring, trigger levels, and the contingency measures for different trigger alarms.

### 5.3 Council's Flood Risk Officer

From the revised submission I can see that they have now ensured all plans indicate the need to waterproof the basement so I'm putting a condition on that they provide exact details for discharge of conditions.

Condition:

Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit a detailed proposal on how drainage and groundwater will be managed and mitigated during and post construction (permanent phase), for example through the implementation of passive drainage measures around the basement structure.

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

### 5.4 Council's Transport and Highways Officer

The proposed development will be formed predominantly underneath the footprint of the existing house. There will be no impact on the adjoining highway.

Recommendation: Raise no objection subject to:

Demolition/Construction Logistic Plan (including a Construction Management plan in accordance with TfL guidance) should be submitted to LPA for approval before commencement of work.

### 5.5 Environmental Health Officer:

We recommend two-conditions regarding contaminated land:

- 1) A preliminary risk assessment, then an investigation shall be undertaken to consider the potential for contaminated-land, and if necessary, a detailed

remediation scheme to bring the site to a suitable state for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to health and the built environment, and submitted to the approval of the LPA. Reason: To protect the health of future users of the site in accordance with policy 5.21 of the London Plan 2016 and policy DM EP4 of Merton's sites and policies plan 2014.

- 2) The approached remediation shall be completed prior to completion. And a verification report, demonstrating the then effectiveness of the remediation, subject to the approval of the LPA. Reason: To protect the health of future users of the site in accordance with policy 5.21 of the London Plan 2016 and policy DM EP4 of Merton's sites and policies plan 2014.

#### 5.6 Council's Tree and Landscape Officer

Having reviewed the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment report – no objections, subject to conditions:

Tree Protection: The details and measures for the protection of the existing trees as specified in the hereby approved document 'Arboricultural Impact Assessment Method Statement & Tree Protection (to BS5837:2012)' reference 'TH2734' dated '10 March 2021' shall be fully complied with. The methods for the protection of the existing trees shall fully accord with all of the measures specified in the report including site supervision and monitoring the progress of site works.

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

No work shall be commenced until details of the proposed design, materials and method of construction of the foundations to be used within 4m of the existing retained tree(s) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing 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.

#### 5.7 Council's Street Tree Officer

Having read through the most relevant sections of Trevor Heaps Arb Report & would echo, as is stated that:

If minded to approve, then it should be conditioned that development should be implemented in accordance with the Tree Protection recommendations in the Report.

Insofar as this is related to the street trees, the London Plane & neighbouring Lime will not be adversely affected.

At 9.4.2 – Individual tree protection, by way of wooden ply-boards, constructed in box-sections to encompass the stem of the London Plane, is noted. This is welcomed as good practice & this should, ideally, be erected around the Lime also.

9.5.5 – Agreed that the incursion into the Root Protection Area (R.P.A) of the London Plane is not regarded as significant and unlikely to cause harm. Both trees are robust species noted for endurance in the urban realm.

The need for facilitation pruning is noted & those Easterly lateral branches could be lightly pruned via tip reduction. Or, as the Report states, it may be that Greenspaces, if approached, would agree to the L.P being repollarded, both from an arb p.o.v & especially if it did not pull on their meagre tree pruning budget.

You may wish to ping Kevin Hawkes an email on this particular point, as I'm sure he'd be interested in this suggestion.

Pursuant to all the above, I have no objections.

## 6. **POLICY CONTEXT**

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)  
Part 7 Requiring Good Design

London Plan (2021)

Relevant policies include:

- Policy D3 Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
- Policy D4 Delivering good design
- Policy D10 Basement development
- Policy G7 Trees and woodlands

Merton Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011)

Relevant policies include:

- CS14 Design
- CS15 Climate Change
- CS16 Flood Risk Management

Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014)

- DM D2 Design considerations in all developments
- DM D3 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
- DM F2 Sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) and; Wastewater and Water Infrastructure

Supplementary planning guidance

- London Plan Housing SPG – 2016
- Basement and Subterranean SPD 2017

## 7 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

The planning considerations for extensions, alterations and a basement to an existing dwelling relate to the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building along with the surrounding area, flood risk, trees and the impact upon neighbouring amenity.

### 7.1 **Character and Appearance**

London Plan policies D3 and D4, Core Strategy policy CS14 and SPP Policies DMD2 and DMD3 require well designed proposals that are of the highest architectural quality and incorporate a design that is appropriate to its context, so that development relates positively to the appearance, scale, bulk, form, proportions, materials and character of the original building and their surroundings, thus enhancing the character of the wider area.

### 7.2 Single storey rear and side infill extension

The proposed single storey rear and side infill extension is of a scale, form and appearance which is considered acceptable to the character of the site and surrounding area. The proposal would have a pitched roof with a minimal eaves height of 2.37m and a maximum roof height of 3.05m. It would extend by 4m beyond the existing outrigger on the west side and by 10.86m on the east side (side infill extension). Materials include bricks to match existing, slate roof tiles, timber framed, sliding, sash windows and powder coated aluminum doors. As such the proposed rear and side infill extension is not considered to appear bulky or incongruous for the site. This part of the proposal is therefore considered to be visually acceptable.

### 7.3 Basement

The proposed basement would be located underneath the existing dwelling and would extend underneath the proposed rear and side infill extension. In addition it would take up less than 50% of either the front or rear garden. The Council's adopted policy on basements does not resist the provision of a basement that covers the full footprint of the dwelling. As such this element of the proposal is considered compliant with policy DM D2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan.

### 7.4 Lightwells

It is noted in the representations received there is some concern over the proposed lightwells and the impact it would have on the character of the area.

7.5 The proposed lightwell at the front of the site would have a metal grill constructed over it. At the rear the lightwell will have a glass walk over. Although the front gardens in this road are relatively short and would be visible from the streetscene,

the proposed lightwell would not be incongruous or visually intrusive as it would be set at ground level and the bay below would match the bay above in terms of design and materials. As such this element of the proposal is considered acceptable.

7.6 Overall, the proposals are considered acceptable to the character of the site and surrounding area.

7.7 **Neighbouring Amenity**

SPP Policy DM D2 states that proposals must be designed to ensure that they would not have an undue negative impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, quality of living conditions, privacy, visual intrusion and noise.

7.8 The properties which have the potential to be affected by the proposal include 1 and 5 Hamilton Road and 5 and 7 Hardy Road.

7.9 1 Hamilton Road

It is noted this neighboring property does not have an existing rear extension.

Due to the minimal eaves height of the proposed rear and side infill extension and taking into account the high existing boundary wall between these neighboring properties, the proposal is not considered to be overbearing, visually intrusive, or result in a loss of privacy or loss of daylight/sunlight. The rear extension would extend 1.0 m beyond the boundary wall and officers consider that this extra depth would not cause material harm.

7.10 5 Hamilton Road

This neighboring property has an existing rear and side infill extension of a similar depth to the proposal. The proposed extension would have a taller parapet wall than this neighboring properties infill extension. Although this will result in some visibility of the parapet wall from the roof lights of the extension at number 5, it is not considered to cause a harmful impact in terms of light and outlook. As such, the proposal is not considered to be overbearing, visually intrusive or result in a loss of daylight/sunlight.

7.11 5 and 7 Hardy Road

There is a separation distance between the rear wall of the proposed extension and the rear wall of these neighbouring properties of approximately 22m. The proposal is also single storey. As such the proposal is not considered to have a detrimental impact on these neighbours amenity.

7.12 **Flood Risk**

A number of representations have been received concerning the impact of the proposed basement construction on drainage and structural stability. However, the applicant has provided an Engineering Design and Impact Statement (informed by

Site Investigation Report) prepared by a qualified structural engineer and the report outlines that there are not identified special structural risks outside of what would normally be expected in a project of this type. The Council's Structural Engineer has reviewed the proposal and is satisfied that the basement can be constructed in a safe manner, subject to a number of submission of further details via planning condition. This includes the requirement to install monitoring gauges to detect any movement of the highway/neighbouring properties from start to completion of the project works.

7.13 Further, the applicants Statement also assesses the impact of flood risk and concludes that the impact from flood risk is low and that flood resilient measures would be implemented for the basement. A formal Flood Risk Assessment has also been undertaken and submitted with the application. The Council's Flood Risk Officer has no objections to the proposal subject to submission of details via condition on how drainage and groundwater will be managed being imposed on any grant of planning permission. The proposed basement is therefore considered to be acceptable in term of policy DM D2.

7.14 **Trees**  
There is one tree in the rear garden of the application site and a street tree at the front of the site. The tree in the rear garden is sited toward the end of the rear garden, away from the house, and is a Magnolia tree. The tree to the front is a street tree and is a London Plan tree. Since deferral at the February Planning Committee meeting, the applicants have submitted an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Method Statement & Tree Protection Plan. The Council's Tree Officers have reviewed the submitted information and have recommended the conditions below to ensure the street tree is protected during construction.

#### 7.15 **Parking and highways**

The proposal would result in a lightwell being at the front of the property. The front of the property currently comprises a hardstanding area which can accommodate 1 parked car. The plans show the lightwell would extend 1.4 m from the front bay window. Some concerns were expressed at the February Planning Committee meeting from Councillors regarding whether the parking can be retained. Since this meeting, officers have assessed whether it is likely that a car would be able to park on the front of the site with the proposed lightwell and consider that as only a distance of 2.5 m of hardstanding would be retained at the front up to the start of the public pavement, officers consider that it is likely that a car would not be able to park on site at the front. Notwithstanding this, the likely loss of 1 parking space on site is not considered to be significant in terms of the effect on the parking on street. The site lies within a high PTAL score of 4 which provides good opportunities and access to public transport options. Further, new London Plan Policy T6.1 outlines that the

maximum parking provision for a new residential unit of 3+ bedrooms in PTAL 4 areas should be up to 0.5-0.75 spaces per dwelling. Although the proposal does not seek a new dwelling, officers consider the loss of the space can not be resisted by the Council as there is a clear steer away from on-site parking provision in the new London Plan policy.

## 8 **CONCLUSION**

The scale, form, design, positioning and materials of the proposals are not considered to have an undue detrimental impact on the host building, the character of the area, neighbouring amenity or flood risk. Therefore, the proposal complies with the principles of policies DMD2 and DMD3 of the Adopted SPP 2014, CS 14 of the LBM Core Strategy 2011 and D3, D4 G7 of the London Plan 2021.

## 9 **RECOMMENDATION**

Grant permission subject to the conditions below:

1. A1 Commencement of Development
2. A7 Approved Plans: The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: [6777/SK04 Revision C, 6777/SK03 Revision C, 2019-023-401, 2019-023-402, 2019-023-403, 2019-023-404, 2019-023-405, 6777/SK12 Revision B, 6777/SK11 Revision B, Report on a Site Investigation (Ref: 20/11866/GO), 2019-023-LP, 2019-023-406, Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) & Mitigation 3 Hamilton Road, Wimbledon, London SW19 1JD (Project Ref: QFRA 1679, Date: 05/05/2020), ENGINEERING DESIGN & IMPACT STATEMENT FOR BASEMENT DEVELOPMENT at 3 Hamilton Road London SW19 1JD August 2020), 6777/SK01 Revision B, 6777/SK02 Revision C, Arboricultural Impact Assessment Method Statement & Tree Protection (to BS5837:2012) reference 'TH2734' dated '10 March 2021']

Reason: In the interests of proper planning

3. B3 External materials as specified: The facing materials to be used for the development hereby permitted shall be those specified in the application form unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development and to comply with policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, policy CS14 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and D3 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

4. D11 Construction times: No demolition or construction work or ancillary activities such as deliveries shall take place before 8am or after 6pm Mondays - Fridays inclusive, before 8am or after 1pm on Saturdays or at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the area and the occupiers of neighbouring properties and ensure compliance with policy DM EP2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

5. H13 Construction Logistics Plan to be submitted: Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a Construction Logistics Plan (including a Construction Management plan in accordance with TfL guidance) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved measures shall be implemented for the duration of the construction process and shall be so maintained, unless the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority is first obtained to any variation.

Reason: To ensure the safety of pedestrians and vehicles and the amenities of the surrounding area and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies 6.3 and T7 of the London Plan 2021, policy CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM T2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

6. Non Standard Condition: Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit a detailed proposal on how drainage and groundwater will be managed and mitigated during and post construction (permanent phase), for example through the implementation of passive drainage measures around the basement structure.

Reason: To reduce the risk of surface and foul water flooding to the proposed development and future users, and ensure surface water and foul flood risk does not increase offsite in accordance with Merton's policies CS16, DMF2 and the London Plan policy SI 13.

7. Non Standard Condition: Prior to commencement of development the applicant must submit the following to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing:

- a. Detailed Construction Method Statement and construction/excavation sequence produced by the respective Contractors responsible for the underpinning, excavation and construction of the basements. This shall be reviewed and agreed by the Structural Engineer designing the basement.

- b. Design calculations, drawings, propping and de-propping sequence of the temporary works supporting the highway and adjoining properties, required to facilitate excavation and underpinning.
- c. Design calculation and drawings (plan and sections) of the underpinned retaining wall and the light well retaining wall. The design has to be undertaken in accordance with Eurocodes. We would recommend using full height hydrostatic pressure and at-rest soil pressures for the design of all retaining walls and a minimum highway loading surcharge of 10 KN/m<sup>2</sup> and 20 KN/m<sup>2</sup> if the adjacent highway has abnormal load traffic movement.
- d. Movement monitoring report produced by specialist surveyors appointed to install monitoring gauges to detect any movement of the highway/neighbouring properties from start to completion of the project works. The report should include the proposed locations of the horizontal and vertical movement monitoring, frequency of monitoring, trigger levels, and the contingency measures for different trigger alarms.

8. Non standard condition: A preliminary risk assessment, then an investigation shall be undertaken to consider the potential for contaminated-land, and if necessary, a detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a suitable state for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to health and the built environment, and shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the health of future users of the site in accordance with policy D10 of the London Plan 2021 and policy DM EP4 of Merton's sites and policies plan 2014.

9. Non standard condition: The approached remediation shall be completed prior to completion and a verification report, demonstrating the then effectiveness of the remediation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the health of future users of the site in accordance with policy D10 of the London Plan 2021 and policy DM EP4 of Merton's sites and policies plan 2014.

10. Tree Protection: The details and measures for the protection of the existing trees as specified in the hereby approved document 'Arboricultural Impact Assessment Method Statement & Tree Protection (to BS5837:2012)' reference 'TH2734' dated '10 March 2021' shall be fully complied with. The methods for the protection of the existing trees shall

fully accord with all of the measures specified in the report including site supervision and monitoring the progress of site works.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing trees in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy G7 of the London Plan 2021, policy CS13 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and 02 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

11. No work shall be commenced until details of the proposed design, materials and method of construction of the foundations to be used within 4m of the existing retained tree(s) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing 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.

12. INFORMATIVE: In accordance with paragraph 38 of the NPPF, The London Borough of Merton (LBM) takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. LBM works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by:

- I. Offering a pre-application advice and duty desk service.
- II. Where possible, suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome.
- III. As appropriate, updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.

In this instance:

- i) The application was amended during the application process and no further assistance was required.