

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**  
**21<sup>st</sup> October 2021**

<u>UPRN</u>	<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>Item No:</u> <u>DATE VALID</u>
	21/P1463	12/04/2021
<b>Address/Site:</b>	Garage Block Heyford Avenue Land rear of 145 & 147 Springfield Avenue Raynes Park	
<b>Ward:</b>	Cannon Hill	
<b>Proposal:</b>	DEMOLITION OF GARAGE BLOCK AND ERECTION OF A 2 BED BUNGALOW WITH HABITABLE ROOFSpace.	
<b>Drawing No.'s:</b>	LP01; BP01; 103 Rev E; 104 Rev D; 105 Rev D; 106 Rev D; 107.	
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	Catarina Cheung (020 8545 4747)	

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Grant planning permission subject to conditions.**

---

**CHECKLIST INFORMATION**

- Is a screening opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental Statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Statement been submitted: No
- Press notice: No
- Site notice: Yes
- Design Review Panel consulted: No
- Number of neighbours consulted: 52
- External consultations: 0
- Controlled Parking Zone: No
- Archaeological Zone: No
- Conservation Area: No

**1. INTRODUCTION**

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

## **2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 The application site comprises a single storey garage block structure (5 garage spaces) with a hardstanding forecourt, to its east is an open area of overgrown grassland. It altogether forms an irregular shape of around 282sqm.
- 2.2 The surrounding area is residential in character. Springfield Avenue comprises 2 storey 1930s semi-detached/terraced dwellings; and Heyford Avenue 1950s buildings, a mixture of 2 storey maisonettes (north-east of the site) and 3x 3 storey block of flats (south of the site). The buildings are quite generously set back from the road, providing gardens/small landscaped areas/off-street parking spaces. Buildings are predominantly finished in red-brick and rendered concrete, with hipped roofs and a general sense of symmetry to their appearance.
- 2.4 The site is not located within a Conservation area nor is the property locally or statutorily listed.
- 2.5 The site has a PTAL of 2 and is not located in a Controlled Parking Zone.

## **3. CURRENT PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 This application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing garage block and erection of a 2 bed bungalow with habitable roofspace.
- 3.2 The main entrance would be sited on the southern elevation, set back 5m from new brick dwarf wall (1m) proposed along the front of the curtilage. A 2m timber fence is proposed toward the sides and rear of the boundary.
- 3.2 The proposed dwellinghouse would have a width of 9m and depth of 7.3m. The rear dormer would measure a width of 3.9m, height of 2.5m and maximum depth of 3.21m.
- 3.3 The new dwellinghouse would provide a 2bed 4person unit with an internal GIA of 81sqm.
- 3.4 The garden would have an area of 123.6sqm.
- 3.5 Refuse bins would be located within the front garden and the cycle store within the side garden of the dwellinghouse.
- 3.6 2x off-street car parking spaces would be provided.

## **4. PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 18/P1712: DEMOLITION OF LOCK UP GARAGES AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 2 STOREY BUILDING CONSISTING OF 1 X 2 BEDROOM FLAT AND 1 X 1 BEDROOM FLAT. – Refused 21/06/2018  
**Reason 1 - The size, siting and design of the proposed building would represent an unneighbourly and unduly dominant form of development that would appear visually intrusive and fail to relate positively and appropriately to the siting, rhythm, scale, density and massing of surrounding buildings and existing street patterns and would be contrary to London Plan policies 3.5, 7.4 and 7.6, policies CS 13 & CS14 of the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011) and policy DM D2 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014).**  
**Reason 2 - The design and layout of the development would result in the provision of a poor quality living environment for future occupiers caused by**

poor outlook and limited light for the ground floor amenity area and poor outlook for the occupiers of Flat 2 to the detriment of the amenity of future occupiers and would be contrary to policy CS14 of the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011) and policy DM D2 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014).

**Reason 3 - The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposals would not adversely affect safety, the convenience of local residents and on street parking management as a result of additional traffic, including vehicle movements, generated by the development, contrary to policy CS20 of the Merton Core Strategy 2011.**

- 4.2 17/P1716: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGES AND THE ERECTION OF A 3 STOREY BUILDING CONSISTING OF 2 X 2 BEDROOM RESIDENTIAL UNITS AND 1 X 1 BEDROOM RESIDENTIAL UNIT. – Refused 16/06/2017, and appeal dismissed 19/01/2018

**Reason 1 - The size, siting, materials and design of the proposed building would represent an unneighbourly and unduly dominant form of development that would appear visually intrusive and fail to relate positively and appropriately to the siting, rhythm, scale, density and massing of surrounding buildings and existing street patterns and would be contrary to London Plan policies 7.4 and 7.6, policies CS 13 & CS14 of the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011) and policy DM D2 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014)**

**Reason 2 - The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposals would not adversely affect safety, the convenience of local residents and on street parking management as a result of additional traffic generated by the development, contrary to policy CS20 of the Merton Core Strategy 2011.**

- 4.3 MER926/72(O): OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR SEMI-DETACHED HOUSE AND GARAGE FRONTING ONTO HEYFORD AVENUE ON LAND REAR OF 143, 145 AND 147 SPRINGFIELD AVENUE – Refused 09/11/1972

- 4.4 MER322/77: FIVE LOCK-UP GARAGES WITH ACCESS ONTO HEYFORD AVENUE – Refused 15/12/1977, Appeal allowed 31/12/1978.

- 4.5 MER212/66: ERECTION OF FIVE LOCK-UP CONCRETE GARAGES AND CONCRETE APRON WITH ACCESS – Granted 30/06/1966.

## **5. CONSULTATION**

### External

- 5.1 Public consultation was undertaken by way of letters sent to 52 neighbouring properties and site notice displayed. 12 representations were received (10 different address points), their objections are summarised below:

### Design and appearance

- The proposal is out of character with the area and neighbouring properties, really badly-planned location for a new building;
- Negative/adverse visual impact – particularly on the landscape as this is a green space;
- The building will not be positive contribution to the area as described in the application;
- The precedents provided in the application do not reflect the situation in Heyford Avenue.

### Impact on neighbouring amenity

- Block sunlight;

- Overlooking into neighbouring bathroom and garden;
- Disagree that lighting will not be affected;
- Do not want construction noise/disturbance, traffic and congestion;
- If the development proceeds, any plans to reduce spread of dirt/dust from the site?
- Personal safety of older residents.

#### Transport/highways/parking/servicing

- The application states there is currently 5 parking spaces available. That is not true as cars would not be able to park outside each garage as other cars would not be able to gain entry to other garages further on;
- Heyford Avenue is a narrow residential road, emergency vehicles have a problem getting access. Will cause problem with large lorries and trucks carrying building supplies, and vehicles living and visiting the proposed property;
- Rubbish collection trucks would not be able to get in the street;
- Traffic generation and increased pressure on existing car parking on the pavement;
- The new development reduces the driveway down;
- The proposed fence would result in existing residents being unable to park in their existing spaces (on the pavement);
- Limited parking;
- Increase in traffic volume will cause danger to residents and deny children playing in this quiet cul de sac;
- Unrealistic to insinuate that all parking will be on site for this proposed development as many households have 2 cars, frequent visitors, carers or childcare;
- With a new build, the entrance (into Heyford Avenue) will be far more used than at present, and to allow a sufficient turning circle into/out of the proposed entrance will limit parking space in the immediate vicinity;
- Where will skips be sited?

#### Other

- There is no anti-social behaviour in Heyford Avenue as stated in the application;
- The application states there no trees or bushes are affected. A tree has already been cut down by the application without permission;
- New dwelling will cause pressure on drainage;
- Thought Merton cared about the environment, why are you taking away a lovely environmentally friendly green grassed area full of wildlife;
- Two BT telegraph poles are sited on/adjacent to the land;
- Telephone pole will be removed and positioned elsewhere, will cause disruption to communication;
- Heyford Avenue is over populated. The new build will cause over-crowding;
- The condition of the existing garages are fine, they have been built to last and are not in poor condition as described in the application;
- Do not like the wording "This new purpose built residential dwelling will assist the Council in meeting their housing targets". Current residents thoughts should be at the forefront, the wording is inconsiderate to residents;
- Any comment on anti-social behaviour, garages not fit for purpose or being untidy should be removed from application as it is not painting the correct picture of our area, the state of the garage or the incompetence of the owner to not look after their land;
- Did not receive a notification letter;
- No mention in report of connection to water, gas, sewage and electricity for the new build.

5.2 2 representations, whilst raising concerns also noted the potential benefits of the scheme:

- There is merit in the scheme mostly because the current location is an eyesore and not well kept, the grass is extremely overgrown, the garages are not kept to a good standard and unsightly trash kept on site.
- Accept that the existing garage complex is somewhat unused in recent times and dilapidated, the additional grass verge which is to be incorporated into the development is often overgrown and strewn with litter, so a new development would be better use of space and visually more pleasing than now, especially as external finishes would blend with existing properties and privacy is going to be maintained.

5.3 The scheme was amended and a 14 day re-consultation carried out 08/09/2021, 6 representations were received (5 different address points). Representations reiterated their original concerns (para 5.1), new comments included below:

- Should this building go ahead, it will be impossible to park and come in and out while all the works are going on;
- An ambulance regularly collects one of the residents, how would they come through with a large lorry delivery materials;
- How is it possible to tarmac a little bit of green that they would use as parking when, the residents, are not allowed to convert our front gardens into driveways;
- Parking difficulties. The applicant has said that residents are parking incorrectly which is against Merton rules. This is the only way residents can park to enable cars, refuse collection and most importantly emergency vehicles to gain entry.

#### Internal

5.4 LBM Transport officer – The site lies within an area PTAL 2 which is considered to be poor. A poor PTAL rating suggests that only a few journeys could be conveniently made by public transport. However, South Merton Railway Station lies approximately 100m of the site through a staircase at the junction of Martin Way and Mostyn Road.

The site is not located within a Controlled Parking Zone and consequently the surrounding streets do not contain parking restrictions.

The proposal provides two car parking spaces in accordance with the London Plan standards. The proposal would require 2 cycle spaces (secure & undercover) in accordance with the London Plan.

Refuse collection will take place from the Heyford Avenue carriageway in the same manner as the existing nearby premises.

Recommendation: Raise no objection subject to car parking as shown maintained, cycle parking provision (2 spaces, secure & undercover) and refuse provision.

5.5 LBM Highways – conditions and informatives recommended. Including an informative reminding the applicant that Highways must be contacted prior to works being carried out to ensure all relevant licenses are in place.

## **6. POLICY CONTEXT**

### **6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (2021)**

Section 5 – Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

Section 9 – Promoting sustainable transport

Section 11 – Making effective use of land

Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places

Section 14 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

## **6.2 London Plan (2021)**

Relevant policies include:

- D1 London's form, character and capacity for growth
- D3 Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
- D4 Delivering good design
- D5 Inclusive design
- D6 Housing quality and standards
- D7 Accessible housing
- D8 Public realm
- D11 Safety, security and resilience to emergency
- D12 Fire safety
- D13 Agent of Change
- D14 Noise
- H1 Increasing housing supply
- H2 Small sites
- G7 Trees and woodlands
- SI 2 Minimising greenhouse gas emissions
- SI 3 Energy infrastructure
- SI 4 Managing heat risk
- SI 5 Water infrastructure
- SI 7 Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy
- SI 8 Waste capacity and net waste self-sufficiency
- SI 13 Sustainable drainage
- T1 Strategic approach to transport
- T4 Assessing and mitigating transport impacts
- T5 Cycling
- T6 Car parking
- T6.1 Residential parking
- T7 Deliveries, servicing and construction

## **6.3 Merton Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011)**

Relevant policies include:

- CS 8 Housing choice
- CS 9 Housing provision
- CS 14 Design
- CS 15 Climate change
- CS 17 Waste management
- CS 18 Transport
- CS 20 Parking servicing and delivery

## **6.4 Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014)**

Relevant policies include:

- DM D1 Urban design and the public realm
- DM D2 Design considerations
- DM EP2 Reducing and mitigating noise
- DM O2 Nature conservation, trees, hedges and landscape features
- DM T1 Support for sustainable transport and active travel
- DM T2 Transport impacts of development
- DM T3 Car parking and servicing standards
- DM T5 Access to the Road Network

## **6.5 Supplementary planning considerations**

- Merton's Explanatory Note: Approaches to Sustainable Design and Construction 2020
- London Plan Housing SPG – 2016
- DCLG Technical Housing Standards - nationally described space standards 2015

## **7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

7.1 The key planning considerations of the proposal are as follows:

- Principle of development
- Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the area
- Impact upon neighbouring amenity
- Standard of accommodation
- Transport, parking and cycle storage
- Refuse
- Sustainability
- Others

7.2 Principle of development

### **Loss of the garage**

7.2.1 The garages were erected around the 1960-70s (see planning history, Section 4). Though they initially functioned as lock-up garages, they most recently have been used for storage purposes. The garage block was created from the purchase of the rear end of the gardens at 145 and 147 Springfield Avenue, this together with the irregular grassed area forms a larger plot for redevelopment. So originally, the site was a residential backland garden plot, and demolishing the garages to erect a new dwellinghouse would be reverting it to its previous land use.

7.2.2 The garage structure is of no particular architectural merit or significance, so its demolition would not be considered detrimental to the character of the area.

### **Provision of housing**

7.2.3 The National Planning Policy Framework, London Plan Policy H1 and the Council's Core Strategy Policies CS8 and CS9 all seek to optimise the potential of suitable sites for housing delivery in order to increase sustainable housing provision and access to a mixture of dwelling types for the local community, providing that proposals are well designed and provide an acceptable standard of accommodation.

7.2.4 London Plan Policy H1 sets the ten-year targets for net housing completions that each local planning authority should plan for. Merton's annual housing target has been increased to 918 from 411 in the previous Plan. For London to accommodate the growth identified in the new Plan in an inclusive and responsible way, Policy D3 seeks to ensure that every new development needs to make the most efficient use of land by optimising site capacity, this means ensuring the development's form is the most appropriate for the site.

7.2.5 Further, London Plan Policy H2 encourages boroughs to support well-designed new homes on small sites (below 0.25 hectares in size), so to recognise that local character evolves over time and will need to change in appropriate locations to accommodate additional housing on small sites.

7.2.6 The development seeks to provide an additional residential unit on the site through the demolition of the garage block and erection of a new detached dwellinghouse. The principle of doing so is considered acceptable and in line with policies seeking to increase provision of additional homes and through intensification of the site.

7.2.7 However, whilst the principle of the development is considered acceptable, the scheme is also subject to the following criteria being equally fulfilled and compliant with the relevant policies set out in the London Plan, Merton's Core Strategy, Merton's Sites and Policies Plan and supplementary planning guidance.

### 7.3 Character and Appearance

7.3.1 London Plan Policy D3 requires development proposals to enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions. Development proposals should be of high quality, with architecture that pays attention to detail and gives thorough consideration to the practicality of use, flexibility, safety and building lifespan through appropriate construction methods and the use of attractive, robust materials which weather and mature well.

7.3.2 Local Policies CS14, DMD1 & DMD2 further supports this, requiring new developments to reflect the best elements of the character of the surrounding area, or have sufficient distinctive merit so that the development would contribute positively to the character and appearance of the built environment, by using appropriate architectural forms, language, detailing and materials which complement and enhance the wider setting.

7.3.3 The NPPF is encouraging of developments which are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities). As mentioned in para 7.2.3, London Plan Policy H2 encourages boroughs to support well-designed new homes on small sites, highlighting the need to recognise that local character evolves over time and will need to change in appropriate locations to accommodate additional housing on small sites.

7.3.4 To understand the evolution of the design, it is helpful to revisit the previously refused permissions in 2017 (17/P1716 – also dismissed at appeal) and 2018 (18/P1712 – also dismissed at appeal):

- 17/P1716 – The development proposed a flatted building of 2-3 storey height, providing 3x self-contained units. Refer to para 4.2 for the full reasons for refusal.

The officer's delegated report describes under the "Design impact on the street scene" section: "From the pre application stage the applicant was advised that officers considered that building a block in this location would be at odds with the predominant housing forms and layouts in the area. This is because the building form is in essence a mixture of either suburban interwar style houses/maisonettes or the large three storey blocks of flats, where all the housing is aligned along similar axis lines and exhibit a commonality of materials. It is considered that placing a one off block that uses materials such as artificial foliage and Rockpanel cladding in this position would not reflect the context and character of the local street scene and as such fails to accord with these policies and is consequently recommended for refusal".

- 18/P1712 – The development proposed a flatted building of 3 storey (2+roof) height, providing 2x self-contained units. Refer to para 4.1 for the full reasons for refusal.

The officer's report re-highlights the concerns above about a stand-alone building, "Whilst this proposal is smaller than the previous refusal and uses more appropriate materials it remains obvious that the design form matches neither of the predominant forms in the area".

7.3.5 The mutual concerns in both applications were the design of the proposals and impact on existing street parking – the transport/parking issues shall to be discussed in Section 7.6. In relation to the design, officers consider that the new proposals deliver a significantly reduced scale of development and are a marked improvement.



- 7.3.6 The proposals move away from attempting a large detached flatted building, reducing the scale to a bungalow style dwelling with roof level accommodation. The reduced height and massing are considered appropriate, relatively modest in scale and would respect the local context and not appear as an unduly dominant or excessive form within the plot.
- 7.3.7 The set back of the dwelling from the boundary/street helps to mitigate its visual impact toward the streetscene and is in keeping with the layout of the neighbouring houses and flats which are also set back from the pavement providing a pleasant openness to the public realm. This is complimented with a 1m dwarf brick wall along the front boundary to increase visibility and also increased natural surveillance. A taller fence would be introduced toward the side/rear of the garden to offer appropriate security and privacy.
- 7.3.8 The building presents a modest hipped roof form with small dormer details, finished in red bricks and slate roof tiles to match the prevailing roof character and materiality of the area. Overall, the dwelling would blend in with the character of the local area and would not create the impression of inappropriate overdevelopment of the site like the previous refusals.

#### 7.4 Neighbouring Amenity

- 7.4.1 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. London Plan Policy D3 states that development should deliver appropriate outlook, privacy and amenity.

#### **143, 145, 147 Springfield Avenue**

- 7.4.2 The new dwellinghouse would be set away around 30m from the rear of 143, 145 and 147 Springfield Avenue – or approximately 26m measured from the single storey element at 145 Springfield Avenue. The separation distances are considered sufficient and would unlikely result in undue harm toward neighbouring amenity in terms of light or outlook. Further, the proposed side window on the western elevation would be obscure glazed (stairwell) so as to mitigate overlooking concerns.
- 7.4.3 Currently, along the boundary between the application site and rear garden area of 143 Springfield Avenue is a thick screen of tall trees. Nonetheless, the proposed dwelling would be set back 2m from the boundary and the proposed first floor rear dormer bedroom windows would be obscure glazed up to 1.7m.

#### **Heyford Avenue – two storey dwellings (north-east of the application site)**

- 7.4.4 The Heyford Avenue dwellings would be separated from the application site by the public highway (Heyford Avenue).
- 7.4.5 Measuring between the proposed dwelling and 1-4 Heyford Avenue would be around a 25m separation distance, and 5-8 Heyford Avenue around 21m. Given the distances provided, it is considered the proposed dwelling would not unduly impact these dwellings in terms of outlook or light.

#### **Heyford Avenue flats (south of the application site)**

- 7.4.6 Similarly, the flatted blocks are also separated from the application site by the public highway. Between the block immediately south of the application site and the new dwelling would be around a 16m separation, and the flatted block positioned at an angle (facing toward the corner of Heyford Avenue) 19m. Given the proposed

separation and height of the new building, this would unlikely be viewed as an excessive form which would inappropriately shade/encroach on the light and outlook from the flats' windows and balconies.

7.4.7 Overall, it is considered the proposed development would not have a negative impact toward neighbouring amenity.

## 7.5 Standard of accommodation

### **Internal**

7.5.1 Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021 requires housing developments to be of the highest quality design and provide adequately-sized rooms with comfortable and functional layouts which are fit for purpose and meet the needs of Londoners without differentiating between tenures, and should provide at least the gross internal floor area and built-in storage area set out in Table 3.1. Policies DMD2 and D6 require housing developments to provide an appropriate quality of living condition with sufficient daylight and sunlight to new and surrounding housing.

7.5.2 The dwellinghouse would provide a 2bedroom 4person unit over 2 storeys with an internal GIA of 81sqm. The London Plan and Technical housing standards requires 79sqm. The proposal would comfortably accord with the required internal space standards.

### **External**

7.5.3 Policy DMD2 of the Council's Sites and Policies Plan requires new houses to provide a minimum garden area of 50 sqm as a single usable regular shaped amenity space.

7.5.4 The proposed garden would provide an area of 123.6sqm, screened along the boundary with a timber fence.

7.5.5 The proposed garden size would comfortably exceed policy requirements.

## 7.6 Transport, parking and cycle storage

7.6.1 Merton SPP Policy DM T2 seeks to ensure that development is sustainable and has minimal impact on the existing transport infrastructure and local environment. Policy DM T3 seeks to ensure that the level of residential and non-residential parking and servicing provided is suitable for its location and managed to minimise its impact on local amenity and the road network.

7.6.2 Core Strategy Policy CS20 and SPP Policy DM T5 requires that development would not adversely affect pedestrian or cycle movements, safety, the convenience of local residents, street parking or traffic management, that that they minimise any impacts on the safe movement of people or goods, are appropriately located and connected to the road hierarchy; respect the streets character and environment.

7.6.3 As set out in para 7.3.5, the previous permissions raised concerns in relation to the impact of the proposals on the existing street parking:

- 17/P1716 – No offer of off-street parking spaces. Refer to para 4.2 for the full reasons for refusal.

Officers concluded from the findings of the Parking Stress Survey submitted that there would not be sufficient capacity on-street in the local vicinity to accommodate

additional vehicles. The site is also not located within a CPZ so there would be no mechanism to control parking by making the scheme permit free. The Inspector concluded: "The appellant's survey suggested that there were significant numbers of parking spaces available in neighbouring streets within 200 metres or so of Heyford Avenue. However, future occupiers would be likely to want to park close to where they live as evidenced by the existing over-parking problem. While alternative parking might be available some distance away it is more likely that the proposal would result in additional parking in Heyford Avenue and thereby increasing the risk to pedestrians and the difficulties for large emergency vehicles".

- 18/P1712 – Provision of 2 off-street parking spaces, one would be located beneath an overhang structure and require the construction of a new dropped kerb. Refer to para 4.1 for the full reasons for refusal.

The officer's report: "Whilst the swept path shows that it is theoretically possible to manoeuvre to and from the two parking bays much of that movement would need to cross the pathways on site and risk conflict with the undercroft support pillars and the soft planting areas as well as the cars parked opposite... The constraints of the site are such that the usability of the provided bays is such that it is considered unlikely to be a practical solution for car parking and that there would be more temptation for future occupiers to park on the street".

7.6.4 Paragraph 111 of the NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

7.6.5 The latest proposals would provide off-street parking spaces unlike application 17/P1716. And unlike application 18/P1712, there would be no restriction for vehicles manoeuvring/turning in the front garden given the lack of obstructions, so these spaces would be more practical for use and vehicles would more likely be able to navigate the narrow street and other parked vehicles along Heyford Avenue when entering/exiting.

7.6.6 With the provision of 2x off-street parking spaces, it is not considered there would be increased stress to the existing on-street parking availability, where representations have raised concerns about the existing parking pressures; nor would it further compromise the width of the highway as vehicles would not be reliant on following the existing parking pattern (parking wholly/partly on the footpath), thereby not creating further obstruction for large service/emergency vehicles entering into this cul-de-sac.

### **Cycle**

7.6.7 Core Strategy Policy CS18 seeks to promote active transport by requiring new development to provide cycle parking, it encourages design that provides, attractive, safe, covered cycle storage, cycle parking and other facilities (such as showers, bike cages and lockers).

7.6.8 London Plan Policy T5 requires developments to provide appropriate levels of cycle parking which should be fit for purpose, secure and well-located. Developments should provide cycle parking at least in accordance with the minimum standards set out in Table 10.2. In accordance with Table 10.2, residential dwellings should provide 1 space per studio/1 person 1 bedroom dwelling, 1.5 spaces per 2 person 1 bedroom dwelling and 2 spaces per all other dwellings.

7.6.9 The proposal provides 2 cycle spaces which satisfies the London plan standards.

## 7.7 Refuse

- 7.7.1 Merton Core Strategy Policy CS17 requires new developments to demonstrate integrated, well-designed waste storage facilities that will include recycling facilities.
- 7.7.2 London Plan Policies SI 7 and SI 8 identifies that in order to manage London's waste sustainably, the waste management capacity of existing sites should be optimised and developments should be designed with adequate, flexible, and easily accessible storage space and collection systems that support, as a minimum, the separate collection of dry recyclables (at least card, paper, mixed plastics, metals, glass) and food.
- 7.7.3 Refuse bins would be located toward the front/side of the property, this is considered a suitable location and would be convenient for pulling out onto the highway on collection days. This arrangement is not dissimilar to the manner in which refuse is currently collected along Heyford Avenue and Springfield Avenue.

## 7.8 Sustainability

- 7.8.1 Merton's Core Planning Strategy (2011) Policy CS15 outlines how all minor and major development, including major refurbishment, should demonstrate: how the proposal makes effective use of resources and materials, minimises water use and CO2 emissions; makes the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with the energy hierarchy and designed to withstand the long term impacts of climate change.
- 7.8.2 London Plan Policies SI 2, SI 5 and Merton's Sustainable Design and Construction Explanatory note, expects developments to achieve carbon reductions beyond Part L from energy efficiency measures alone to reduce energy demand as far as possible. For minor residential developments, development is required to achieve a 19% improvement on Part L of the Building Regulations 2013 and water consumption should not exceed 105 litres/person/day.
- 7.8.3 To ensure that the proposed development will meet the policy standards in accordance with the Local and London plan, the imposition of a pre-occupation condition is recommended to be attached to any grant of planning permission in order to secure these improvements.

## 7.9 Others

- 7.9.1 Trees – London Plan Policy G7 states that development proposals should ensure that, wherever possible, existing trees of value are retained. Policy DM O2 seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity, particularly on sites of recognised nature conservation interest. To protect trees, hedges and other landscape features of amenity value and to secure suitable replacements in instances where their loss is justified. Representations have raised concerns over the felling of an existing tree on site. However, the site does not lie within a Conservation area nor does it contain any protected trees (TPOs), therefore its removal would not have required a tree work application.
- 7.9.2 Construction – The impact of the construction process itself cannot reasonably form a reason for refusal. However, the impacts can be minimised through the provision of a construction management plan which will be secured by way of condition.
- 7.9.3 Telegraph poles – The amended ground floor plan (103 Rev E) shows the positioning of the 2x telegraph poles within/adjacent to the site. These shall remain in situ and the

boundary fence has been designed to exclude the poles within the curtilage of the proposed dwellinghouse.

## **8. CONCLUSION**

- 8.1 The scale, form, design, positioning and materials of the new dwellinghouse have been well-considered conceiving a suitably reduced scheme to overcome the previous reasons for refusal. Officers consider that the proposals provide an optimal solution to redevelop the underused site to provide further residential accommodation. In addition, the proposed development is considered not to have an undue detrimental impact toward neighbouring amenity, and would offer comfortable internal and external living environments, with adequate storage for refuse and cycle parking and off-street parking spaces.
- 8.2 Therefore, it is considered the proposal complies with the principles of policies referred to above in Section 6 and it is recommended to grant planning permission subject to the attachment of appropriate conditions.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Grant planning permission subject to the attachment of the following conditions:

1. A1 Commencement of Development – The development to which this permission relates shall be commenced not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
2. A7 Approved Plans – The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: LP01; BP01; 103 Rev E; 104 Rev D; 105 Rev D; 106 Rev D; 107.
3. B1 External Materials as specified – The facing materials to be used for the development hereby permitted shall be those specified in the application form unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 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. B5 Details of Walls/Fences – No development shall be occupied until details of all boundary walls or fences are submitted in writing for approval to the Local Planning Authority. No works which are the subject of this condition shall be carried out until the details are approved, and the development shall not be occupied until the details are approved and works to which this condition relates have been carried out in accordance with the approved details. The walls and fencing shall be permanently retained thereafter.
5. C03 Obscure Glazing – Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied, the dormer windows on the first floor level (north, east and west elevations) shall be glazed with obscure glass and fixed shut up to 1.7m (measured from the internal floor level), and shall be permanently maintained as such thereafter.
6. C01 No permitted development (extensions) – Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order

2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no extensions, other than that expressly authorised by this permission shall be carried out without planning permission first obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

7. C02 No permitted development (windows) – Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no window, door or other opening other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed on the first floor level without planning permission first being obtained from the Local Planning Authority.
8. C07 Refuse & Recycling – The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the refuse and recycling storage facilities shown on the approved plans have been fully implemented and made available for use. These facilities shall thereafter be retained for use at all times.
9. C09 No Use of Flat Roof – Access to the flat roof of the development hereby permitted shall be for maintenance or emergency purposes only, and the flat roof shall not be used as a roof garden, terrace, patio or similar amenity area.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities and privacy of the occupiers of adjoining properties and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 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.

10. D11 Construction hours – No demolition or construction work or ancillary activities such as deliveries shall take place before 8am or after 6pm Mondays - Fridays inclusive, before 8am or after 1pm on Saturdays or at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.
11. H04 Provision of Vehicle Parking – The vehicle parking area shown on the approved plans shall be provided before the commencement of the building use hereby permitted and shall be retained for parking purposes for occupiers and users of the development and for no other purpose.
12. H07 Cycle Parking – The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the cycle parking shown on the plans hereby approved has been provided and made available for use. These facilities shall be retained for the occupants of and visitors to the development at all times.
13. H10 Construction Vehicles, Washdown Facilities etc – Development shall not commence until a working method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to accommodate:
  - (i) Parking of vehicles/construction vehicles of all site workers and visitors;
  - (ii) Loading and unloading of plant and materials;
  - (iii) Storage of construction plant and materials;
  - (iv) Wheel cleaning facilities
  - (v) Control of dust, smell and other effluvia;
  - (vi) Control of surface water run-off.

No development shall be carried out except in full accordance with the approved method statement.

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 T4 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.

14. Non-standard condition – No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until evidence has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority confirming that the development has achieved CO2 reductions of not less than a 19% improvement on Part L regulations 2013, and internal water usage rates of not more than 105 litres per person per day.

Reason: To ensure that the development achieves a high standard of sustainability and makes efficient use of resources and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: Policy SI 2 and SI 5 of the London Plan 2021 and Policy CS15 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011.

#### Informatives

15. INF Party Walls Act
16. INF Sustainability
17. INF 09 Works on the Public Highway – You are advised to contact the Council's Highways team on 020 8545 3700 before undertaking any works within the Public Highway to obtain the necessary approvals and/or licences. Please be advised that there is a further charge for this work. If your application falls within a Controlled Parking Zone this has further costs involved and can delay the application by 6 to 12 months.
18. INF 12 Works affecting the public highway – Any works/events carried out either by, or at the behest of, the developer, whether they are located on, or affecting a prospectively maintainable highway, as defined under Section 87 of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991, or on or affecting the public highway, shall be co-ordinated under the requirements of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 and the Traffic management Act 2004 and licensed accordingly in order to secure the expeditious movement of traffic by minimising disruption to users of the highway network in Merton. Any such works or events commissioned by the developer and particularly those involving the connection of any utility to the site, shall be co-ordinated by them in liaison with the London Borough of Merton, Network Coordinator, (telephone 020 8545 3976). This must take place at least one month in advance of the works and particularly to ensure that statutory undertaker connections/supplies to the site are co-ordinated to take place wherever possible at the same time.
19. INF 15 Discharge conditions prior to commencement of work – This planning permission contains certain conditions precedent that state 'before development commences' or 'prior to commencement of any development' (or similar). As a result these must be discharged prior to ANY development activity taking place on site. Commencement of development without having complied with these conditions will make any development unauthorised and possibly subject to enforcement action such as a Stop Notice.
20. INF 16 Trees – You are advised to employ a suitably qualified arboricultural expert for advice on pruning and general works to be undertaken to trees on the site and those in neighbouring properties that are likely to be affected by the scheme. A list of qualified experts can be obtained from the Arboricultural Association at [www.trees.org.uk](http://www.trees.org.uk).

21. INF 20 Street naming and numbering – 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](mailto:street.naming@merton.gov.uk)
22. INF Swifts – The applicant should be aware that the site may provide a useful habitat for swifts. Swifts are currently in decline in the UK and in order to encourage and improve the conservation of swifts the applicant is advised to consider the installation of swift nesting box/bricks on site.
23. Note to Applicant – approved schemes.