

## Agenda Item 06

### Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 16 October, 2024

Case No. 24/1219

---

Location Garages rear of 88-98 Wrentham Avenue, Tiverton Road, London  
Description Proposed demolition of existing garages and erection of two residential units with landscaping, private and communal amenity areas, cycle and refuse storages and associated works.

**Agenda Page Number: 145 - 174**

#### Further representations

One further comment has been received in objection to the proposals since the publication of the committee report. The objection includes some issues previously raised and some additional concerns. The concerns can be summarised as follows:

Nature of Objection	Officer response
<p>Site Visit:</p> <p>Residents express concern over the absence of a organised committee site visit.</p> <p>Residents believe that such visits would allow them to highlight critical aspects of the site's past history, which they believe planners and applicants may overlook, particularly nuances that can affect decision-making.</p>	<p>It is important that members understand the site and its context. However an organised site visit is not always necessary in order to achieve this. Members often visit the site in their own time however if they decide for a specific application not to visit a site, members may also understand the site and its context from previous experience.</p> <p>The purpose of the site visit is for members of the planning committee to understand the site and not engage in a debate on the proposal which may happen at the committee meeting itself.</p>
<p>Principle of Loss of Garages:</p> <p>The garages at the rear of 88-98 Wrentham Avenue have previously been used for business purposes related to the motor trade. While this usage has decreased, it hasn't completely ceased.</p> <p>Local residents have expressed a need for garage and storage space, but there have been difficulties in making contact with the former owner. The loss of these garages would negatively impact local storage solutions for residents</p>	<p>This is discussed within "principle of loss of garages" within the main committee report.</p>
<p>Accessible Housing:</p> <p>The proposed design includes a stair lift to provide access to the two residential units. However, the current design appears inadequate for full disability access, as it can only accommodate a Class 1 invalid carriage. To meet accessibility needs, the lift would need to support a Class 3 mobility scooter.</p> <p>Additionally, the on-site pathways must be wide enough to allow for scooter manoeuvrability, and a parking space for the scooter must be provided without impeding pedestrian access.</p>	<p>This is discussed within "Accessible Homes" within the main committee report.</p>

<p><b>Impact on Neighbouring Amenity:</b></p> <p>The separation distance between the development and the habitable room windows of neighbouring properties at 88, 92, and 94 Wrentham Avenue is only 13.8 meters, which is less than the minimum 18 meters required by SPD1 Principle 5.2.</p> <p>This shortfall raises concerns about the potential negative impact on privacy and the quality of living for neighbouring residents.</p>	<p>This is discussed within "privacy and overlooking" within the main committee report.</p>
<p><b>Massing and Height:</b></p> <p>The development's compliance with SPD1 guidelines regarding massing and height is disputed. The separation from habitable room windows is less than 14 meters, and there are concerns that the ground level measurements are inaccurate.</p> <p>The report claims compliance with the 45-degree rule, but the ground level of the development appears to be higher than indicated, which would result in non-compliance with the rule and exacerbate the impact on neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Additionally, the development would create a significant sense of enclosure and overshadow gardens, particularly in the winter months when sunlight is limited. This overshadowing would reduce the natural light available to residents, leading to a loss of outlook and replacing the current greenery with a visually unappealing grey structure.</p>	<p>This is discussed within "massing and height" of the main committee report.</p>
<p><b>Privacy and Overlooking:</b></p> <p>There are no measures outlined to prevent the flat roof of the ground floor from being used as a sun-deck. This poses a risk of serious overlooking and would infringe upon the privacy of residents living on Wrentham Avenue.</p> <p>Although the first-floor windows face away from the gardens, no barriers are in place to prevent people from using the first-floor windows to access the flat roof.</p>	<p>The sedum roof has not been designed as a roof terrace. Nevertheless, it is recommended that an additional condition is secured to prevent access to the sedum roof to be used as a terrace or sitting out area. the flat roof being used as a recreational space.</p>
<p><b>Noise, Light, and Disturbance:</b></p> <p>The trees on the property, particularly T1 (a poplar tree), have been a source of concern due to their contribution to ground movement, which has caused damage to boundary walls, including the garage wall of 88 Wrentham Avenue. The failure to address these trees, especially T1, which has been recommended for removal, could lead to further structural issues.</p> <p>Additionally, the introduction of hard surfaces in</p>	<p>T1 lies outside the application site. Trees typically only make a minor difference to noise level and construction would create a further barrier between the railway and existing homes and not expected to materially affect noise levels</p>

<p>place of the current soft landscaping could create acoustic reflections, altering how sound from the nearby railway is experienced by residents and potentially increasing noise levels.</p>	
<p><b>Transport Considerations:</b> The report does not fully consider the differences in controlled parking zones (CPZ) in the surrounding area. For instance, Tiverton Road has two distinct CPZs (Zone KS and Zone KQ), which complicates parking regulations. Many streets, including Wrentham Avenue, are heavily parked, and the development would likely exacerbate this issue. It is suggested that the report downplays the extent of parking stress in the area.</p>	<p>This is discussed under "car parking and access" within the main committee report.</p>
<p><b>Car Parking and Access:</b> The report inaccurately claims that the majority of properties in the area have off-street parking. In fact, 88-98 Wrentham Avenue consists of semi-detached flats, with only half of the properties having off-road parking (typically, only the ground-floor flat has off-street parking).  The number of available on-street parking spaces has decreased over time due to the installation of a zebra crossing and the creation of additional crossovers.</p>	<p>This is discussed under "car parking and access" within the main committee report.</p>
<p><b>Refuse Storage:</b> The plans currently provide storage for only three bins per unit, but with the introduction of blue recycling bags, four bins are now required: general waste, recycling, food waste, and paper/cardboard. A fifth garden waste bin may also be necessary for properties with gardens.  The distance from Unit 2 to the bin store exceeds the maximum recommended distance by 50%, meaning that residents would likely keep bins closer to their property, raising concerns about convenience and safety. The use of the stair lift to move bins could also result in damage or accidents.</p>	<p>This is discussed under "cycle and refuse storage" within the main committee report.</p>
<p><b>Drainage and Flood Risk:</b> There is uncertainty about how rainwater from the first-floor protuberances and flat roof will be managed. It is essential that water be directed towards the railway and away from the boundary wall to prevent damp ingress and damage to nearby garages.</p>	<p>This is discussed under "drainage and flood risk" in the main committee report.</p>

<p><b>Biodiversity:</b></p> <p>No mention is made of the presence of urban foxes inhabiting the railway embankment, which contribute to noise disturbances with their barking.</p>	<p>The proposal not considered to be materially affected by foxes.</p>
<p><b>Trees:</b></p> <p>Tree T1 has caused damage both inside and outside the application site. The root protection area (RPA) on the plans appears to be underestimated, as poplar roots can extend up to 40 meters. This tree, along with others on the site, is contributing to soil desiccation, making the subsoil vulnerable to moisture changes and structural damage.</p>	<p>T1 lies outside of the application site and is therefore not proposed to be removed. The concerns raised would be considered under Building Regulations.</p>
<p><b>Noise and Vibration:</b></p> <p>The noise and vibration survey carried out for the development was limited to a period of four days and a single location, which is insufficient for a full assessment. The railway is a significant source of noise, particularly from the diesel-hauled freight trains, which operate around 70-80 times per day.</p> <p>Vibration patterns are unpredictable, and past surveys have shown that vibration radiates unevenly, affecting some properties more than others. Therefore, monitoring at a single location will not provide an accurate assessment.</p>	<p>This is discussed under "noise and vibration" of the main committee report.</p>
<p><b>Air Quality:</b></p> <p>The air quality assessment focuses solely on the demolition and construction phases and does not consider the impact of the nearby railway, which acts as a pollution corridor. The levels of nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) along the railway are near the legal limit, and diesel-hauled freight trains are likely contributing to this pollution.</p>	<p>This is discussed under "air quality" of the main committee report.</p>
<p><b>Conditions for Construction:</b></p> <p>The demolition of the garages poses a structural risk to the boundary walls shared with neighbouring properties, as these walls support gardens that are at a higher level than the development site. A Construction Method Statement should be required to ensure that steps are taken to protect these walls from collapse during demolition, particularly given that soil movement has already affected these walls.</p>	<p>The structural stability of the retained wall would be considered through building regulations.</p> <p>Additionally, a Construction Method Statement (CMS) condition is in place to ensure that impacts to neighbouring properties are minimised during construction.</p>

### Additional conditions

It is recommended that a condition is secured to restrict access to the sedum roof above ground floor level. This condition would read as follows:

No access shall be provided to the roof of the ground floor of the dwellinghouses hereby approved by way of window, door or stairway and the roof of the ground floor of the dwellinghouses hereby approved shall not be

used as a balcony, terrace or sitting out area.

Reason: To preserve the amenity and privacy of neighbouring residential occupiers.

**Recommendation: Officers continue to recommend that permission is granted, subject to an additional condition as set out above together with the conditions as set out within the draft decision notice.**

DocSuppF