

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

23/2401/FUL

Proposal Proposed development of 3no. two-storey maisonettes with accommodation into the roof and a partial basement level on land at Junction of Roseleigh Close and Cambridge Park, associated landscaping, car/cycle parking and refuse storage at Cambridge Park, East Twickenham.

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

References and quotes are from the officers' report under the above reference.

The following texts are agreed:

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

5. MAIN POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

Issue ii - Design and impact on heritage assets

It is considered that the development is compliant against NPPF (2023) Paragraph 209 and has adequately addressed policies LP3, LP4 and emerging/Submission Policy 30 in directly addressing the relationship of the development to the setting of identified heritage assets...

It is acknowledged that the proposed development does generally seek to reflect the existing height, style and pattern of development and although not directly in line with the immediate neighbour to the north (as is also the case on the other side of Roseleigh Close), the building generally fits with the proportions of others.

Issue iii - Impact on Neighbour Amenity

Although these residents would be faced with a more enclosing, structure close to their boundary and rear amenity area, due to the creation of a new building over a site that has not previously been developed over, the proposal is not considered to harmfully impact upon this neighbouring residential block through loss of light or visual intrusion having regard to the orientation, siting, scale and separating distances.

Noise and Disturbance

Noise during construction would be managed through a Construction Management Plan to control hours of work, as well as dust suppression measures etc., and statutory nuisance legislation would apply through Environmental Services.

External areas/ASHPS could have the potential to cause noise. However, a residential use is not an inherently noisy use, and the site is surrounded by residential uses which also have gardens and the likely noise nuisance from the proposed residential development is not considered to be excessive or unjustifiably harmful. It is acknowledged that noise from any ASHP unit serving the development could be appropriately conditioned.

Likewise, no excessive light pollution would occur to the proposed surrounding environment. Appropriate conditions could be considered in the event of a recommendation of approval.

Overall, the proposed development is considered to be in general accordance with, in particular policies LP8 and LP10.

Issue iv – Residential Standards

The proposed units therefore meet with and exceed policy requirements and provide flexible layouts and adequate storage, which would meet with the relevant space standards with regards to internal space. The three maisonettes would be fully Building Regulations M4(2) compliant in accordance with Policy LP 35 (E) requirements for inclusive access...

Issue v – Affordable Housing

The LPA does acknowledge the costs involved in undertaking this work [*viability appraisals*] for applicants and in the event the application is refused and an appeal to the Secretary of state is made, this particular issue could be resolved at that point and an independent review undertaken of the Applicant's viability information as supplied. The applicant is advised to contact the Council to progress this at such time as an appeal is progressed. [*This is in hand*].

Issue vi – Sustainability

In order to ensure the application is compliant with Local Policy, a condition would have been

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

recommended on any planning consent securing the proposals meet the necessary sustainability and energy efficiency targets as stated within the submitted energy statement, but overall the applicant has demonstrated that the proposed development which would make efficient use of land within the borough in accordance with the aims and objectives of Policy LP22 and the Sustainable Construction Checklist SPD. The proposals are compliant with Local Plan policies LP20 and LP22...

In terms of the SCC the scheme scores an A+ (80) , which indicates that the development would make a major contribution towards achieving sustainable development in the Borough and the total carbon dioxide savings would amount to 77% over the target emission rate over the baseline level, well in excess of the 35% requirement.

Issue vii - Transport

In terms of the highways impacts of the proposed development, the Council's Transport Officer has Official been consulted and confirmed that they have no objection, subject to a pre-commencement planning condition which will require the applicant to submit a detailed drawings for the new crossovers and a detailed construction Management Plan to be approved in writing by the Council.

Issue ix - Flood Risk/SuDS

Based on the findings, which have been produced by persons with relevant qualifications, sufficient information has therefore been provided to the Local Planning Authority to confirm that the proposed would not increase flood risk from all sources and suitable mitigation measures in place to reduce flood risk in compliance with Policy LP21 of the Local Plan, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2021), Basement Assessment User Guide (2021) and the aims and objectives of the NPPF.

A condition would be imposed requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted BIA were the application being recommend for approval, but overall, it has been demonstrated that the development would be safe, would not increasing flood risk elsewhere, and that flood risk would be minimised through the implementation of a range of SuDS measures. A condition would also be necessary for a final detailed drainage design and maintenance strategy.

Issue x – Fire safety

Overall, the scheme can therefore be considered consistent with Policy D12 of the London Plan.

8. PLANNING BALANCE/CONCLUSION

It is accepted that the site is an established residential area and would provide net additional homes. The creation of three new residential units would add to the housing supply in the Borough. As set out in the assessment, this afforded weight as a benefit of the scheme...

The scheme meets policy requirements in several respects, but these are considered necessary requirements rather than public benefits. The sustainability credentials do exceed the policy requirement which is a modest benefit.

The applicant has indicated that they would be prepared to undertake an independent review of their viability information to determine whether or not the development should make an affordable housing contribution.

Brian Waters for the Appellant

4 September 2024