

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
21st January 2016

Item No:

UPRN

APPLICATION NO.

DATE VALID

15/P3366

28/08/2015

Address/Site:

28 & 30 Ridgway Place, Wimbledon, SW19 4EP

(Ward)

Hillside

Proposal:

Demolition of existing two houses and erection of 4 x 4 bedroom semi-detached houses with basement accommodation.

Drawing Nos:

640/010 P10, 040 P4, 041 P4, 042 P4, 043 P4, 044 P5, 050 P4, 060 P5, 061 P5, Basement Construction Method Statement (Ref: 3845-ST-ST001 P3) & Flood Risk and SuDs Assessment (Ref: 3845-FR001D).

Contact Officer:

David Gardener (0208 545 3115)

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT Planning Permission Subject to a S106 Legal Agreement and Conditions

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- Heads of agreement: Permit free, Affordable housing
- Is a screening opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental Statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Impact Assessment been submitted: No
- Press notice: No
- Site notice: Yes
- Design Review Panel consulted: No
- Number of neighbours consulted: 28
- External consultations: None

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The applications have been brought before the Planning Applications Committee due to the number of objections received.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site comprises two detached houses (Nos. 28 & 30), which are located on the northeast side of Ridgway Place, Wimbledon. No.28 is a two-storey house with a gable roof, whilst No.30 is an L-shaped bungalow.
- 2.2 The application site is located on a steep section of Ridgway Place, with the road following the gradient of the hill, which slopes downwards from northwest to southeast.
- 2.3 The surrounding area is generally characterised by low-density detached residential houses.
- 2.4 The application site has a PTAL rating of 6a (excellent) and is not located in a conservation area. The site is also located in a controlled parking zone (CPZ).

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The current application is for full planning permission to demolish the two existing detached houses and erect four semi-detached houses. The proposed houses are numbered 28, 28A, 30 & 30A on the submitted plans.
- 3.2 The proposed houses would be arranged over four floors, with accommodation at basement, ground, first floor and roof levels. Each semi-detached pair of houses would feature a house with a projecting gable end addressing the street and a house with a double height front bay window and front dormer. Three houses would also feature rear dormers. One off-street parking space per house is provided within the front curtilage.
- 3.3 The application follows the previous refusal of a planning application under delegated powers in April 2015 (Ref: 15/P0663) for the demolition of the two houses and erection of four semi – detached houses. The key differences are
 - reduction in height
 - depth of houses adjacent to Nos. 26 and 32 Ridgway Place reduced at either ground or first floor level or both
 - size of front gable ends reduced in both size and number from four to two.
 - mixture of render and brick facing materials instead of just brick, and clay tile instead of slate
- 3.4 All the houses in the latest proposal feature basements and front lightwells. It should be noted that the current application has been amended since its initial submission with the front elevation of each house moved back 50cm, the gable and double height bay windows swapped over on the northwest pair of houses and the single storey rear element of the house closest to No.26 stepped in, to reduce impact on neighbours. The applicant has also confirmed that the roofs of the houses would be clay rather than slate as originally submitted.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

The following planning history is relevant:

- 4.1 No.28
No Planning history.
- 4.2 No.30
- 4.3 WIM2891 – Erection of 1 x Bungalow and garage. Granted - 14/08/1956
- 4.4 15/P0663 - Demolition of existing 2 x houses and erection of 4 x semi detached houses with associated landscaping. Refused - 13/04/2015, for the following reasons:
- “ The proposal, by reason of its height, depth, and siting would be visually intrusive, overbearing and result in an unacceptable loss of daylight/sunlight to the detriment of the amenities of occupiers of Nos. 26 and 32 Ridgway Place, contrary to policy DM D2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014).”
- And
- “ The proposed houses by reason of their excessive height, bulk, and massing, would not relate positively and appropriately to the siting, rhythm, scale, density, proportions, height, materials and massing of surrounding buildings, and would have a detrimental impact on the Ridgway Place street scene, contrary to policy DM D2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014).”
- 4.5 Pre –application advice for the demolition of the two houses and erection of four semi-detached houses was sought in May 2015 (Ref: 15/P1808/NEW)

5. POLICY CONTEXT

- 5.1 Adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014):
DM D1 (Urban design and the public realm), DM D2 (Design considerations in all developments), DM F2 (Sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) and; Wastewater and Water Infrastructure), DM T1 (Support for sustainable transport and active travel), DM T3 (Car parking and service standards)
- 5.2 Adopted Merton Core Strategy (July 2011) are:
CS.8 (Housing Choice), CS.9 (Housing Provision), CS.14 (Design), CS.20 (Parking, Servicing and Delivery)
- 5.3 London Plan (March 2015) are:
3.3 (Increasing Housing Supply), 3.5 (Quality and Design of Housing Developments), 3.8 (Housing Choice), 5.3 (Sustainable Design and Construction), 6.13 (Parking)
- 5.4 The following Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) is also relevant:
New Residential Development (September 1999)

6. CONSULTATION

6.1 The application was publicised by means of Conservation Area press and site notice procedure and individual letters to occupiers of neighbouring properties. In response, 27 letters of objection have been received, including an objection letter from the Ridgway Place Residents Association, raising the following concerns:

- The proposal is an overdevelopment of plot; does not relate positively to the height, massing, rhythm and density of surrounding properties; out of keeping; too high and prominent, doesn't follow roof lines, excessive bulk, two detached houses more appropriate, goes beyond established building line
- Object to loss of two on-street parking bays. Permit free requirement ineffective in preventing new occupiers from successfully applying for permits; one off-street car parking space is not sufficient for houses of this size;
- Unsafe part of the road for cars to access off-street parking bays because of crest of the road, which means there is a collision risk with oncoming traffic such as car and cyclists. This could also raises safety concerns during construction;
- Construction of basements would pose a risk to stability of adjacent houses; the hydrology report does not make provision for how water would flow downhill from No. 32 Ridgway Place; Impact on groundwater flow has not been adequately assessed; approving a development with basement would set an undesirable precedent for the road; a structural assessment and land stability investigation has not been provided - an informed decision cannot be made about structural stability impact; construction methodology unclear/lacking in detail;
- Noise, disturbance and inconvenience caused during construction;
- Overlooking/loss of privacy, loss of views, overshadowing/loss of daylight/sunlight, visually obtrusive and overbearing
- No information in relation to Merton's policy on Carbon reduction;
- Proposed trees in front curtilage compromised by location of sewerage and drainage facilities, limited landscaping and impact on wildlife;
- Limited outdoor amenity space;
- Lack of consultation;

6.3 Future Merton

The Flood and structural engineers have assessed the proposal and are satisfied with the details submitted so far. They have requested further conditions area attached with any approval.

6.4 Transport planning

No objections subject to relevant conditions.

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations are the impact that the proposed houses would have on the streetscene and character of the area, impact on residential amenity (including impact of the basements), the standard of accommodation and impact on parking/highways.

7.1 Design and Impact on Street Scene

- 7.11 Policy DM D2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) states that proposals for development will be required to relate positively and appropriately to the siting, rhythm, scale, density, proportions, height, materials and massing of surrounding buildings, whilst using appropriate architectural forms, language, detailing and materials which complement and enhance the character of the wider setting.
- 7.12 The existing development pattern of this part of Ridgway Place is mainly medium density detached houses with heights that generally step down following the steep road gradient. The previous scheme was refused in part because it was considered that the combination of the excessive height and amount of development was out of keeping with the pattern of development pattern in this part of Ridgway Place.
- 7.13 It is considered that the current proposal has addressed the grounds for refusal relating to the previous scheme by reducing the size of the houses and designing them so that they are more in keeping with the style of houses along this part of Ridgway Place. The houses would now appear much less prominent in the street scene with their heights substantially reduced so that they step down more in rhythm with the other houses along this part of the road and with a reduced number and size of front gables. The front elevations have also been moved back a further 50cm.
- 7.14 The proposed houses in the current scheme will feature a mixture of render, brick, and clay tiles, which further breaks down their massing, whilst providing a pallet of materials which better reflects the street. The houses also comprise design features, which are common on a number of houses along this part of Ridgway Place with for example rendered front gables featured on the adjoining property, No.32 and a number of houses on the other side of the road. Overall, it is considered that the current proposal would complement the character of the Ridgway Place street scene and the wider area in general and as such accords with policy DM D2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014).

7.3 Standard of Accommodation

- 7.31 The London Plan was published in July 2011 and sets out a minimum gross internal area standard for new homes as part of policy 3.5. It provides the most up to date and appropriate minimum space standards for Merton.

- 7.32 In addition, adopted policy CS.14 of the Core Strategy and DM D2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) encourages well designed housing in the borough by ensuring that all residential development complies with the most appropriate minimum space standards and provides functional internal spaces that are fit for purpose. New residential development should safeguard the amenities of occupiers by providing appropriate levels of sunlight & daylight and privacy for occupiers of adjacent properties and for future occupiers of proposed dwellings. The living conditions of existing and future residents should not be diminished by increased noise or disturbance.
- 7.33 As the proposed houses would comfortably exceed the minimum space standards set out in the London Plan, with each habitable room providing good outlook, light and circulation, it is considered the proposal would provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation. In addition, the proposed houses would provide a minimum of 80sqm of private amenity space, which is in excess of the minimum of 50sqm required in policy DM D2. The proposed house would therefore comply with policy 3.5 of the London Plan (July 2011), CS.14 of the Core Planning Strategy (July 2011) and DM D2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014).

7.4 Residential Amenity

- 7.41 Policy DM D2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) states that proposals for development will be required to ensure provision of appropriate levels of sunlight and daylight, quality of living conditions, amenity space and privacy, to both proposed and adjoining buildings and gardens. Development should also protect new and existing development from visual intrusion.
- 7.42 It is considered that the current proposal has addressed the concerns from the previous application in terms of its impact on No. 26 and 32 Ridgway Place. This part of Ridgway Place is located on a steep gradient, which means the ground level of the house closest to No.26 Ridgway Place is considerably higher. In the previously refused scheme, the house closest to No. 26 projected 3.3m at ground floor and 2.3m at first floor beyond the two-storey rear wing of this property. This degree of projection would normally be considered acceptable on a flat site. However, given the steep gradient of the land it was considered on balance that it would result in an unacceptable level of visual intrusion when viewed from this property. For the current proposal, the first floor of house No.28 has been pulled back by 1m from the rear so that it would only project 1.3m beyond the rear of the two-storey projecting wing at No.26 and the ground floor has been stepped in adjacent to the boundary to project by only 2.3m. As the house is also sited 1m from the side boundary with No.26, the impact of the scheme is now considered to be acceptable in relation to this property. Windows in the side elevation of proposed House No.28 would also be obscure glazed to prevent any overlooking of No.26.
- 7.43 The previous scheme was also considered to be unacceptable in terms of its impact on No.32 Ridgway Place. No.32 Ridgway Place sits at a much higher

ground level than that of the closest proposed house (No.30A). However, in the previously refused scheme, it was considered that as this house would project approx. 2.6m beyond the rear of the conservatory of No.32 at first floor level, it would be visually intrusive and overbearing when viewed from this property whilst resulting in an unacceptable loss of daylight/sunlight. The current application is considered to address these concerns by stepping in part of the flank wall of the first floor by 2.3m, which means the flank wall, which hasn't been stepped in would not project beyond the rear of the conservatory at this property. It should also be noted that at the request of the Council's Planning section, the front elevation of the proposed houses have been set back by 50cm and the double height front bay window and front facing gable swapped over between Nos.30 and 30A. This means the depth of the side wall extending beyond the front elevation of No.32 has been reduced from 3m to 1.3m. Given the gap between the proposed house and No.32, combined with the lower ground of the application site, this is considered acceptable.

- 7.44 Overall, it is considered that the impact of the proposed houses, in terms of any loss of outlook, daylight/sunlight, or visual intrusion, is insufficient to warrant refusal of the application. The proposal therefore accords with policy DM D2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014).

7.5 Basement Construction

- 7.51 The applicant has provided a basement construction method statement and flood risk and SuDs assessment demonstrating how the stability of ground conditions will be maintained in relation to adjoining properties and details of a drainage strategy in relation to surface water and ground water flows.
- 7.52 The basement construction method statement states that a ground investigation has been undertaken and no groundwater strikes occurred during the investigation, however, subsequent monitoring recorded standing groundwater at depths of 1.13m and 2.34m below ground level. It is considered that this is likely to be because the groundwater is perched, sitting above the clay, considering the geology found at this location. The Council's Flood Engineer has assessed the application and has recommended that passive drainage measures are provided around the structure to avoid a backwater effect (rise in levels upstream) even though the results are shown to be in clay with low permeability, as there have been some records of underground springs in the wider area and the site investigation results show perched shallow groundwater.
- 7.53 The surface water drainage strategy proposes to discharge water to the sewer at a restricted rate of 5l/s and to provide no less than 15.2m³ of attenuation through the implementation of a Sustainable Urban Drainage system in the form of permeable paving to external hard landscaping areas such as the driveways/patios and through rainwater harvesting tanks of approx. 0.4m³ for each dwelling. A condition will be attached requiring a detailed scheme for the provision of ground water and surface water drainage, which is designed in accordance with the proposed drainage strategy (Ref: 3789-DR-DR001) is

submitted and approved in writing prior to the commencement of the development.

- 7.54 The submitted basement construction method statement outlines how the land can be supported during construction work close to the boundaries with adjoining properties. The Council's structural engineer has assessed the submitted details and is satisfied with the information, which has been provided so far. A condition will however be attached requiring the submission of a detailed method statement, which has been reviewed/agreed by a chartered engineer prior to commencement of works. Overall, it is considered that the proposal would accord with policies DM D2 and DM F2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014)

7.6 Parking and Traffic

- 7.61 The application site has a PTAL rating of 6a, which means it has excellent access to public transport. The scheme proposes the provision of one off-street parking space per house, which would result in the loss of 2 on-street permit only parking bays.
- 7.62 Policy DM T3 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) states that development should only provide the level of car parking required to serve the site taking into account its accessibility by public transport (PTAL) and local circumstances in accordance with London Plan standards unless a clear need can be demonstrated. Policy 6.13 Table 6.2 of the London Plan (March 2015) allows for up to 1 space per unit with 4 bedrooms or more where there is a PTAL rating of 5-6. The level of parking provision is therefore in accordance with London Plan policy.
- 7.63 Although the applicant suggests that the on-street permit bay outside No.32 Ridgway Place could be extended south to partially compensate for the loss of the two on-street bays, it is unlikely that the bay could be extended far enough to accommodate an additional vehicle. Due to the loss of the two bays and in accordance with Policy DM T3 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) all four dwellings will be required to be permit free so that the development does not create any additional parking stress in the area.
- 7.64 The proposal does not show any cycle parking provision. Policy DM T1 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) states that development must provide cycle parking in accordance set out in the London Plan. It states that residential cycle parking facilities should be provided in secure, covered and conveniently sited positions with good access to the street. Policy 6.13 of the London Plan states that developments must meet with minimum cycle parking standards set out in Table 6.3 which in this instance requires 2 spaces per dwelling. A condition will therefore be attached requiring details of secure cycle storage are submitted prior to commencement of development.

7.7 Landscaping

- 7.71 The proposed houses would each feature raised planting beds with a tree, which would soften the houses appearance when viewed from the street. Further planting and landscaping would be provided at the rear of the houses. A condition would be attached requiring details of landscaping including the species of the proposed tree. The condition would also require that the trees are permanently retained.

8. SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

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

9. LOCAL FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 9.1 The proposal would result in a net gain in gross floor space and as such will be liable to pay both the Mayoral and Merton Community Infrastructure Levies (CIL). The funds will be spent on the Crossrail project, with the remainder spent on strategic infrastructure and neighbourhood projects.

10. SECTION 106 LEGAL AGREEMENT

10.1 Affordable Housing

- 10.11 In terms of affordable housing, Policy CS.8 of the Core Planning Strategy (July 2011) requires developments of 1 – 9 units to make an off-site financial contribution for provision of affordable housing in the borough. The affordable housing contribution is calculated based on a formula using the median open market valuation of the completed development based on three independent valuations. The proposal would result in a net increase of two residential units in this instance. After applying the formula a figure of £337,364 would be sought as a S106 planning obligation.

10.2 Permit Free

- 10.21 The development is to be 'Permit Free' in line with policy CS.20 of the Core Planning Strategy, which seek to reduce reliance on private motor vehicles in locations with good access to public transport facilities.

- 10.22 Further information in respect of the above, including details of supplementary research carried out in justification of the S106 requirements, can be viewed here:

<http://www.merton.gov.uk/environment/planning/s106-agreements.htm>

11. CONCLUSION

- 11.1 It is considered that the proposed houses would be acceptable in terms of their size and design and would not have an unacceptable impact on the Ridgway Place street scene or the wider area. The houses are also considered to have an acceptable impact on neighbor amenity, traffic/parking and the proposed basements are not considered to be detrimental to flooding or structural stability of adjoining houses. Overall it is considered that the proposal would comply with all relevant planning policies and as such planning permission should be granted.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION

Subject to a S106 legal agreement with the following heads of terms:

1. That the residential units are 'Permit Free';
2. Financial contribution for affordable housing (£337,364)
3. The developer agreeing to meet the Council's costs of preparing, drafting and monitoring the Section 106 Obligations.

And the following conditions:

1. A.1 (Commencement of Development)
2. A.7 (Approved Plans)
3. B.1 (External Materials to be Approved)
4. B.4 (Details of Site/Surface Treatment)
5. B.6 (Levels)
6. C.1 (No Permitted Development (Extensions))
7. C.2 (No Permitted Development (Windows and Doors))
8. C.4 (Obscured Glazing (Opening Windows))
9. C.8 (No Use of Flat Roof)
10. C.10 (Hours of Construction)
11. F.1 (Landscaping/Planting Scheme)
12. F.2 (Landscaping (Implementation))
13. F.9 (Hardstandings)

14. No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until evidence has been submitted to the council confirming that the development has achieved not less than the CO2 reductions (ENE1), internal water usage (WAT1) standards equivalent to Code for Sustainable Homes level 4. Evidence requirements are detailed in the "Schedule of evidence Required for Post Construction Stage from Ene1 & Wat1 of the Code for Sustainable Homes Technical Guide. Evidence to demonstrate a 25% reduction compared to 2010 part L regulations and internal water usage rates of 105l/p/day must be submitted to, and acknowledged in writing by the Local Planning Authority, unless otherwise agreed in writing.

Reason: To ensure that the development achieves a high standard of sustainability and makes efficient use of resources and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 5.2 of the London Plan 2011 and policy CS15 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011.

15. Prior to the commencement of the development details of the provision to accommodate all site operatives, visitors and construction vehicles and loading / unloading arrangements during the construction process shall be submitted and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The approved details must be implemented and complied with for the duration of the construction process.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

16. H.2 (Vehicle Access to be provided)
17. H.3 (Redundant crossovers)
18. H.5 (Visibility splays)
19. H.6 (Cycle Parking – Details to be Submitted)
20. J.1 (Lifetime Homes)
21. The raised planter beds adjacent to the car parking spaces shown on the approved plans shall be implemented before the development is first occupied and retained permanently thereafter.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2011, policy CS.14 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and D3 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

22. No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a detailed scheme for the provision of ground water and surface water drainage has been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The final drainage scheme shall be designed in accordance with the submitted Surface Water

Drainage Strategy (ref: 3789-DR001 dated June 2015) and will dispose of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) to ground, watercourse or sewer in accordance with drainage hierarchy contained within the London Plan Policy (5.12, 5.13 and SPG) and the advice contained within the National SuDS Standards.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory means of surface water drainage, to reduce the risk of flooding and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 5.13 of the London Plan 2011, policy CS16 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM F2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

23. No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a detailed method statement has been submitted produced by the contractor and reviewed/agreed by a chartered engineer. The details shall include construction working drawings, temporary support drawings/details showing how the adjacent land would be supported during construction, and construction sequence drawings.

Reason: To ensure that structural stability of adjoining houses is safeguarded and neighbour amenity is not harmed and to comply with policy DM D2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.