PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
11 AUGUST 2016

UPRN	**APPLICATION NO.**	**DATE VALID**
	16/P1901	06/05/2015

Address/Site 110 Copse Hill, West Wimbledon SW20 0NL

(Ward) Wimbledon Village

Proposal: Demolition of existing dwelling and the erection of a 2 storey dwellinghouse with basement level and rooms in roofspace.

Drawing Nos 172-01, 172-02, 172-03 rev A, 172-07, 172-08, 172-09 rev A, 172-10 rev A, 172-11 rev A, 172-12 rev A, 172-13 rev B, 172-14 rev B, 172-16 rev A, 172-15 rev A, 172-17

Contact Officer: Arome Agamah (8545 3116)

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- Heads of agreement: no
- Is a screening opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental impact statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Impact Assessment been submitted: No
- Press notice- No
- Site notice-Yes
- Design Review Panel consulted-No
- Number neighbours consulted – 13
- External consultants: None
- Density: n/a
- Number of jobs created: n/a
- Archaeology Priority Zone: Yes

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This application has been brought to the Planning Applications Committee due to the number of objections received.

2. **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

The application site is a two-storey detached 5 bedroom dwelling, situated on a large plot on the northern side of Copse Hill. The property is one of a group of four detached houses of a similar scale and footprint granted permission in the late 1970s. The surrounding area is residential, comprised of large, predominantly detached properties with varying architectural styles. It is not in a conservation area. There is no unified or distinctive architectural style, although there are clusters of properties that have similar characteristics.

3. **CURRENT PROPOSAL**

3.1 The application is for the demolition of the existing detached dwelling and the erection of a 5 bedroom dwelling with basement accommodation. The building would be two storey, with accommodation over 4 levels including basement and roofspace. The proposals include the formation of a first floor terrace to the rear elevation.

3.2 The application follows the withdrawal of a previous application when it was indicated that the outcome was likely to be a refusal. Pre-application advice was sought prior to the current submission and amendments were made tro address the previous concerns.

3.3 Further amendments have been made to this latest proposal after its submission following feedback from planning officers and in response to concerns raised by the residents of neighbouring properties.

3.4 In design terms, the proposed scheme takes a cue from the form and architectural style of the newly constructed detached properties on the opposite side of Copse Hill. On the front elevation there would be an integrated garage and a two storey centrally located gable, with a portico over the main entrance. Other design features on the front elevation include 4 French windows with glass balustrades at first floor level, 2 roof dormers at loft level and 2 cast stone pilasters at the building corners.

3.5 The new building would have a width of 16.5 metres, a depth of 11 metres, maximum/ridge height of 8.15 metres and eaves height of 5.7 metres. The new house would have an additional depth of 3.4 metres in comparison to the original house. Although it is taller, the ground levels have been lowered such that ridge line is no higher than the original house.

3.6 To the rear of the building there would be a further 4.5 metres deep single storey element (with basement below), with a semi-circular plan and centred approximately in the midpoint of the buildings width. The eaves height of the addition would be 2.4 metres, and the overall height would be 2.7 metres.

3.7 Above the rear addition would be an external terrace accessed from the first floor by 3 sets of French doors. The usable floor area for the terrace would be set back by 1.25 metres from the sides, and obscured glazed screening would be erected on the two flank sides to a height of 1.7 metres to prevent overlooking to the neighbouring properties on either side. The width of the

screen would be 3 metres, and a glass balustrade would border the edge facing the rear elevation. At first floor level, the rear corner to the building nearest the property boundary to number 108 would be recessed away from the boundary by a depth of 3.36 metres and width of 1.56 metres. On the rear elevation there would be 2 small gable roofed dormers and a larger centrally positioned flat roofed dormer serving a sun room.

3.8 The new building will broadly keep to the current front building line as established by the original group of buildings i.e. 104, 106, 108 and 110. The roof ridge lines of the group of buildings generally tend to follow a progressive pattern of stepping down in height from east to west (number 108 stepping down to number 112). The ground floor level for the proposed house has been lowered in order to retain the pattern as closely as possible.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 15/P2960 – Demolition of existing detached dwelling and erection of 1 x 5 bedroom dwelling with basement accommodation. Withdrawn by applicant 14/10/2015.

4.2 MER244/81 – Removal of existing garage and erection of two storey extension. Granted 28/05/1981.

4.3 MER408/77 – Erection of 4 detached houses. Granted 11/11/1977.

The planning history also contains various applications for tree works.

5. CONSULTATION

5.1 The proposal has been publicised by means of standard site notice procedure and individual letters of notification to adjoining properties.

Six objections to the proposals have been received on the following grounds:

- Development is inappropriate and out of keeping with local character of area
- Development is unduly large and out of scale with respect to the modestly sized plot
- Impact of basement works on soil conditions and structural integrity of site and adjoining properties
- Disruption and inconvenience created by works
- Unduly dominant to neighbouring properties with respect to bulk, scale and height
- Overlooking from the roof terrace to neighbouring gardens and to school behind the site
- Development will produce structure with form and massing that is out of keeping with existing street pattern

5.2 Council's Tree and Landscape officer - no objections in respect of arboricultural matters.

6. **POLICY CONTEXT**

6.1 The relevant policies contained within the adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014) are DM D2 (Design Considerations in all developments) and DM H4 (Demolition and redevelopment of a single dwelling house).

The relevant policies within the Merton Adopted Core Planning Strategy (July 2011) are CS 14 (Design) and CS 15 (Climate Change).

6.2 Adopted Merton Core Strategy (July 2011)

CS14 (Design), and CS15 (Climate Change)

6.3 Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014)

DM D2 (Design Considerations in all developments) and DM H4 (Demolition and redevelopment of a single dwelling house).

7. **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

7.1 The principal planning considerations related to this application are design, the impact on the current streetscape, and the impact on neighbouring amenity.

7.2 Design and Impact on Streetscape

7.3 Other than the fact that the area is predominantly residential and characterised by large detached properties, there is no prevailing architectural style or formal consistency that typifies this section of Copse Hill as a whole. The existing building forms part of an original group of 4 dwellings that were erected during the late 1970s and early 1980s. They are not of particular historical interest or architectural merit. The dwelling at number 104 Copse Hill has already been modified extensively although it has not been rebuilt. The principle of redevelopment involving a new design is considered to be acceptable subject to the new dwelling sitting comfortably within the streetscene.

7.4 The applicant has responded to feedback from officers following the previously withdrawn application, pre-application advice and during the course of the current application and has made amendments to reduce the bulk, massing and overall visual impact created by the new building. With previous submissions the impact was most pronounced at roof level, and the current proposal makes use of mansard profiles with 70 degree slopes to the front, side and rear elevations, which is considered to satisfactorily reduce the bulk of the roof form.

7.5 In terms of style, the house is influenced by the design of numbers 41, 43 and 47 Copse Hill, located directly opposite the application site (forming part of the Atkinson Morley redevelopment, originally housing The Firs nurses

accommodation). It proposes the use of similar materials, i.e. red brick, cast stone and slate tiling, and similar detailing. On the front elevation, the number of roof dormers has been kept to a minimum and the scale and materiality of the individual design features have been chosen to minimise the visual impact and weight of the façade. The proportions and scale of the constituent features of the façade are considered to be a coherent composition.

7.6 The front elevation of the proposed house and gaps to the boundaries would be of similar dimensions to the existing building, and generally retains the same building line as currently established by numbers 104, 106, 108 and 110 with the exception of the centrally placed front gable and porch. As such the front setback from Copse Hill would also be retained.

7.7 The ridge lines of the group of buildings generally tend to follow a progressive pattern of stepping down in height from east to west (number 108 stepping down to number 112). Although the new house is taller than the original, the ground level has been lowered in order to nearly match the current ridge line of the original and therefore retains this pattern.

7.8 The main increase in massing is through the addition of a basement level , increased rearward projection and changed roof form. The additional rearward projection is relatively modest in relation to the existing scale. Although the design is different to the original house, it is considered that the proposal would be acceptable within the varied character of the surrounding area. Given its relationship to existing ridge heights, eaves levels, building lines and gaps between buildings, the impact on the streetscape of the new building is considered to be acceptable.

7.9 At the increased footprint, the building would still sit comfortably within its plot and would not appear cramped. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not constitute overdevelopment of the plot.

7.10 Impact on Neighbour Amenity

Following amendments lowering the ground floor level of the new building, the overall height relative to the neighbours will closely match the current situation. The use of mansard roofs has reduced the overall bulk of the building, particularly at the roof and upper floor levels. Although the footprint of the new house will be larger, the reductions to the overall height and design changes are considered to have reduced the impact on neighbours to an acceptable level.

7.11 The rear first floor terrace has also been reduced in scale when compared to previous versions of the design, as a result of a setback of the usable floor area from the flanks by 1.25 metres from either side. Also on the flanks, obscured glass screens have been erected to a height of 1.7 metres and are expected to preclude the possibility of overlooking from the terrace to the rear gardens of neighbouring properties on either side.

7.12 The application is bordered to the east by number 108 Copse Hill. The section of number 108 nearest the property boundary is a single storey garage and as such the bulk of the main house is set back from the property boundary. At the first floor level of the proposed building, the building has been amended to recess away from the boundary at first floor and roof level by 2.620m. The amendment was requested in order to reduce the massing and bulk at the section and to mitigate the impact on outlook from within the garden of 108. A single storey section will therefore sit closest to this boundary where the building projects beyond the rear of 108 with the upper levels recessed further away.

7.13 The layout of number 112 with respect to the application site is such that massing of the house is oriented away from the property boundary with the application site. It is also well set back from the building line as established by numbers 104, 106, 108 and 110. As such the proposed increased depth of the proposed house towards the rear is not expected to create significant adverse impacts to the occupiers of 112 as the increased depth will be opposite the flank wall of 112.

7.14 The proposed scheme does not involve an increase in the depth towards the front of the application site, and with the current overall relative height being retained it is not expected that there would be significant additional adverse impacts with respect to outlook. With the use of mansards to minimise the bulk at the upper floors, it is not expected that there would be a significant additional adverse impact by reason of being overbearing or unduly dominant.

7.15 On the two flank elevations of the proposed house, there are a number of windows to bathrooms on the first floor, and low level glazing to the basement floor. To preclude the possibility of overlooking or intrusion on the privacy of neighbours, it will be required that the windows are glazed with obscured glass and retained as such permanently thereafter. A condition to that effect will be attached to the permission.

7.16 Tree Protection Issues

There is one tree located within the front curtilage of the application site that is subject to a Tree Protection Order. No arboricultural objection has been raised to the proposed development provided the existing trees are protected during the course of site works and in accordance with the details contained in the submitted Arboricultural report. A condition will be attached to the current permission with respect to safeguarding the protection of the tree.

7.17 Basement Impact

A basement impact assessment and flood risk assessment has been submitted, based on findings following site investigations involving the installation of boreholes and the excavation of trial pits against the side of the existing property.

The Council's Structural Engineer has advised that the submitted Construction Method Statement (CMS) is acceptable provided that they also

give details of a method statement for demolition too and that further details are provided of of the design parameters to be used in the design of the temporary and permanent retaining walls. E.g.: Soil Parameters, Surcharge from codes and any additional surcharge from adjacent building foundations, ground water level etc. This information would be required by condition and be subject to written approval before works commence on site.

The Council's Flood Engineer has commented as follows: The site is shown on the Borough's BGS 'susceptibility to groundwater flooding map' contained within our Local Risk Management Strategy as having 'limited potential for groundwater flooding to occur'. However, it should be recognised that there have been historic incidents of groundwater flooding in and around Copse Hill, these have been noted on the Borough's flood incident database.

The submitted report/s show that Groundwater was encountered as high as 4.00m depth in boreholes and also in the standpipes during return monitoring visits. The depth of the groundwater found within the standpipes was relatively consistent. The groundwater is considered to be superficial 'perched' groundwater table lying above the underlying more impermeable silty clay. It is noted that seasonal groundwater (which may be higher than the levels recorded at the time of the report writing) may be encountered during basement excavations and a contingency should be made for by the contractor to deal with this groundwater during the construction period.

Once the basement construction has been completed there is also a possibility that this will act as a local 'sump' for surface groundwater and run-off. We would advise that the proposal considers the use of passive drainage measures around the structure to reduce the potential for groundwater levels to back up as a result of the proposed basement structure. This could be included as a condition, should you wish for this to be included as a further mitigation measure.

The basement structure will be designed to resist the buoyant uplift pressures and lateral pressure due to water up to 1m from the top of the wall. We would advise that the design considers full hydrostatic pressure to the ground level and tanking to ground level.

Suitable conditions are proposed in line with the comments above and on that basis the basement impact is considered to be acceptable.

8.0 SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

8.1 The proposal does not constitute Schedule 1 or Schedule 2 development. Accordingly there is no requirement for an EIA submission. The proposal will be required to meet energy and water consumption targets equivalent to Code 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes.

10. **CONCLUSION**

10.1 The concerns of the neighbours have been noted and following amendments the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of neighbour amenity, subject to appropriate planning conditions concerning the preservation of neighbour privacy. The design of the proposed house is considered to be acceptable following the stated amendments, and would not create an overall negative impact on the appearance of the surrounding area. Accordingly, it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION

and subject to the following conditions:-

1. A.1 Commencement of Development

2. A.7 Approved Plans

3. B.3 (External Materials as Specified)

4. B.5 (Boundary Treatment)

5. C.2 (No Permitted Development Doors/Windows)

6. C.3 (Obscure Glazing – Fixed Windows facing numbers 108 and 112)

7. C.4 (Obscure Glazing – Opening windows facing numbers 108 and 112)

8. F5. (Tree Protection)

9. H.4 (Provision of vehicle parking – including approved garage)

10. H.09 (Construction Vehicles)

11. H.12 (Delivery and Servicing Plan)

12. H.17 (Sustainable Urban Drainage –surface water and groundwater)

11. L.8 (Sustainability – Demolition and Redevelopment of a single dwelling house)
13. Detailed Construction Method Statement

14. Construction hours

15. 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 rats of 105l/p/day must be submitted to, and acknowledged in writing by the Local Planning Authority, unless otherwise agreed in writing.

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.

To view Plans, drawings and documents relating to this application please follow the link

Please note that this link, and some of the related plans, may be slow to load

This page is intentionally left blank