

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
17 NOVEMBER 2016**

	<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>DATE VALID</u>
	16/P2451	14/06/2016
Address/Site:	7 Ridgway Place, Wimbledon, SW19 4EW	
(Ward)	Hillside	
Proposal:	DEMOLITION OF A SEMI-DETACHED DWELLINGHOUSE (ONE HALF OF A PAIR) AND REPLACEMENT WITH A NEW SEMI-DETACHED DWELLINGHOUSE WITH BASEMENT	
Drawing Nos:	200.211.P3 (Location Plan); 200.331.P3 (Existing elevations); 200.311.P3 (Existing Plans); 200.313.P5 (Proposed Plans); 200.332.P5 (Proposed Elevations); 200.314.P5 (Proposed Roof Plan); 200.213.P5 (Proposed Block Plan); 200.321.P5 (Proposed Sections); 200.333.P5 Existing and Proposed Street Scene; Proposed Construction Strategy CA5016.01 amended 16/08/16	
Contact Officer:	Jonathan Gregg (3297)	

RECOMMENDATION
GRANT PERMISSION SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS.

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- Heads of agreement: n/a
- Is a screening opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental Statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Impact Assessment been submitted: No
- Press notice: Yes
- Site notice: Yes
- Design Review Panel consulted: No
- Number of neighbours consulted: 18
- 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 This application relates to a semi detached dwellinghouse on the western side of Ridgway Place. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached properties set in relatively spacious plots. The application site property is part of a grouping of 6 pairs of semi-detached properties at this end of Ridgway Place which were originally of the same design (namely no's 1&3, 5&7, 9&11 on one side of the road and 2&4, 6&8 and 12&14 on the other) although a number have now been altered with hip to gable conversions and other roof extensions.
- 2.2 The site is within Controlled Parking Zone W1 which operates Monday – Saturday 8:30 – 18:30. The proposal is not covered by any site specific planning designations. At the rear, the site borders the Wimbledon West Conservation Area.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The proposal is for the demolition and replacement of no 7 Ridgway Place, one half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings, 5 and 7. The replacement dwelling would be set over four floors at basement, ground, first and roof level and would contain five bedrooms.
- 3.2 The replacement house would maintain a ridge and eaves height and materials to match the other half of the semi and would replicate the existing bay window and porch detailing. It would have an identical first floor depth.
- 3.3 The key differences between the existing and proposed house are as follows: it would contain a basement level largely under the footprint of the new house but extended slightly further to the front and rear; the main roof would be a gable instead of hipped; it would have a full width rear single storey projection and a recessed single storey side projection; it would have a single off street parking space within the front curtilage; the main front elevation would be 0.543m wider, reducing the gap between the main flank wall ,at first floor, and the boundary to 0.984m, and it would have a slightly adjusted front elevation window configuration and a rear dormer .
- 3.4 The single storey flat roofed projection at the rear is stepped in along both boundaries after 3m of projection with a single storey pitched roof projection at the side adjacent to the boundary with no 5. The new dwellinghouse would have maximum dimensions of 9.194m wide (at ground floor), 8.233m wide (at first floor) x 15.71m deep (at ground floor), 10.332m deep (at first floor) x 8.8m high. The existing property measures 13.7m deep x 7.58m wide at ground/first floors.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 There are no relevant planning records for this site or the attached property at no.5.

5. POLICY CONTEXT

- 5.1 London Plan 2015;
3.3 (Increasing housing supply), 3.4 (Optimising housing potential), 3.5 (Quality and design of housing developments), 3.8 (Housing choice), 5.1 (Climate change mitigation), 5.2 (Minimising carbon dioxide emissions), 5.3 (Sustainable design and construction), 5.7 (Renewable energy), 6.3 (Assessing effects of development on transport capacity), 6.9 (Cycling), 6.13 (Parking), 7.1 (Lifetime neighbourhoods), 7.2 (An inclusive environment), 7.3 (Designing out crime), 7.4 (Local character), 7.6 (Architecture)
- 5.2 Merton Sites and Policies Plan July 2014 policies;
DMH2 (Housing mix), DMH4 (Demolition and rebuilding of a single dwelling house), DMD1 (Urban design and the public realm), DMD2 (Design considerations in all developments), DMD4 (Managing heritage assets), DMT1 (Support for sustainable transport and active travel), DMT2 (Transport impacts of development), DMT3 (Car parking and servicing standards), DMT5 (Access to the Road Network)
- 5.3 Merton Core Strategy 2011 policy:
CS8 (Housing choice), CS9 (Housing provision), CS11 (Infrastructure), CS14 (Design), CS15 (Climate Change), CS17 (Waste Management), CS18 (Active Transport), CS19 (Public Transport), CS20 (Parking, Servicing and Delivery)
- 5.4 Mayor of London Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance March 2016;
DCLG Technical Housing standards March 2015

6. CONSULTATION

- 6.1 Public consultation was undertaken by letters sent to neighbouring properties, a site notice and press advert were also published.
- 6.2 Twenty three letters of objection were received, summarised as;
- Will reduce the space between buildings and be out of character with the street scene
 - Renovation of the existing property would be more sustainable
 - The crossover is excessive and would result in the loss of two on street parking spaces
 - Construction period will be extended by the basement which will be detrimental to amenities of neighboring properties
 - Basement could impact on the water table, especially cumulatively with the basements already built nearby.
 - Potential instability to no.5 during construction works.
 - Increased mass of the proposal would have an impact on the outlook and amenities of neighbouring occupiers.
 - There is no justification for the demolition of the property
 - Basement would result in flooding in neighbouring gardens
 - Off street parking would increase risk to others from impaired sight lines
 - Will result in a large, expensive home, out of reach of normal families
 - Basement could be separated from the above floors and used on its own.
 - Rear extension will impede light to neighbouring properties

- No direct access to the rear garden from the street.
- 6.3 Additional public consultation was undertaken following the submission of amended drawings which reduced the size of the rear dormer, reduced the height and depth of the single storey rear element, stepping it in from the adjoining boundaries, and reduced the front curtilage parking to a single space. Further representations were received, summarised as:
- Amendments are minor changes, proposal remains out of character with the road
 - Original objections remain in place
 - Adjacent properties will be uninhabitable or sellable during construction works
 - Amendments do not overcome concerns about demolition and the basement
- 6.4 Representation from Stephen Hammond MP was also received, seeking confirmation that if permission is granted, all efforts should be made to ensure that the construction work is undertaken in a way that does not impact on no.5.

7 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 The main considerations for this application are the principle of demolition and rebuild, design and appearance, the impact on neighbour amenity, the impact of demolition and the basement, impact on traffic and parking, sustainability and internal standards and amenity space. Given that the proposal is for the demolition of one half of an existing pair of occupied houses and the construction of a new house attached as a new 'half' of a semi-detached pair, there is a particular concern about the impact on the attached property, no 5.

Principle of Demolition and Rebuild

- 7.2 The existing property is a modest semi-detached dwelling which forms part of a grouping of six pairs of semi-detached properties of similar appearance at the southern end of Ridgway Place near the junction with Worple Road. There is no in principle objection to the demolition and rebuild of this property subject to the replacement scheme being acceptable in respect of all other material planning considerations, including design and appearance, impact on neighbours, quality of accommodation provided, and highway safety.
- 7.3 Furthermore, given the proposal relates to one half of this pair of properties, it is considered necessary that it should be demonstrated that there would be no harm to the structural integrity of no.5 during the demolition or construction works.

Design and Appearance

- 7.4 The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached properties set in relatively spacious plots. As noted above, the grouping of six properties at this end of Ridgway Place are of the same

original design, namely no's 1&3, 5&7, 9&11 and 2&4, 6&8 and 12&14, although a number have been altered with hip to gable conversions and other roof extensions.

- 7.5 The proposed replacement house would maintain the same ridge and eaves height as the existing property and the other half of the semi at no.5. It would be approximately 0.543m wider at first floor. In terms of the appearance of the pair of properties, this is achieved by increasing the width of the panels between the new bay window and the neighbour's bay window and it is considered that this would not upset the overall proportions of the pair. The single storey side addition would be recessed behind the front main wall. A gap of just under 1m would be retained between the first floor of the property and the boundary with no.9 which is considered to be acceptable.
- 7.6 The proposal would also result in the formation of a gable ended wall and roof instead of the existing hipped roof to match the hipped roof of the attached property at no.5. Whilst officers would have preferred to see a matching hipped roof, as the roof form will unbalance the symmetry of no's 5 and 7, they have had regard to the appearance of the other semi-detached pairs within the immediate vicinity. 2 of the other pairs are already similarly unbalanced due to hip to gable main roof extensions at no's 1 and 8, whilst 2 others lack symmetry due to roof alterations to the hip at 11 and 16. A recent application 15/P4742 for no.4 Ridgway Place for a hip to gable extension was only refused due to the bulk of the rear dormer, the hip to gable element being deemed to be acceptable by the officer because of the changes to the other pairs. Given the existing context, although maintenance of the existing symmetry of the main roofs of 5 and 7 would be desirable, this is not considered to constitute a sustainable ground for refusal of this application.
- 7.7 Following amendments, the dormer is now split into two which results in it having a more modest appearance on the roof slope. The two elements would be separated by 1m and would be set in 1.5m from the flank and 1m from the party wall. Given these amendments, it is considered that the dormer would sit comfortably within the roof slope and would not appear overly dominant, finished in hanging tiles to match the proposed roof tiles and is therefore acceptable.
- 7.8 The basement would have two small light wells in the front garden area immediately adjacent to the front wall of the house. Given their siting and size, it is not considered that these would appear prominent within the street scene and an appropriate landscaping condition can ensure that these are screened by planting. At the rear a larger glazed panel would be immediately adjacent to the rear projection with a stairwell down to the basement exiting into the rear garden, these elements are acceptable.
- 7.9 Amendments to the scheme have ensured that the provision of off street parking is only for a single car to maintain an appropriate front curtilage boundary treatment and balance between soft and hard landscaping. The property would also be built in materials to match the existing and the

adjoining property at no.5 and details of these can be secured by condition to ensure an appropriate match.

- 7.10 Representations have also raised concern that the proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site. The current property has a GIA of 140sqm and the replacement would have a GIA of 368sqm, an increase of 228sqm or 162%. However 145.67sqm of this is in the basement which would have extremely limited manifestation above ground. Therefore above ground there is 82.33sqm of new floorspace.
- 7.11 41.85sqm of extensions could be built at ground floor under permitted development, and the hip to gable and dormer would also be permitted development, increasing the GIA at loft level by roughly 42sqm. This would result in around 83.85sqm of additional floorspace added to the existing property without the need for any planning permission. In light of this it is not considered that the proposal represents an unacceptable overdevelopment of the plot.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

- 7.12 The impact of demolition, rebuild and construction of a basement will be considered in more detail in the following section. In relation to the main bulk of the building above ground, it generally maintains a similar relationship to neighbouring properties. The key differences are the adjustment to the width and new roof form, single storey side and rear projections as well as the rear dormer.
- 7.13 In relation to the dormer, there is a suitable separation distance between the dormer and properties to the rear to maintain privacy.
- 7.14 In relation to no 9, although there is a small reduction in the gap between the main wall and the boundary, a gap of 0.96m is maintained at first floor level. Whilst the additional width and change to main roof form would increase the overall massing of the property, no 9's main habitable room windows face towards the front and rear and the proposed replacement house is not considered to have an overbearing or visually intrusive impact when viewed from no.9 or its garden.
- 7.15 The single storey rear projection has been amended at officers' request since the original submission to take account of changing levels and impact on outlook and the single storey rear projection would now only project 3m from the rear of the main house, stepping for 1.3m before extending a further 1.1m. The projection would also feature mono-pitched roofs sloping down to an eaves height of 2.25m at each boundary. It is noted that no.5 has a slightly lower ground level however given these mitigating features it is not considered that the new rear projection would appear visually intrusive or overbearing, nor would it have any unacceptably adverse impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of either neighbouring property.

- 7.16 The proposal would include plant and machinery within the basement. A condition can secure further details, including noise mitigation measures to ensure that this does not result in undue noise and disturbance and have an adverse impact on the residential amenities of the neighbouring occupiers. Further controls during the demolition and construction phases relating to the amenity of neighbouring residents are considered below.

Impact of Demolition and the Proposed Basement

- 7.17 As the proposal is to demolish one half of a pair of semi detached properties it is considered necessary and reasonable to attach a condition that requires a contract of works to have been entered into for the construction of the new half of the pair prior to demolition taking place.
- 7.18 Policy DM D2 of the adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan 2014 sets out specific requirements in relation to proposals with a basement element, which are amplified upon in the justification for the policy at paragraphs 6.26 to 6.36 of the plan and any development should have regard to these requirements.
- 7.19 A number of representations raise concern over the process of demolition and construction and timeframes for these. However these are not material planning considerations and conditions limiting the time frames to undertake building works would not be reasonable.
- 7.20 It is recognised, and officers have raised concern throughout, that this is a relatively unique proposal to demolish one half of an occupied pair of semi detached properties. A key concern, as has already been outlined is the structural integrity and safety of no.5 during all the works, as well as impact from noise, vibrations and other construction related disturbances. Further flood and groundwater impacts are also a concern which has been raised by a number of representations and are dealt with below.
- 7.21 A report by Coopers Associates, consulting structural engineers has been submitted with the application. This notes that the party wall with no.5 would be underpinned and propped up in accordance with Party Wall agreements and would be controlled by the separate requirements of Building Control. Whilst it is noted that DMD2 b)i requires basements to be wholly within the curtilage of the application property, the Councils Structural Engineer has confirmed that the underpinning of the party wall is the normal way that these works are undertaken. Therefore the small incursion under the party wall is considered acceptable and would meet the other requirements of DMD2 b)i which requires any basement to safeguard the structural stability of ... nearby buildings.
- 7.22 The Councils Senior Structural Engineer raises no objection to the proposal subject to conditions requiring further details which would ensure the structural stability of no.5 during the demolition, excavation and construction phases. These details would cover both demolition and construction method statements, construction sequence and temporary works drawings. The

method statements would have to be prepared by the contractor responsible for the works and cover all aspects of the demolition and construction phases.

- 7.23 Moreover it is considered both reasonable for the council to be certain that the property would be rebuilt in a timely manner following demolition before any work on site starts. It is therefore necessary to attach a condition to ensure a valid contract of works has been entered into prior to the commencement of development (including any demolition). This should ensure that no.5 is left standing alone for the minimum amount of time, although as noted at 7.43 it is not reasonable, and therefore outside of what can be achieved by a planning condition, to limit the amount of time taken for building works.
- 7.24 In terms of noise, and vibrations from the excavation and any piling works that would be undertaken, an hours of work condition would be attached to any consent to ensure that works only occur during normal working hours Monday to Friday (08:00-18:00), Saturday mornings (08:00-13:00) and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Furthermore a condition securing details, including noise mitigation methods relating to any piling works would also be attached to any consent.
- 7.25 Additionally given the demolition of the whole of this property, in such close proximity to both neighbouring houses it is considered reasonable to request further details of dust dampening and mitigation measures to protect the residential amenities of the neighbouring occupiers during this stage of the works.
- 7.26 A Geotechnical Survey by Fastrack has also been submitted which provides data of the three trial pits dug on site. One of these, BH2, adjacent to the rear wall encountered standing water at a depth of 4.4m, however the report notes that this could be because of seepage through the clay, but notwithstanding this the depth is deeper than the proposed basement.
- 7.27 The Councils Flood Risk Engineer required further information in relation to the design of the basement, specifically in the mitigation of any build up of backwater around the basement. It was noted that the original information didn't deal properly with the variations in geology in this area, which coupled with the changes in topography result in the area being prone to some emergent springs. Also, a perched groundwater level is likely to be present due to rainwater sitting on the London Clay layer.
- 7.28 Additional information, amended drawings (200.213.P5; 200.313.P5; 200.321.P5) and an updated 'Construction Strategy' from Coopers Associates was submitted in relation to these concerns. This also provided information for a SuDS drainage scheme. Following receipt of these the Flood Risk Engineer considered the proposal acceptable subject to appropriate conditions. Information relating to the final structural design of the basement can be reasonably dealt with by condition within the construction method statement and structural designs required by the Structural Engineer.

Traffic and Parking

- 7.29 The site has a PTAL rating of 6a (excellent). At present, the house has no off street parking. The original proposal included the creation of a new vehicular access and two off street parking spaces but this has been amended to a single parking space to provide a suitable balance between parking provision and the appearance of the front curtilage, consistent with other recent planning permissions granted in the vicinity. The level of off street parking is considered to be acceptable. The council's transport planner raises no objection to the proposal.
- 7.30 Representations have raised concern about the loss of one street parking space, however the provision of an off street space would mitigate the loss of this single on street space and is in this case considered acceptable.
- 7.31 Cycle parking for two bicycles, covered and secure, is shown on the drawings and as this is in line with London Plan standards is acceptable. Its implementation can be secured by condition.

Sustainability

- 7.32 Policy DM H4 requires applications for replacement dwellings to exceed the minimum sustainability requirements outlined in Core Planning Strategy CS15.
- 7.33 Following Central Government withdrawing the Code for Sustainable Homes scheme in March 2016, the parts of the policy which refer to this are no longer applicable. However local planning authorities can still apply a requirement for water efficiency and CO2 reduction standards up to the equivalent of Code 4 and this will be required.

Internal Standards and Amenity Space

- 7.34 The accommodation schedule shows that the property would meet the national space standards, now incorporated into the London Plan (March 2016 Minor Alterations) and would provide a suitably sized rear garden space.

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. CONCLUSION

The principle of development is considered acceptable, the design draws on the existing property and the larger footprint is considered acceptable and is comparable to what is possible under permitted development with the existing house. It is not considered that there would be any undue impact on the privacy or residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties that would warrant the refusal of the application and the off street parking space would mitigate the loss of the on street bay. The demolition and

construction of the property and the excavation of the basement are both considered acceptable subject to conditions. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with the relevant policies of the Sites and Policies Plan, the Core Strategy, the London Plan and the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

1. A1 Commencement of Development (Full Application)
2. A7 Approved Plans
3. B1 External Materials to be Approved
4. B5 Details of walls/fences
5. H06 Cycling parking – details to be submitted
6. C06 Refuse & Recycling – details to be submitted
7. F01 Landscaping/Planting Scheme
8. H02 Vehicle Access to be provided
9. C01 No Permitted Development (extensions/windows)
10. C03 No Use of Flat Roof
11. H18 Sustainable Drainage
12. D05 Soundproofing of Plant and Machinery
13. D11 Construction Times
14. NS Condition 1

No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme to reduce the potential impact of groundwater ingress both to and from the proposed development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall address the risks both during and post construction as highlighted in the final Construction Method Statement.

Reason: To ensure the risk of groundwater ingress to and from the development is managed appropriately and to reduce the risk of flooding in compliance 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 policies, DM D2 and DM F2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014

15. NS Condition 2

No work shall be commenced until a Demolition Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This should detail which parts and how these will be demolished and should be informed by a lead and asbestos survey of the material which is to be removed. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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 6.3, 6.14 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DMD2 and DMT2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

16. NS Condition 3

No work shall be commenced until a Construction Method Statement including details of the proposed design, method of excavation and construction of the basement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This must include drawings of the construction sequence. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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 6.3, 6.14 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DMD2 and DMT2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

17. NS Condition 4

No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until drawings at a scale of not less than 1:20 indicating the construction sequence and any temporary works required during the demolition and construction phases have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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 6.3, 6.14 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DMD2 and DMT2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

18. NS Condition 5

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 (2010).

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 2015 and policy CS15 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011.

19. NS Condition 6

Prior to demolition of the existing building(s) forming part of the development hereby permitted, evidence of a valid contract which has been entered into for the carrying out and completion of the works hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the demolition is followed by immediate rebuilding and in the interests of the amenity of neighbouring residents and to comply with the

following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies DMD2 Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

20. NS Condition 7

Piling methodology, including noise mitigation

21. NS Condition 8

Dust dampening and mitigation measures

Informatives:

1. Note to Applicant – Approved Schemes
2. Party Walls Act
3. Works on the Public Highway
4. Discharge conditions prior to commencement of work

[Click here](#) for full plans and documents related to this application.

Please note these web pages may be slow to load