

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
09 FEBRUARY 2016**

APPLICATION NO.
16/4709

DATE VALID
20/12/2016

Address/Site: 7 Ridgway Place, Wimbledon, SW19 4EW

Ward Hillside

Proposal: ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY SIDE & REAR
EXTENSION FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION AND
EXCAVATION OF BASEMENT

Drawing Nos: 200.211.P6; 200.213.P6; 200.223.P6; 200.313.P6;
200.332.P6; 200.314.P6; 200.321.P6

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.
- 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 relevant planning

designations, however at the rear the site borders the Wimbledon West Conservation Area.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 This application proposes the extension of the existing property to form a single storey side and rear extension, a modest first floor side extension and the excavation of a basement.
- 3.2 This would feature a single storey flat roofed projection at the rear, which would be stepped in along both boundaries after 3m of projection and a single storey pitched roof projection at the side adjacent to the boundary. The basement would extend under the whole of this footprint i.e. under the existing house and the extensions.
- 3.3 The proposed works would be finished in materials to match the existing property and no.5. A new off street parking space and dropped kerb are also proposed.
- 3.4 The property would have maximum dimensions of 9.217m wide (at ground floor), 7.691m wide (at first floor) x 14.95m deep (at ground floor), 10.3m deep (at first floor) after the works were complete. There would also be a small 0.2m wide projection at first floor with a depth of 2.2m set roughly half way down the flank elevation. The overall height of the property would not alter.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 There are no relevant planning for the attached property at no.5.
- 4.2 There is one application for this property, which was refused at Planning Applications Committee in November 2016. The application was for; 'Demolition of the existing dwelling house to be replaced by a new dwelling house to include a basement.' This was refused for the following two reasons:
- *The proposed dwelling by reason of its design, siting, width, massing and roof form would break the rhythm of the built form found within this part of Ridgway Place and it would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DM1 and DMD2 of the Sites and Policies Plan, Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan.*
 - *The proposed replacement dwelling would by reason of its excessive scale both above and below ground, result in an overdevelopment of the available plot and therefore fail to relate positively to the existing context, street pattern and scale of the surrounding buildings. As a result it would be harmful to the character and appearance of this pair of semi-detached properties and the wider street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DM1 and DMD2 of the Sites and Policies Plan, Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan.*

5. POLICY CONTEXT

- 5.1 London Plan 2015;
6.3 (Assessing effects of development on transport capacity), 6.9 (Cycling),
6.13 (Parking), 7.4 (Local character), 7.6 (Architecture)
- 5.2 Merton Sites and Policies Plan July 2014 policies;
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:
CS11 (Infrastructure), CS14 (Design), CS17 (Waste Management), CS18
(Active Transport), CS19 (Public Transport), CS20 (Parking, Servicing and
Delivery)

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 Six letters of objection were received, summarised as;
- Will reduce the space between buildings and be out of character with the
street scene
 - Side extension would result in loss of daylight/sunlight to no.9
 - Proposal is overdevelopment of the plot
 - Basement could impact on the water table, especially cumulatively with the
basements already built nearby.
 - Basement is bigger than the footprint of the house
 - Increased mass of the proposal would have an impact on the outlook and
amenities of neighbouring occupiers.
 - Basement would result in flooding in neighbouring gardens
 - Rear extension will impede light to neighbouring properties
 - No direct access to the rear garden from the street.
 - Side extension is out of character with the street scene
 - Application is so similar to that previously refused

7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.01 The main considerations for this application are the design and appearance,
the impact on neighbour amenity, the impact of the basement, impact on
traffic and parking.
- 7.02 It should be noted that this application is different to the previous application
in that it retains the existing house. The application is therefore for extensions
to an existing property.

7.1 Design and Appearance

- 7.11 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.
- 7.12 The single storey side addition would be recessed behind the front main wall and would incorporate a mono-pitched roof. Halfway down the flank wall this roof would increase in height by 0.6m to create internal headspace for the stairs to the basement. At first floor as noted above would be a very modest projection of 0,2m for this width to allow for the internal staircase to be moved slightly. Given the scale of this first floor element and its siting it is considered acceptable.
- 7.13 At the rear the extension would feature a flat roof, with a large glazed rooflight and with sliding doors across its rear elevation. This would step in after 3m of projection and then step in before continuing to extend an additional metre. On each side would be mono-pitch roofs that pitch away from the boundaries.
- 7.14 At the rear a larger glazed panel would serve the basement and would be immediately adjacent to the rear projection with a stairwell down to the basement exiting into the rear garden, these elements are acceptable.
- 7.15 The provision of off street parking is only for a single car that helps to maintain an appropriate front curtilage boundary treatment and balance between soft and hard landscaping. The extensions would also be built in materials to match the existing and details of these can be secured by condition to ensure an appropriate match.
- 7.16 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 269.425sqm, an increase of 129.425sqm or 92%. However 96.44sqm of this is in the basement which would have extremely limited manifestation above ground. Therefore above ground there is 32.985sqm of new floor space.
- 7.17 Roughly 41.85sqm of extensions could be built at ground floor under permitted development. In light of this it is not considered that the proposal represents an unacceptable overdevelopment of the plot.
- 7.18 It is noted that this differs from floor space given in the CiL form submitted with the application, however this included a roof extension which was removed prior to the validation of the application and therefore forms no part of this application.

7.2 Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

- 7.21 The impact of demolition, rebuild and construction of a basement will be considered in more detail in section 7.4 below.
- 7.22 In relation to no 9, the side extension would abut the boundary at ground floor. The spacing at first level would be maintained, with the exception of the small projection which measures 0.2m. No.9 does have side facing windows which serve the kitchen at ground floor, however the outlook from these is already impeded by the two storey flank wall of no.7. It is accepted that this would be reduced further, but given there is also a rear facing window serving this kitchen, it is not considered that there would be any undue harm to the residential amenities of the occupiers of no.9.
- 7.23 The single storey rear projection would project 3m from the rear of the main house, stepping in for 1.3m before extending a further 1.1m, to give a total projection of 4.1m from the rear of the house. 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.
- 7.24 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.

7.3 Impact of the Proposed Basement

- 7.31 Policy DM D2 of the adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan 2014 sets out specific requirements in relation to proposals with a basement element, with further information provided in the justification for the policy at paragraphs 6.26 to 6.36 and any development should have regard to these requirements.
- 7.32 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.
- 7.33 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 excavation and construction phases. These details would cover 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.

- 7.34 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.
- 7.35 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.
- 7.36 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 during the previous application. 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. This was submitted with this application and in this context there is no objection from the Flood Risk Engineer.

7.4 Traffic and Parking

- 7.41 The site has a PTAL rating of 6a (excellent).At present the house has no off street parking, however a new crossover is proposed to create a single off street parking space that would be consistent with other properties on Ridgeway Place. There is no objection to this subject to appropriate hard and soft landscaping. Furthermore the Council's transport planner raised no objection to the proposal.
- 7.42 The provision of an off street space would mitigate the loss of this single on street space and is in this case considered acceptable.
- 7.43 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.

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 design, scale and siting of the extensions are not considered to harm the character or appearance of the host property or the locality and would be comparable with what could be built under permitted development. 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 excavation of the basement is 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. H07 Cycling parking – implementation
6. C06 Refuse & Recycling – details to be submitted
7. F01 Landscaping/Planting Scheme
8. H02 Vehicle Access to be provided (edit)
9. C03 No Use of Flat Roof
10. H18 Sustainable Drainage (edit)
11. D05 Soundproofing of Plant and Machinery
12. D11 Construction Times
13. 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 Polices Plan 2014

14. 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.

15. 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.

16. NS Condition 7

Piling methodology, including noise mitigation

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