

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 16 MARCH 2017

APPLICATION NO.
17/P0004

DATE VALID
11/01/2017

Address/Site: 122 Copse Hill, West Wimbledon, SW20 0NL

Ward Village

Proposal: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING RESIDENTIAL DWELLING AND
THE ERECTION OF 2 x 5 BED DWELLINGHOUSES

Drawing Nos: PL001; PL102C; PL103A; PL104A; PL105A; PL110; PL-111;
PL201A; PL202A; PL203; JDA/212/1/3; Proposed
Landscaping Scheme

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: No
- Site notice: No
- Design Review Panel consulted: No
- Number of neighbours consulted: 7
- External consultations: None

1. INTRODUCTION

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

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1. This application relates to the demolition and replacement of no 122 Copse Hill Ridgway Place, which is a detached house set within a spacious plot on the northern side of Copse Hill close to the junction with Almer Road to the west. Within the locality there is a mix of dwelling sizes and styles although the majority are detached. Both side boundaries and the rear are heavily screened by mature trees and other planting. Recent developments include no.124 immediately to the west (left hand side) and the former Firs site on the opposite side of Copse Hill.

- 2.2. The proposal is within the Wimbledon Common Archaeological Priority Zone however is not covered by any other relevant planning designations, however at the rear the site borders the Drax Avenue Conservation Area. The large Oak Tree in the front garden is protected by Merton (No.690) TPO 2016. The site is not within a CPZ.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1. The proposal is to demolish the existing property and construct two five bedroom detached houses arranged over three floors at ground, first and second floor levels, including accommodation in the roof space.
- 3.2. The proposal would have two similar house types. House type one, on the north eastern half of the site would have maximum dimensions of 15.3m deep (at ground floor) x 12.75m deep (at first floor) x 9m wide x 9.75m high.
- 3.3. House type two would have maximum dimensions of 14.8m deep (at ground floor) x 13.1m deep (at first floor) x 8.5m wide x 9.7m high. Both properties would be finished in stock brick with tiled crown roof. The existing property measures 10.9m wide x 7.55m high x 11.75m deep.
- 3.4. Both properties would feature crown roofs with a small dormer and a front facing bay window with a gable feature above. Both would be finished in stock brick, tiled roofs and painted timber windows.
- 3.5. Plot 1 would have a rear garden depth of 15m with an area of over 225sqm. Plot 2 would have a rear garden depth of 17m and an area of 168sqm.
- 3.6. A gap of 1m would be maintained between the house on plot 2 and the boundary with no.120, a 1.7m gap would result between the two proposed dwellings and a gap of 4.3m would be maintained between the house on plot 1 and no.124.
- 3.7. Vehicle access would continue from the existing single access point that would serve both properties with each property provided with a single parking space. Pedestrian access would be through two new accesses along the front boundary. Cycle parking would be provided to London Plan Standards.
- 3.8. The proposal would result in the removal of two trees T6 (Pine) and T15 (Ornamental Cherry) both of which are category U and are growing within two groups of hedge which would also be removed G2 and H1. T6 and G2 along the rear northern boundary and H1 and T15 are on the eastern boundary with no.120. A new 1.9m high close boarded fence would be erected around the whole site.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1. There are no relevant planning records for this site,

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;
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 Planning Strategy 2011 :
CS8 (Housing choice), CS9 (Housing provision), CS11 (Infrastructure), CS13 (Open Space, Nature Conservation, Leisure and Culture), 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; Merton's Adopted New Residential Development SPG

6. **CONSULTATION**

- 6.1. Public consultation was undertaken by letters sent to neighbouring properties
- 6.2. Five letters of objection were received, summarised as;
- Would increase the density of housing
 - Would have a negative impact on traffic and parking
 - The buildings will be taller than existing and would overlook neighbouring gardens
 - Taller buildings would be overly dominant
 - Trees along the rear boundary should be retained
 - The reduced gap between the properties has a negative impact on the street scene and is out of character with the area
 - Inappropriate development on garden land
 - Site has a low PTAL and is not a sustainable location

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, impact on protected trees, impact on traffic and parking, sustainability and internal standards and amenity space.
- 7.2. **Principle of Demolition and Rebuild**

- 7.2.1. Paragraph 53 of the NPPF states that during the Local Plan process, policies to resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens should be considered. Policy CS13 notes that garden development should ensure the proposal is acceptable in terms of local context and character of the site, does not harm the biodiversity of the site including green islands and corridors and has no adverse impact on flood risk or further the risks of climate change.
- 7.2.2. Context and character and climate change are assessed below. In terms of flooding the site is within flood zone 1 (lowest risk) and does not form part of an identified green island or green corridor network and given its location is not considered to result in any harm to the biodiversity of the area.
- 7.2.3. The existing property is a pleasant detached dwelling which features a Dutch barn roof form with modest dormer windows on the front and side elevations. It is not within a Conservation Area, nor is the building locally or statutorily listed and there is therefore no in principle objection to the demolition and development for residential purposes.
- 7.2.4. This is subject to the replacement scheme being acceptable in respect of all other material planning considerations as noted above.

7.3. Design and Appearance

- 7.3.1. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of detached properties set in relatively spacious plots which are individually designed but with no consistent or harmonious design features other than generally being two storeys and most, but not all, being traditional in form. The majority are finished in red brick with eaves and roof heights that follow the fall in the levels of the street as the road slopes downhill from east to west.
- 7.3.2. The properties would be a similar style to those recently built on the former Firs site on the opposite side of Copse Hill. Further along Copse Hill there are also examples of new properties including those at no.22 (12/P21312) and no.92 (14/P0124).
- 7.3.3. The existing property sits on the north-eastern side of the plot, which is wider than average, with a timber detached garage on the western side. Whilst the sub division into two plots would result in narrower plots than the immediate neighbours, given the width of the existing plot and the range of plot widths in the area it is considered that this would be acceptable and would not be out of character with the locality.
- 7.3.4. In terms of spacing between properties, as noted above a gap of 1m would be maintained between plot 2 and the boundary with no.120, a 1.7m gap would result between the two proposed dwellings and a distance of 4.3m would be maintained between plot 1 and no.124. Spacing between properties along Copse Hill is varied, with smaller gaps between properties to the southwest of the site, whilst properties to the east have larger gaps. Given this it is considered that the size of gaps proposed would maintain the character of the locality, furthermore the use of a hipped roof form helps to maintain a sense of space around each dwelling.

- 7.3.5. Both properties would be similar in appearance from the street scene, with canted bay windows at ground and first floors projecting forward of the main elevation and modest porches above the front doors. A gable feature would face towards the street and would open up onto the roof above the bay window to create a small terrace area with both properties also having a single modest dormer in this front elevation.
- 7.3.6. The properties would feature hipped crown roofs and would be taller than the existing by around 2m. Given the fall in the road the properties would remain below the height of no.120 with house type 2 being lower still as the road continues to fall to the west and in this context the proposal is considered to respect the stepping down pattern of the ridge lines of neighbouring properties.
- 7.3.7. At the rear the properties would have modest dormers on the rear roof slope and a small single storey flat roof projection at ground floor. Folding doors would span across the majority of these ground floor rear elevations.
- 7.3.8. To the rear is the Drax Avenue Conservation Area. The two proposed dwellings are of an acceptable design and maintain rear garden depths of at least 15m and 9 of the 10 trees along the rear boundary are retained. In view of this, it is considered that the proposal would preserve the setting of the Conservation Area.
- 7.3.9. The existing boundary fence is somewhat dilapidated and a new 1.9m high close boarded fence would be erected around the boundary of the whole site, this would improve the appearance of the boundary treatment.
- 7.3.10. Taken as a whole the proposals are considered acceptable and would not harm the character and appearance of the locality.

7.4. Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

- 7.4.1. The two proposed houses would extend slightly further rearwards, plot 1 by 1.3m and plot 2 by 1.7m, than the existing property and the property on plot 2 would sit 6.4m closer to the western boundary with no.124. No. 124 fronts onto Almer Road and has an unusual layout in that the majority of rear outlook is to the northeast, towards the application site. This property was built under permission 07/P2261 and the approved drawings indicate there are two rear facing windows at first floor which serve bedrooms (master suite and guest bedroom), and one dormer in the rear roof slope which serves the sixth bedroom.
- 7.4.2. The Council's SPG on New Residential Development notes that where the windows of habitable rooms face onto a flank wall then the minimum spacing between the window and the flank wall should be 4m for a single storey wall, 12m for a two storey wall and 15 metres for a 3 storey flank wall. It also notes that the roof form should be pitched/hipped on the flank wall to reduce its massing. In this instance the guideline is for a 15m minimum between the existing habitable windows at no.124 and the flank wall of the dwelling on plot 2.
- 7.4.3. Plot 2 would be set off this boundary by 4.1m and the existing open plan dining/kitchen at no.124 is set off their boundary a minimum of 6.2m ranging up to

8.3m given the angle of the boundary. These windows are full height and also wrap around to the north facing elevation of this room. Whilst separation distances of between 10.3m and 12.4m would be below the 15m guideline, this boundary is already extremely well screened by mature vegetation which, following amendments to the tree removal and landscaping plans will be retained, and this already screens the views from no.124. In these circumstances it is not considered that the proposal would have such an undue impact on outlook from these windows, given it would be substantially the same as the existing situation, as to warrant refusal of this application.

- 7.4.4. Furthermore, a daylight and sunlight analysis has been submitted with the application, which notes that this ground floor window would retain 84.5% of its current daylight which exceeds the BRE guidance of 80% of its existing value. Given this it is not considered that the proposal would have an unacceptably adverse impact on daylight or sunlight to this room.
- 7.4.5. There is also a ground floor window serving a living/drawing room which is double aspect. However the window facing towards the application site would be over 15m from the flank wall of plot 2 and given the angle of outlook it is not considered there would be any unacceptable adverse impact.
- 7.4.6. Windows at first and second floor of no.124 would be well over 15m from the flank wall of the dwelling on plot 2 and given the use of the hipped roof it is not considered that there would be any undue impact on the rooms served by these windows that would warrant refusal of this application. The Daylight and Sunlight analysis notes that these windows would all retain at least 92% of their existing daylight and sunlight.
- 7.4.7. On the opposite boundary is no.120, this property has a single storey side extension, used as a garage that abuts the boundary with the application site. The proposal would move the house on plot 1 off the boundary, at ground floor the plot 1 dwelling would extend slightly further back than the rear elevation of no.120 whilst at first floor they would align.
- 7.4.8. No.120 has two side facing windows which face onto the application site, these are likely to serve non habitable rooms however the Daylight and Sunlight analysis has confirmed that these would keep at least 80.8% of their existing daylight/sunlight and would therefore meet the BRE guidance. In terms of outlook whilst the proposal would be bulkier at first floor, given these are side facing windows that already look at the flank elevation of the existing property it is not considered that there would be any undue harm to residential amenities of the occupiers of no.120.
- 7.4.9. The rear of the proposed properties is at least 17m from the rear boundary with the properties along Drax Avenue, with these properties having gardens roughly 25m deep. The New Residential Development SPG suggest a minimum distance of 20m between facing habitable room windows which would be far exceeded in this case. Furthermore 9 of the 10 existing trees are retained along this rear boundary and given this it is not considered that there would be any adverse impact on the privacy or residential amenities of the occupiers of these properties

7.5. **Trees**

- 7.5.1. The application is supported by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment completed by Indigo Surveys (ref 16193/A2_AIA).
- 7.5.2. Following amendments to retain trees on the western boundary with no.123, the proposal would result in the removal of two trees, T6 (Pine) and T15 (Ornamental Cherry) both of which are category U trees which are the lowest classification and thus have little amenity value. All of these are growing within two groups of hedge which would also be removed, G2 and H1. T6 and G2 are along the rear northern boundary and H1 and T15 are on the eastern boundary with no.120.
- 7.5.3. Given the extent of existing planting within the site and as a soft landscaping scheme can be secured by condition, it is not considered that the removal of poor quality trees and planting would harm the amenities of the site.
- 7.5.4. After discussions between the Council's Tree Officer and the agent, all hardstanding has been removed from the Root Protection Area (RPA) of the large Oak tree (T1) in the front garden area which is protected by a Tree Preservation Order. This follows concern that any further impingement of its RPA would be likely have an unacceptably detrimental impact on its health. Following this amendment, the Tree Officer has no objection to the proposal subject to conditions. Given this it is also considered prudent to remove permitted development rights for the creation of additional hard standing in the front garden areas.

7.6. **Traffic and Parking**

- 7.6.1. The site has a PTAL rating of 1b (poor). The current house has an access from Copse Hill which would be retained and used as the sole point of vehicular entry for both properties.
- 7.6.2. As noted above, additional hard standing within the RPA of the protected Oak Tree has been removed and this results in the proposal providing two parking spaces, one for each property. Tracking diagrams have been submitted with the amended layout. These show that it is possible to enter and exit the parking area in a forward gear.
- 7.6.3. Given the poor PTAL rating it would normally be expected that a development of this type would provide 4 parking spaces (2 per dwelling). However, the London Plan standards are maximums rather than minimums and given the importance and amenity value of the Oak Tree to the locality it is considered that this level of provision is acceptable and would not result in any undue harm to the free flow of traffic or the safety of the local highway network.
- 7.6.4. Cycle parking and refuse/waste storage is indicated on the drawings and is considered acceptable, this can be secured by condition.
- 7.6.5. Given the above the Council's Transport Planner raised no objection to the proposal.

7.7. Sustainability

- 7.7.1. Policy DM H4 requires applications for replacement dwellings to exceed the minimum sustainability requirements outlined in Core Planning Strategy CS15.
- 7.7.2. 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.
- 7.7.3. An energy statement has been submitted with the application which notes that the application would achieve a 21% improvement in CO2 emissions on Part L 2013 and thus the proposal would meet the minimum sustainability requirements of CS15. Whilst no internal water consumption calculations have been submitted, compliance with the 105litres per person per day can be secured by condition.
- 7.7.4. The Councils Climate Change Officer is content that the energy approach is compliant with policy and therefore acceptable. In light of this and in the context of DMH4 conditions regarding carbon emissions and water usage are considered reasonable and necessary and can be attached to any consent.

7.8. Internal Standards and Amenity Space

- 7.8.1. The two properties would exceed the national internal space standards, now incorporated into the London Plan (March 2016 Minor Alterations) and would provide well in excess of the 50sqm of rear garden space required for a family dwelling. Given this they would provide a high standard of living for future occupiers.
- 7.8.2. A new close boarded fence would extend between the two properties which is considered sufficient to protect the amenities of future occupiers.

8. SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

- 8.1.1. 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 of the two properties would not be out of character with the locality and would not harm the street scene. 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 provision of two off street parking spaces is, when taken in the context of the protected tree considered to be acceptable. The two properties would provide a high standard of accommodation for future occupiers and would be policy compliant in their energy strategy. 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. H07 Cycling parking (implementation)
5. C07 Refuse & Recycling (implementation)
6. F01 Landscaping/Planting Scheme
7. F02 Landscaping (Implementation)
8. F05 Tree Protection
9. F08 Site Supervision (Trees)
10. C01 No Permitted Development (extensions/windows/hardstanding)
11. C03 No Use of Flat Roof
12. NS Condition 1

‘No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until evidence has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority confirming that the development has achieved CO2 reductions of not less than a 19% improvement on Part L regulations 2013, and internal water usage rates of not more than 105 litres per person per day.

13. New boundary fence to be provided

Evidence requirements:

- Carbon emissions evidence requirements for Post Construction stage assessments must provide:
 - Detailed documentary evidence confirming the Target Emission Rate (TER), Dwelling Emission Rate (DER) and percentage improvement of DER over TER based on ‘As Built’ SAP outputs (i.e. dated outputs with accredited energy assessor name and registration number, assessment status, plot number and development address).
 - or, where applicable:
 - A copy of revised/final calculations as detailed in the assessment methodology based on ‘As Built’ SAP outputs
 - Confirmation of Fabric Energy Efficiency (FEE) performance where SAP section 16 allowances (i.e. CO2 emissions associated with appliances and cooking, and site-wide electricity generation technologies) have been included in the calculation
 - Water efficiency evidence requirements for Post Construction Stage assessments must provide:
 - Detailed documentary evidence representing the dwellings ‘As Built’; showing:
 - the location, details and type of appliances/ fittings that use water in the dwelling (including any specific water reduction equipment with the capacity / flow rate of equipment); and
 - the location, size and details of any rainwater and grey-water collection systems provided for use in the dwelling;
- Along with one of the following:

- Water Efficiency Calculator for New Dwellings; **or**
- Written confirmation from the developer that the appliances/fittings have been installed, as specified in the design stage detailed documentary evidence; **or**
- Where different from design stage, provide revised Water Efficiency Calculator for New Dwellings and detailed documentary evidence (as listed above) representing the dwellings 'As Built'

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.

Informatives:

1. Note to Applicant – Approved Schemes
2. Party Walls Act
3. 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