

## PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 22 JUNE-2017

**APPLICATION NO.**  
16/P3531

**DATE VALID**  
05/09/2016

**Address/Site** 34 Cottenham Park Road, West Wimbledon SW20 0SA

**(Ward)** Wimbledon Village

**Proposal:** Demolition of the existing detached dwelling and the erection of a semi-detached pair of 5 bedroom dwellings including basement accommodation for both dwellings.

**Drawing Nos** 1512/01 rev C, 1512/201 rev D, 1512/401 rev B

**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 – 16
- 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 north side of Cottenham Park Road. The surrounding area

is predominantly residential, with several detached properties of a similarly large scale. The application site is not in a conservation area but closely adjoins the Wimbledon West conservation area.

### **3. CURRENT PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 The application is for the demolition of existing detached dwelling and the erection of two semidetached 5 bedroom dwellings, each with basement accommodation. The buildings will be basement and two storeys, with further accommodation in the loft space.
- 3.2 The current scheme comprises various amendments to the previously refused proposals. The new dwellings are proposed as a semi detached pair with additional setbacks from the adjoining plots on either side of the site, with 2.4 metres from the boundary with number 36 Cottenham Park Road and 2.6 metres from number 32.
- 3.3 The roof form for both properties will be mansard shaped with slopes of 70 degrees and following amendments to the scheme to reduce the scale of the loft level bedrooms, the mansard form will be used on all sides. At the front elevation the single driveway serves both properties and leads to the integrated garages at lower ground level, with the existing upward sloping driveway levelled for access accordingly.
- 3.4 The ground floor/entrance level of the properties will be the same as the existing property. A patio will be formed to the front of the properties above the lower ground level garages. The buildings make use of the topography of the site which lopes upwards towards Copse Hill at the rear. The internal layouts of each of the units are exactly mirrored.
- 3.5 The existing point of access at the front boundary will be retained and a single driveway will serve the two dwellings, as opposed to the previous proposal which had the formation of two separate plots with their own points of access.
- 3.6 Further amendments have been made to the proposals to reduce the massing of the buildings at second floor/loft level by reducing the size of the bedrooms in the loft space and replacing the full size balconies with Juliette balconies.

### **4. PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 16/P0943 – Demolition of existing house and erection of two new detached five bed roomed dwelling houses with basement level. Refused 29/06/2016. Reasons:
- 1) The proposed dwelling, by reason of its bulk, massing and siting would be an overly dominant and un-neighbourly form of development, and leading to visual intrusion, overshadowing and overlooking of neighbours, which is contrary to policies DM D2 Design Considerations in all developments, and CS14 - Design of Merton's adopted Core Planning Strategy (July 2011).

- 2) The creation of the two large driveways leading to the property, with the potential loss of trees and reduction in soft landscaping within the front curtilage, is considered to result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity and streetscape of the immediate area, contrary to policy DM D2 Design Considerations in all developments in the adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan 2014 and CS14 - Design of Merton's adopted Core Planning Strategy (July 2011).
  - 3) It is considered that the proposed scheme would not provide acceptable outdoor amenity spaces for the occupiers to the rear of the building, due to the limited depth, site levels in relation to the boundary and overshadowing brought about by the bulk of the proposed buildings, contrary to policy DM D2 Design Considerations in all developments in the adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan 2014 and CS14 - Design of Merton's adopted Core Planning Strategy (July 2011).
- 4.2 05/P1067 – Erection of a single storey side/front extension with roof terrace above. Granted 20/07/2005.
  - 4.3 87/P0746 – Erection of a side extension to dwelling house at first floor level over existing garage. Granted 03/09/1987.
  - 4.4 MER961/72 – Single storey rear extension. Granted 12/10/1972.
  - 4.5 MER854/72 – Alteration to existing access. Granted 19/09/1972.
  - 4.6 MER187/72 (O) – Outline application for single storey rear extension. Refused 14/04/1972.
  - 4.7 WIM1738 (D) – Erection of one dwelling house. Granted 14/07/1954.
  - 4.8 WIM1738 (O) – Outline application for erection of one detached dwelling house. Granted 20/01/1954.
  - 4.9 WIM1677 – Outline erection of 5 new houses within the grounds on 113 Copse Hill, SW20. Granted 02/11/1953.

Planning history also includes applications for various 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.

Eight representations have been received, comprising of two general comments requesting further information with respect to lower ground works,

one statement of support and six objections. The objections are on the following grounds:

- Inaccurate information on plans
- Inadequate provision of outdoor amenity space
- Potential adverse impact on the existing tree planting line on property boundaries
- Adverse impact on amenity of neighbouring property in terms of overshadowing and loss of outlook
- Overlooking and intrusion on privacy of properties to the rear of the site
- Visual intrusion for the properties to the rear
- Creation of an overbearing structure with respect to neighbouring properties to rear and side of site
- Unacceptable increase in bulk and massing
- Unacceptable increase in ridge height
- Erection of building that is not in keeping with the local context
- Overdevelopment of the site and of the surrounding area.

Tree and Landscape officer comments:

- 5.2 The principles as set out in the arboricultural report are acceptable at this stage. Conditions have been recommended to clarify the landscaping scheme in terms of trees and natural features to be retained or replaced, and to ensure that new planting would include species that would be beneficial for existing wildlife on the site.

Flood Risk Management Officer Comments:

- 5.3 The ground investigation was carried out on 14 February 2017. The ground investigation comprised two windowless sampler boreholes drilled to depths of 4.00-5.45m. Groundwater was noted standing in the borehole WS 1. After 2 hours the water level was 1.98m bgl, and after 4 hours it had risen slightly to 1.96m bgl. The report does not appear to make reference to a return visit at a later date to obtain a standing water level.
- 5.4 No groundwater was observed in WS SA 1. The soakaway test was carried out in this hole, and very slow outflow rates were recorded, with a fall from the fill level of 1.53m bgl to 1.76m bgl taking just over 4 hours before the test was abandoned. The soakaway test data is presented in Appendix A, along with the test interpretation, which indicates a calculated infiltration rate of  $1.9 \times 10^{-8}$ m/sec. This is well below the recommended lower threshold of  $1 \times 10^{-6}$ m/sec for suitability of soakaways, and hence soakaway drainage is not feasible on the site.
- 5.5 The findings of borehole WS 1 indicate a groundwater level of around 2m below current front garden level, and higher groundwater levels are likely to occur towards the rear of the property due to the rise in ground levels, and across the site as a result of seasonal variations.
- 5.6 The proposed sheet pile wall around the basement is expected to provide adequate groundwater control during the excavation work, but in the

permanent case the basement impact assessment report has identified a concern that existing groundwater flowpaths could be disrupted by the basement structure. In order to prevent this occurring, which could cause groundwater to 'bank up' against the upstream (north) side of the basement; it is recommended that a drainage layer is provided at the back of the permanent retaining wall and beneath the raft/floor slab to enable groundwater to divert around the structure. A geocomposite fin-type drainage layer could be used, as mentioned by the report. Drainage provision is also recommended behind any landscape retaining structures proposed.

Biodiversity Officer Comments:

5.7 The timing of the survey undertaken and methodology used is acceptable.

I would recommend the following planning conditions:

- 1) A suitably worded condition requiring the burrows identified on the site to be dug back in the presence of a suitably qualified ecologist. This is in accordance with recommendations in section 6 of the submitted badger report and to ensure the safety of mammals during the re-development of the site.
- 2) A suitably worded condition ensuring that all new fencing should be designed to include access holes for badgers, as agreed by a suitably qualified ecologist. This is to ensure that mammals can continue to move through the site and to be in accordance with the recommendations in section 6 of the submitted badger report.

6. **POLICY CONTEXT**

6.1 Adopted Merton Core Strategy (July 2011)

The relevant policies within the Merton Adopted Core Planning Strategy (July 2011) are CS 9 (Housing Provision), CS 14 (Design) and CS 15 (Climate Change).

6.2 Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014)

The relevant policies within the Merton Adopted Core Planning Strategy (July 2011) are CS 9 (Housing Provision), CS 14 (Design) and CS 15 (Climate Change).

7. **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

7.1 The principal planning considerations related to this application are the principle of development, design, impact on the existing street scene and the impact on neighbour amenity.

Principle of Development

- 7.2 With respect to pattern of development, the area is primarily residential, with comparable plot sizes comprising of large detached properties or semi detached properties. The current scheme will be in keeping with previously permitted developments on Cottenham Park Road with permissions granted for the replacement of single dwellings on similarly sized plots with semi detached properties or short terraces. As such the proposals are not considered to constitute overdevelopment.
- 7.3 The London Plan and both the Council's adopted Core Planning Strategy (2011) and Sites and Policies Plan (2014) seek to increase housing provision where it can be shown that an acceptable standard of accommodation and a mix of dwelling types will be provided. The London Plan published in March 2016 sets Merton with a minimum ten-year target of 4107 dwellings within the borough between 2015 - 2025. The principle of a residential use is considered to be acceptable, making a modest contribution towards meeting housing choice and housing targets. As the proposed scheme is for the formation of 2 dwellings as a replacement of the existing single unit, there would be no net loss of any family sized dwellings, which are defined in Merton policy as 3+ bedroom units.
- Design and Impact on Streetscape
- 7.4 There is no prevailing architectural style or formal consistency that typifies Cottenham Park Road as a whole. The dwelling presently on the site dates from the 1950s and is not of particularly remarkable architectural style or of significant historical interest. Although the proposed scheme is of a different design to the original dwelling, such variance will be consistent with the varied character of the surrounding area.
- 7.5 The single point of access will be retained in the same position as the existing building and there are no proposed additional access points or driveways. It is also indicated on the plans that the front boundary landscaping will be largely retained with no removal of significant trees. The new dwellings will also retain a setback from the front boundary. As such it is not expected that the proposed scheme will have an unduly adverse impact on the street scene and the verdant character of the road will be largely preserved.
- 7.6 The section of Cottenham Park Road hosting the application site has a gently upward slope in the western direction, with the more dramatic upward slope occurring to the rear of the site towards Copse Hill. The proposal makes use of the rear sloping site to embed the lower ground level of the development and maintain a comparable building height with the neighbouring properties.
- 7.7 The ridge height of the proposed scheme is slightly higher than that of the existing building. However, the additional height is not considered to be excessive considering the setting whereby there are variable roof forms on the road. The mansard shaped roof reduces the bulk and massing at the roof level, and the setback from the front boundary will minimise the visual impact on the street scene. Notwithstanding the additional height of the ridge, the proposed dwellings remain at a lower height than the buildings on the

adjoining plots on either side. As such it is deemed that the building height is acceptable.

#### Impact on Neighbour Amenity

- 7.8 The proposed scheme as a semidetached pair of dwellings has a more compact bulk and massing than previous proposals. The amended mansard roof form is expected to further reduce the bulk and massing of the buildings. The compact form of the buildings also results in a greater setback from the property boundaries with the immediate adjoining plots at numbers 32 and 36 Cottenham Park Road, with minimum distances of 2.6 metres and 2.4 metres respectively. Taking these into consideration, it is therefore considered that the buildings will not create an unduly adverse impact nor be overbearing or create an unacceptable sense of enclosure.
- 7.9 The bedrooms on the first floor are provided with rear facing external balconies with obscured glass screens installed on the flanks to a height of 2 metres. As proposed, the screening is expected to significantly reduce the possibility of overlooking from the terrace to the rear gardens of neighbouring properties on either side.
- 7.10 The proposed dwellings will largely keep to the rear building line as established by the existing house. As such the setbacks to the rear properties, currently at a minimum of 23 meters, will be largely retained. Given the local topography the rear properties will be at a relatively higher elevation than the application site and as such it is expected that the impact of the development in relation to those rear properties will be acceptable given that level change.

#### 8. **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.

#### 9. **CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 The current scheme has improvements over the previous refusal with respect to the design, massing and impact on the visual character of the area. The concerns of the neighbours have been noted; however it is considered that sufficient measures have been included in the design, along with subsequent amendments to the scheme to reduce adverse impacts of the scheme on the amenity of neighbours.
- 9.2 A number of conditions have been recommended to mitigate impacts on wildlife and preserve the natural features on the site.
- 9.3 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. C.7 (Refuse & Recycling - Implementation)
5. B.5 (Boundary Treatment)
6. Non Standard Condition (Boundaries)
7. C.2 (No Permitted Development Doors/Windows)
8. F.1 (Landscaping/Planting Scheme)
9. F.2 (Landscaping - Implementation)
10. F5. (Tree Protection)
11. F8. (Site Supervision – Trees)
12. Non Standard Condition (Site Supervision – Ecology)
13. H.4 (Provision of vehicle parking – including approved garage)
14. H.09 (Construction Vehicles)
15. H.12 (Delivery and Servicing Plan)
16. H.17 (Sustainable Urban Drainage)
17. L.2 (Code for Sustainable Homes – Pre-Commencement [New build residential])
18. L3 (Code for Sustainable Homes – Pre-Occupation [New build residential])

---

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

Please note these web pages may be slow to load