PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 7 November 2013

Item No:

<u>UPRN</u> <u>APPLICATION NO.</u> <u>DATE VALID</u>

 (1) 13/P2263
 30/07/2013

 (2) 13/P2342
 30/07/2013

Address/Site 30 Arthur Road, Wimbledon SW19 7DU

(Ward) Village

Proposal: (1) Demolition of the existing house and the erection of a new

six bedroom detached dwelling house arranged over four floors (with accommodation at basement level and within the roof

space).

(2) Conservation Area Consent for demolition of existing

dwellinghouse.

Drawing Nos HH/578/P01, P02, Design and Access Statement and Tree

Report

Contact Officer: Richard Allen (8545 3621)

RECOMMENDATION

(1) GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

(2) Grant Conservation Area Consent 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: 8
- External consultants: None
- Density: n/a
- Number of jobs created: n/a

Archaeology Priority Zone: No

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**

2.1 The application site comprises a two storey detached dwellinghouse situated on the east side of Arthur Road close to the junction with Currie Hill Close. The property was originally the gate house to the adjoining house and was remodelled and extended in the 1960's. The application site is within the Merton (Wimbledon North) Conservation Area.

3. **CURRENT PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 The current proposal involves the demolition of the existing dwelling house and erection of a new six bedroom detached dwelling house with accommodation within the roof space and at basement level. The proposed house would be set back from the Arthur Road frontage by between 9.5 and 10.8 metres. The proposed house would be set off each boundary by between 1.5 and 1.8 metres. The main rear elevation of the proposed house would be sited 10.2 metres from the rear boundary of the site, although the ground floor family roof would project 1.3 metres further into the rear garden from the rear elevation of the house. The proposed house would have an eaves height of between 6 metres and 7.5 metres and have pitched roofs with a ridge height of between 9.2 and 12.2 metres.
- 3.2 Internally, at basement level three rooms would be provided together with utility/plant room. At ground floor level an entrance lobby, hallway, living room, dining room would be provided. At first floor level four bedrooms would be provided, with a further two bedrooms and study rooms would be formed within the roof space. Light and ventilation to the rooms within the roofspace would be provided by dormer windows and rooflights.
- On the site frontage the existing hedge would be retained albeit that a section of the hedge would have to be removed to provide an additional vehicular access. Off street parking would be provided within the front cartilage. At the rear of the site 175m2 of amenity space would be provided.
- 3.3 A traditional design approach has been adopted for the proposed house with a hipped roof, bay windows and feature dormer windows.

4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

.

- 4.1 In July 1954 outline planning permission was granted for the division of the land into 11 building plots involving retention of the existing cottage and lodge (Ref.WIM1903).
- 4.2 In September 1966 planning permission was granted for the erection of a single storey extension (Ref.WIM451/66).
- 4.3 In May 1967 planning permission was granted for the erection of a boundary wall (Ref.MER293/67).
- 4.4 In August 1968 planning permission was granted for the construction of a garage (Ref.MER681/68).
- 4.5 In January 1970 planning permission was granted for the erection of a garage (Ref.MER1066/69).
- 4.6 In December 1972 planning permission was granted for the erection of a boundary wall (Ref.MER1200/72).
- 4.7 In February 1987 planning permission was granted for the erection of first floor rear extension (LBM Ref.86/P1379).
- 4.8 in August 2010 a pre-application meeting was held in respect of the redevelopment of the site by the erection of a pair of four bedroom houses (LBM Ref.10/P2253/NEW).
- 4.9 In May 2013 a pre-application meeting was held in respect of the redevelopment of the site by the erection of a detached dwelling house (LBM Ref.13/P1160/NEW).

5. **CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 The application has been advertised by conservation area site and press notice and letters of notification to occupiers of neighbouring properties. In response 15 representations have been received. The grounds of objection are set out below:-
 - -The proposed house would be much larger than the house opposite at 49 Arthur Road.
 - -The proposed house would overlook 49 Arthur Road and result in loss of light.
 - The size and height of the proposed house is enormous in comparison to the existing property. There are already two large new builds further down the road and if this application is allowed it will ruin the discreet and charming style of the road.
 - -The proposal appears overbearing for the size of the plot.
 - First and second floor windows would overlook 47 Arthur Road.

- -The proposal is an over intensive development of the plot and will overshadow surrounding houses.
- -The proposed house would have little amenity space and only two parking spaces would be provided which is insufficient for the number of bedrooms.
- -The proposal is a material overdevelopment of the site.
- -The study room and rooms in the basement could be additional bedrooms, creating an eight bedroom house.
- -The proposed house would overlook neighboring properties.
- -There is a Yew tree in the garden of 1 Currie Hill close and protection measures are inadequate.
- -If the application were allowed an application for a pair of semidetached houses would follow.

5.2 Tree Officer

The applicant proposes the removal of four trees (including one dead tree) and 2 lengths of mixed hedging. The only tree to remain is the Japanese Larch (number T2 in the Tree Survey). The position of tree T2 is incorrectly marked on the arbouricultural documents and does not appear on the proposed plans. The minimum are of root protection has been reduced to permit the installation of a large are of hard standing. There are no indications on the plans as to whether new planting is proposed. As the tree has been incorrectly plotted a new tree protection plan is required. The plans should be modified to provide a greater area of open ground to meet the minimum standards set by the BS 5837:2012. There would also appear to be room for a new tree at the other end of the central planting bed at the entrance.

6. **POLICY CONTEXT**

- 6.1 The relevant policies contained within the Adopted Merton Core Strategy (July2011) are CS8 (Housing Choice), CS9 (Housing Provision), CS13 (Open Space, Nature Conservation Leisure and Culture) and CS14 (Design).
- The retained policies contained within the Adopted UDP (October 2003) are NE.11 (Trees-Protection), HS.1 (Housing Layout and Amenity), BE.15 (New Buildings and Extensions, Daylight, Sunlight, Privacy, Visual Intrusion and Noise), BE.23 (Alterations and Extensions to Buildings).
- 6.2 The London Plan (February 2011)

The relevant policies within the London Plan are 3.5 (Design and Quality of Housing), 3.8 (Housing Choice), 7.4 (Local Character) and 7.21 (Trees).

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 The main planning considerations concern the acceptability of the demolition demolition of the existing building, the design and appearance of the

replacement building and its impact upon the Conservation Area and trees, neighbur amenity, quality of accommodation and parking/highway issues.

7.2 <u>Demolition of Existing Building</u>

The existing building is of little architectural merit and there are no objections to the demolition of the existing building subject to an acceptable design for a replacement dwelling. Therefore there is no requirement to justify demolition in terms of retained UDP policy BE.1.

7.3 Design and Conservation Issues

The initial redevelopment proposal was subject to pre-application discussions and the submitted scheme follows advice given at the pre-application meeting. The height of the proposed house being reduced from that shown on pre-application plans in relation to number 28 Arthur Road and a traditional design approach adopted. The existing building on the site is a single storey building (with rooms within the roof space) and the proposed replacement house is arranged over four floors (with accommodation at basement level and within the roofspace). Although the proposed house would be higher than the existing house the eaves height of the house would be similar to the existing house at 28 Arthur Road. The proposed house would be set back from the Arthur Road frontage and most of the existing hedge would be retained. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of Adopted Core Strategy policy CS14 and retained UDP policies BE.1 and BE.22.

7.4 Neighbour Amenity

A number of objections have been received concerning the height of the proposed house and its impact upon the Arthur Road streetscene. However, the proposed house would be set back from the Arthur Road frontage and the highest part of the building would be adjacent to the driveway that provides access to 34 Arthur Road. Number 34 Arthur Road is sited at the rear of a long driveway screened by mature trees so the height of the proposed house adjacent to the boundary with 34 Arthur Road would not be detrimental to neighbour amenity. The proposed house would be set back from the Arthur Road frontage by 10 metres and although the site has an elevated position the height of the proposed house and its relationship to 28 Arthur Road is considered to be acceptable. The objectors concerns regarding potential overlooking and/or loss of privacy are also noted. However, the rear elevation of the proposed house would be 10 metres from the rear boundary (albeit that the rear ground floor window would project 1.5 metres further into the garden). The separation distance between windows at first floor level and the boundary is considered to be acceptable. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of retained UDP policy BE.15.

7.6 Parking

Vehicular access from Arthur Road would be maintained with the construction of an additional vehicular access to provide an in/out access arrangement. There are no highways objections to the proposal and proposed development is acceptable in terms of Adopted Core Strategy Policy CS20.

7.7 Local Financial Contributions

The proposed development is liable to pay the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy, the funds for which will be applied by the Mayor towards the Crossrail project. The CIL amount is non-negotiable

SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

9.1 The proposal does not constitute Schedule 1 or Schedule 2 development. Accordingly there is no requirement for an EIA submission.

10. **CONCLUSION**

10.1 The design of the proposed replacement house is considered to be acceptable and the proposal would not affect neighbour amenity. The proposed development would also preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Merton (Wimbledon North) Conservation Area.

Accordingly it is recommended that planning permission be and conservation area consent granted.

RECOMMENDATION

(1) 13/P2263

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION

subject to the following conditions:-

- 1. A.1 Commencement of Development
- 2. B.1 External Materials to be Approved
- 3. B.4 Details of Site/Surface Treatment
- 4. D.11 Hours of Construction
- 5. H.9 Construction Vehicles
- 6. F.1 Landscaping Scheme
- 7. F.4 <u>Tree Survey Approved</u>
- 8. F5P Tree Protection
- 9. No works or development shall commence until a scheme of supervision for the arboricultural protection measures required by Condition 6 has been

approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme will be appropriate to the scale of the works and will include details of;

- (a) Induction of personnel awareness of arboricultural measures.
- (b) Identification of individual responsibilities and key personnel.
- (c) Statement of delegated powers.
- (d) Timing and methods of site visiting and record keeping, including updates.
- (e) Procedures for dealing with variations and incidents.
- (f) The scheme of supervision will be carried out as agreed.
- (g) The scheme of supervision will be administered by a qualified arboriculturalist instructed by the applicant and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason for condition: To safeguard the existing retained trees in accordance with policy CS13 of the Adopted Merton Core Strategy (July 2011).

10. No development shall take place until there has been submitted in writing for approval to the Local Planning Authority details of the method of the excavation and the construction of the basement extension. Such details shall be included in the Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan.

Reason for condition: To protect and safeguard the retained trees in accordance with policy CS13 of the Adopted Merton Core Strategy (July 2011).

11. INF1 Party Wall Act

(2) 13/P2342

GRANT CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT

Subject to the following conditions:-

1. A.4 (Conservation Area Works)











