

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
24 SEPTEMBER 2020**

<u>UPRN</u>	<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>Item No:</u> <u>DATE VALID</u>
	20/P0024	09/01/2020

Address/Site Ridgway Stables, 93 Ridgway, Wimbledon, SW19 4SU

(Ward) Hillside

Proposal: Demolition of existing stable buildings involving re-instatement of ground level retail unit and erection of new stables with offices above plus caretaker accommodation.

Drawing Nos RS093-P001, P100, P101, P102, P103, P104, P105, P106, P200, P201, P202, P203, P300, P301, Heritage Statement and Design and Access Statement

Contact Officer: Tim Bryson

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- Yes
- Site notice-Yes
- Design Review Panel consulted-No
- Number neighbours consulted – 9
- External consultants: None
- Controlled Parking Zone: Yes
- Conservation Area: Yes (Wimbledon West)

1. **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This application has been brought to the Planning Applications Committee due to the number and nature of objections received.

2. **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 The application site comprises Wimbledon Stables situated on the south side of Ridgway and to the side and rear of The Swan Public House. The stables are made up of a mixture of single storey and two storey buildings set around a yard area. The application site is within the Merton (Wimbledon West) Conservation Area. The site surroundings consist of residential properties and the public house, including Grade II Listed Building opposite to the north.

3. **CURRENT PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 The current proposal involves the partial demolition of the existing stables and construction of replacement stables with office accommodation above, provision of a replacement A1 retail unit at ground floor level and provision of replacement caretakers accommodation at first floor (1-bed flat).
- 3.2 The replacement A1 retail unit would comprise the ground floor in the north-western part of the site with retaining main access from The Ridgway. The floorspace proposed would be 45 sq m. This element of the building would be single storey with roof terrace above for the proposed office use.
- 3.3 The replacement stables would utilise the existing set of stables at the rear of the site and provide new ones facing into the courtyard, all with access only off Hillside.
- 3.4 The existing caretakers accommodation at first floor level would be reconfigured and partially re-built on the eastern boundary to form a 1-bed flat (51 sq m) for occupation by caretaker for the stables only.
- 3.5 The proposed office accommodation would be accommodated at ground, first and second floor level in the main building (333 sq m) with access only off Hillside, and a small office unit at first floor level in the existing stable barn building (36 sq m) at the rear of the site, with access off Hillside.

4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 October 2018 a pre-application meeting was held in respect of the erection of new stables and dwellings (LBM Ref.18/P2868).
- 4.2 June 2019 - PRE APPLICATION ADVICE FOR REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING STABLES WITH THE NEW STABLES AND OFFICES ABOVE. (LBM Ref. 19/p1759).

5. CONSULTATION

5.1 The application has been advertised by Conservation Area site and press notice procedure and letters of notification to occupiers of neighbouring properties. In response 11 letters of objection have been received. The grounds of objection are set out below: -

- No traffic impact assessment has been provided.
- No information has been provided on the use of the shop and offices.
- Why do the stables need to be redeveloped. Can they not be refurbished?
- The locally significant brick wall fronting Hillside will be compromised and its unique aesthetic significantly downgraded by the addition of two painted timber doors and new windows. These should be removed.
- The higher level accommodation (with its dormer windows and lower level windows) built as a vertical extension to the existing brick wall will again compromise the aesthetics fronting Hillside, creating excessive bulk and massing leading to a canyoning effect. In order to maintain the local character as much as possible the upper level should be set back from the existing wall.
- The proposal would add significant bulk to the Hillside frontage.
- Given parking problems in the area the development should be 'permit free'.
- Is there any guarantee that the stables will continue to support the local community programme, riding school and affordable accessible riding?
- Are the proposed stables of adequate size?
- Loss of privacy to 95 Ridgway.

5.2 Three letters have been received in support of the proposal and three letters commenting on aspects of the proposal have been received, raising the following:

- Glad to see stables retained.
- Good to see a small amount of accommodation as this will be good for security.
- Welcome the refurbishment of the barn building.
- Aesthetically pleasing.

5.3 Wimbledon Society

The Wimbledon Society state that the site a Heritage Asset, it is evident that the Stables have been seen as a community asset also. The stables and the adjoining pub are linked historically and visually. The proposal to reinstate an active stables on the site is welcomed. The application shows that the original stables are to be partially retained/adapted, but somewhat reduced in size and additional floor space added, being new offices plus retail and a caretakers flat. The Societies comments are as follows:-

- The roofs are show as clad in artificial slate. Natural slates should be used.
- No information on how energy is to be provided.
- Stables by their nature have specific needs. Where would the manure be stored and is there enough storage?
- As riders dismount in Hillside should consideration be given to the surfacing of the footway and carriageway in front of the entrance?

- The offices do not appear to have sufficient light.
- The proposed additional storey facing onto the adjoining site appears to infringe the daylight angle on the common boundary.
- The narrowness of Ridgway footway has meant that existing from Hillside into Ridgway is difficult. Should not the building be set back?
- The blank flank wall forming the Hillside elevation is the most 'public' elevation and further thought should be given to this elevation. Doors should not open onto the public footway.

5.4 Council's Conservation Officer

The whole site is being Locally Listed. But the most significant part is the rear stables (the barn). This part is to be restored and refurbished which is welcome. Some concerns with the new window in the side wall to Hillside. Regarding the height of the proposed building, I still feel that it would be better if the height was reduced to be the same as the adjacent wing of the Swan Pub. However, preservation of as much fabric of the oldest range of stables is very important. I believe there are two original fireplaces which should be retained. I would like to be consulted and monitor the restoration of the building regarding rebuilding any sections and replacement timbers. Can that be conditioned? In lowering the floor they may reveal old flooring slabs which could be reused. Both the Engineer's Report and the Heritage Statement mention the brick sets. The shopfront design is a good reflection of the existing. They must use real slates for the roof tiles and we will need to see material samples secured through planning condition.

5.5 Council's Transport Planner

Observations:

The proposed development is sited at the junction of Ridgway with Hillside. The access to the stables is off Hillside, a cul-de-sac with a speed limit of 20mph.

The site lies within an area with a PTAL 1b, which is considered poor. A poor PTAL rating suggests that only a few journeys could be conveniently made by public transport.

Parking restrictions are in place on Hillside, the first section with pay and display parking (Mon- Sat 8.30am- 6.30pm with permits not valid) and the rest of the cul-de-sac is within the Controlled Parking Zone (VOt) where parking is controlled from Monday to Saturday between 8:30am – 6:30pm.

There will be no increase in vehicular traffic due to the proposed development. The commercial uses would not be allowed to apply for parking business permits for each employee, however, they can apply for 2 parking permits only for the day to day running of the business.

Recommendation:

The proposed development is unlikely have significant impact on the adjoining highway. No objection to the proposal, subject to:

- Demolition/Construction Logistic Plan (including a Construction Management plan in accordance with TfL guidance) should be submitted to LPA for approval before commencement of work.

6. **POLICY CONTEXT**

6.1 Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Map (July 2014)

DM O2	Nature Conservation, Trees, hedges and landscape features
DM D1	Urban design and the public realm
DM D2	Design considerations in all developments
DM D3	Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
DM D4	Managing heritage assets
DM E1	Employment areas in Merton
DM EP2	Reducing and mitigating noise
DM EP4	Pollutants
DM F2	Sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) and; Wastewater and Water Infrastructure
DM T1	Support for sustainable transport and active travel
DM T2	Transport impacts of development
DM T3	Car parking and servicing standards
DM T5	Access to the Road Network
DM R2	Development of town centre type uses outside of town centres.

6.2 Core Strategy (July 2011):

CS11	Infrastructure
CS12	Economic Development
CS14	Design
CS15	Climate Change
CS16	Flood Risk Management
CS17	Waste Management
CS18	Active Transport
CS19	Public Transport
CS20	Parking, Servicing and Delivery

6.3 London Plan (2016) policies:

5.1	Climate change mitigation
5.2	Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
5.3	Sustainable design and construction
5.7	Renewable energy
5.13	Sustainable drainage
6.3	Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
6.9	Cycling

- 6.10 Walking
- 6.13 Parking
- 7.2 An inclusive environment
- 7.4 Local character
- 7.6 Architecture
- 7.8 Archaeology and Heritage
- 7.14 Improving air quality

6.4 NPPF (2019)

7. **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

7.1 The main planning considerations concern the principle of development, design/visual impact and impact on Conservation Area, neighbour amenity, setting of listed buildings, and highways and parking.

7.2 Principle of development

7.2.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that when determining a planning application, regard is to be had to the development plan, and the determination shall be made in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

7.2.2 *Replacement A1 retail unit*

Policy DMR2 aims to focus town centre type uses into the most sustainable locations whilst allowing development of small convenience shops within walking distance of residences. Part (c) of this policy supports the replacement of small shop out of town centre as long as the retail floorspace is less than 280 sq m. The policy also states in (d)(iii) that planning conditions may be imposed on developments to control the type of goods sold or the type of activity. This is to maintain the vitality and viability of the existing town centres in the Borough. As there is an existing shop at the Ridgway frontage of the site, the proposed replacement A1 retail commercial unit in this location is considered to be acceptable. It would especially be in line with policy as it is a small-scale A1 retail unit proposed.

7.2.3 *Stables and Caretakers accommodation*

The stables are well established and the proposals improvement of the stable facility is welcomed and considered acceptable in principle. The existing site contains caretakers accommodation and the proposal would re-provide this, albeit in a slightly different location on the site. This is long well established and its re-provision is welcomed.

7.2.4 *Office use*

Planning policy DM E3 seeks to ensure that there is a diverse mix of size, type, tenure and location of employment facilities which can support a range of employment opportunities towards creating balanced mixed use neighbourhoods in Merton.

7.2.5 Paragraph 80 of the NPPF 2019 outlines that significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development.

7.2.6 Policy DME1 aims to ensure that there is an adequate supply of suitable sites and premises in locations that optimise opportunities and co-locational advantages for businesses and minimise negative effects on other users. Small office spaces (below 280m²) are supported throughout the borough. The proposal would provide 369 sqm of office floorspace and would be in a position in reasonable proximity to the village high street for amenities. Taking into account the size of the proposal, officers are satisfied that the principle of the office floorspace can be supported in this location as it is of a limited size in floorspace proposed.

7.3 Design/visual impact and impact on Conservation Area

7.3.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that planning should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. The regional planning policy advice in relation to design is found in the London Plan (2015), in Policy 7.4 - Local Character and 7.6 - Architecture. These policies state that Local Authorities should seek to ensure that developments promote high quality inclusive design, enhance the public realm, and seek to ensure that development promotes world class architecture and design.

7.3.2 Policy DM D2 seek to ensure a high quality of design in all development, which relates positively and appropriately to the siting, rhythm, scale, density, proportions, height, materials and massing of surrounding buildings and existing street patterns, historic context, urban layout and landscape features of the surrounding area. Policy DM D4 seeks to ensure that development adjacent to Conservation Areas either preserves or enhances the setting of the Conservation Area. Local Development Framework Policy CS14 supports these SPP Policies.

7.3.3 The existing stables were formerly part of a wider complex of buildings which include the adjacent public house, the Swan Inn. The entire complex was built in the mid-to-late nineteenth century, with the livery stable providing a horse and carriage service to Wimbledon Railway station. Although the stable are not listed, they form part of the historical development of the Conservation Area and make a positive contribution to sub-area 15C of the Conservation Area. Whilst the site has changed over the years and is in a poor condition, being in need of cosmetic improvements, the current proposals seek to retain and conserve as much historic fabric and character as possible, especially given the stables are noted as making a 'positive' contribution towards the character of the Conservation Area.

7.3.4 The proposed office space would be in a building that would be traditional in design and have a hipped slate roof, in keeping with existing slate roof at the adjacent public house. The two storey aspect would be set back from the front

elevation, and thereby leaving a single storey element at the front. This reduces the visual impact of the new building in the streetscene and surrounding area. The use of dormer windows which break the eaves help break up the bulk and massing of this element of the proposal. Further, the maximum height of the new building would not exceed the maximum height of the existing adjacent public house. Given the position of the site in the Conservation Area, and the surrounding traditional buildings, officers consider a samples of materials condition is necessary should permission be granted.

- 7.3.5 The replacement single storey shop unit at the front would re-provide the unit with new larger arches and parapet walls, which officers consider are of sufficient high quality design. The alterations to the existing flank wall which fronts Hillside would be limited to traditional arched timber doors and one set of windows. These additions are considered to respect the historic character of the wall and would not cause a detrimental impact on the streetscene. The alterations to the existing two storey stable building at the rear of the site would largely be visible internal to the site and would not alter its appearance from the south side of Hillside.
- 7.3.6 Overall, the proposal would be of an appropriate architectural form and scale that would satisfactorily preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and streetscenes of Ridgway and Hillside. The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of polices policies CS14 and DM D2, DM D3 and DM D4.

7.4 Neighbour Amenity

- 7.4.1 SPP policy DMD2 states that proposals must be designed to ensure that they would not have an undue negative impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, quality of living conditions, privacy, visual intrusion and noise.
- 7.4.2 The site is bordered by residential property to the south. The area south of the site is garden space and driveway space for number 1 Hillside. The proposal does not propose any windows in the south elevation for the stable building, which is to be restored and converted. The rear facing new dormer window in the office building would be set back from the south boundary and would not cause any overlooking harm to the rear. Officers are therefore satisfied there would be no material impact on the amenities of this adjoining neighbouring property.
- 7.4.3 The west elevation of the two storey office building would offer views towards the flank elevation of number 95 Ridgway. This would, however, be across the road and the primary outlook for 95 is to its front and rear elevations which do not face the site. Taking into account the limited height of the proposal, and the orientation of the new windows, officers are satisfied there would not be material harm caused to the amenities of this neighbouring property. Further, some views would be afforded toward number 56 Ridgway to the north from

windows and the roof terrace, however owing to the separation distance across the road, this would not be a harmful relationship.

- 7.4.4 To the east of the site lies the Swan Public House. The proposed development would be sited on the shared boundary with part of the Public Houses' outdoor terrace/garden. However, the majority of the taller two storey aspect of the proposal would be adjacent to the side building of the Public House, with the smaller two storey aspect being sited adjacent to the terrace/garden. Whilst there would be some increased sense of enclosure to this outdoor space, officers do not consider it would be so significant to warrant an objection on the impact on the functioning of the Public House. The Public House benefits from a wide outdoor space, which includes wrapping round to the front adjacent to Ridgway.
- 7.4.5 Overall, the proposal would not cause material harm to the surrounding amenities of neighbouring residential properties and is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of policy DM D2 (Design Considerations in all Developments).

7.5 Sustainability

- 7.5.1 In light of the Government's statement and changes to the national planning framework it is advised that conditions would not be attached requiring full compliance with Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes but would be attached so as to ensure that the dwellings are designed and constructed to achieve CO2 reduction standards and water consumption standards equivalent to Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4.
- 7.5.2 As per CS policy CS15, minor residential developments are required to achieve a 19% improvement on Part L of the Building Regulations 2013 and water consumption should not exceed 105 litres/person/day. The new caretakers residential flat would fall into this category and therefore a condition will be added to secure the above requirements. Non-domestic development (office/commercial) under 500m², does not require assessment under CS Policy CS15. There are therefore no sustainability requirements required for the proposal.

7.6 Setting of listed buildings

- 7.6.1 The site is located opposite a Grade II Listed Building on the north side of the Ridgway (number 56 Rdgway). This building was originally constructed as a single residence, however, it's now divided into flats. This building is visually separated from the site as it is across the road and its principal façade elevation being its east elevation which fronts Lauriston Road. Officers are satisfied that the proposal would not cause a harmful impact on the setting of this listed building, due to its scale, design and form not competing with this listed building and being separated by the road. There are also several locally listed buildings in the area, with those nearby on Ridgway including 95, 97 and 99. Again these buildings are distinctly taller than the proposed

development and are separated to the site by a road. Overall, officers are satisfied that the proposal would not harm the setting of any of these buildings and is of an appropriate scale, form and design which respects the historic context of the application site and its surroundings.

7.7 Highways and Parking

- 7.7.1 London Plan policy 6.3 requires that development proposals ensure that impacts on transport capacity and the transport network at both corridor and local level are fully assessed. Development should not adversely affect safety on the transport network. Similarly Core Strategy policy CS20 requires that development would not adversely affect pedestrian or cycle movements, safety, the convenience of local residents, on street parking or traffic management.
- 7.7.2 London Plan policies 6.9 and 6.10 seek to secure to ensure that developments provide integrated and accessible cycle facilities and high quality pedestrian environments while policy 6.13 sets out maximum parking standards. The policies provide an overarching framework for decision making.
- 7.7.3 Core Strategy Policy CS 18 promotes active means of transport and the proposal includes on-site secure cycle parking for both the residential and office uses of the proposal.
- 7.7.4 The Council's Transport Planner has assessed the proposal and has raised no objections to the proposal. It is noted that the proposal would be a car-free development, with no on-site parking proposed. Officers note the concerns raised by third parties with regards to parking problems in the surrounding roads. The proposed commercial uses (retail and office) would only be allowed a maximum of 2 parking permits each and taking into account this limitation and the surrounding area, officers do not consider this would cause a harmful impact to warrant an objection. Officers do not consider that the level of floorspace for the new offices is significant to warrant a transport assessment or impact assessment. Any vehicle movement associated with the office use would likely be visitors and servicing, which is expected to be minimal. Although the site has a PTAL rating of 1b (poor), Ridgway is served by a bus route and the site is circa 500 m from the village High street which is served by further bus routes in and out of Wimbledon. Cycle storage would be provided for the office space internally at the main entrance off Hillside. Servicing for the office and retail unit would be taken from the new bin store facility adjacent to Hillside road, and the stables would retain their existing access to service from this road.
- 7.7.5 The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of impact on highways and parking.

7.8 Impact of updates to the GPDO (2015) (as amended)

- 7.8.1 From 1st September 2020, the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes)

(Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020 will come into effect. Therefore, officers note that the changes to the current Use Classes proposed would be as follows:

Existing to New Use Class

A1 Shops E or F.2

A2 Financial and professional services E

A3 Restaurants and cafes E

B1 Business E

D1 Non-residential institutions E or F.1

7.8.2 In light of the proposed changes to the Use Classes, future occupation of the commercial premises shall benefit from some greater flexibility. Such as uses within A1, A2, A3 and B1 would fall under Class E (Commercial, Business and Service), so change of use between those specified uses would be considered permitted development and would not require planning permission to be sought from the Local Planning Authority.

7.8.3 However, Classes A1 and D1 could also fall within the classification of Classes F.1 and F.2, dependant on the size of the unit and its use:
Class F.1 (Learning and non-residential institutions): schools, non-residential education and training centres, museums, public libraries, public halls, exhibition halls, places of worship, law courts.

7.8.4 Class F.2 (Local Community) consists of: a shop mostly selling essential goods, including food, to visiting members of the public in circumstances where the shop premise does not cover more than 280sqm and there is no other similar facility with 1000m radius of the shop's location; or a hall or meeting place for the principal use of the local community, swimming pool, skating rink or an area or place for outdoor sport or recreation, not involving motorised vehicles or firearms.

7.8.5 Should planning permission be granted and the development works carried out, the commercial uses would fall under the provisions of the new Use Classes rather than those currently specified. Therefore, to ensure there is better clarity for future occupiers, and having regard to the residential surroundings of the site's location, a condition shall be attached which limits the use of the commercial spaces proposed to those as specified in the planning application (retail and office space).

7.9 Local Financial Considerations

7.9.1 The proposed development is liable to pay the Merton and Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), the funds for which will be applied by the Mayor towards the Crossrail project. Merton's Community Infrastructure Levy was implemented on 1st April 2014. This will enable the Council to raise, and pool, contributions from developers to help pay for things such as transport, de-centralized energy, healthcare, schools, leisure and public open spaces - local infrastructure that is necessary to support new development. Merton's CIL has replaced Section 106 agreements as the principal means by which pooled developer

contributions towards providing the necessary infrastructure should be collected.

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 design and scale of the replacement buildings is considered to be acceptable and the proposal would not harm neighbour amenity. The proposal would also preserve the character and appearance of the Merton (Wimbledon West) Conservation Area. The proposal would re-provide an enhanced retail unit and new stable accommodation, thereby maintaining the vitality of the site and its contribution to the local area. Accordingly, it is recommended that planning permission be granted, subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions: -

1. A.1 (Commencement of Development)
2. A.7 (Approved Plans)
3. B.1 (Approval of Facing Materials)
4. B.4 (Details of Surface Treatment)
5. C.6 (Refuse and Recycling-Details to be Submitted)
6. D.11 (Hours of Construction)
7. Demolition/Construction Logistic Plan (including a Construction Management plan in accordance with TfL guidance).
8. Details of cycle parking to be submitted
9. Drawings at 1:20 scale of the proposed doors and windows in the west wall elevation.
10. Restricting commercial uses to be Retail and Office only.
11. Access for recording (rear barn stable building)

12. Sustainability pre-occupation condition (residential unit)
13. Residential flat to be caretakers occupation only

This page is intentionally left blank