

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

10 DECEMBER 2020

APPLICATION NO.

DATE VALID

20/P2610

18/08/2020

Site Address:

5 Parkside Avenue, Wimbledon, SW15 5ES

Ward:

Village

Proposal:

DEMOLITION OF 2 STOREY DWELLINGHOUSE AND
ERECTION OF REPLACEMENT DWELLINGHOUSE
WITH ACCOMODATION WITHIN THE ROOF SPACE.

Drawing Nos:

PO1 (Rev D); PO2 (Rev A); PO3 (Rev B) PO4 (Rev B);
EW01 (Rev D); EW02 (Rev A); Tree Retention and
Protection Plan (171901/TRPP/Rev 2);

Contact Officer:

Calum McCulloch

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT Planning permission subject to conditions

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

Is a screening opinion required	No
Is an Environmental Statement required	No
Press notice	Yes
Site notice	Yes
Design Review Panel consulted	No
Number of neighbours consulted	10
External consultations	1
Internal consultations	3
Controlled Parking Zone	Yes - VN

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This planning application has been brought before the planning committee due to the number of representations received. Furthermore, the application has been called in by Councillor Thomas Barlow representing Village Ward.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site comprises two-storey 1950s dwelling located on a generously sized plot (0.18 ha) on the north side of Parkside Avenue.
- 2.2 Parkside Avenue generally consists of large recently built semi-detached dwellings which have replaced 1950s dwellings over the course of the last three decades.
- 2.3 Currently the dwelling is largely screened from view by a line of mature cypress trees.
- 2.4 The site is located within the Wimbledon North Conservation Area.
- 2.5 The site has a significant amount of foliage with generous number of mature trees. A blanket TPO has been applied to the site.
- 2.6 The site is also located within the Wimbledon Village Archaeological Priority Area.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The application seeks to demolish the existing 1950s dwelling and construct a part two-storey, part three-storey dwelling positioned towards the southern boundary of the site. It would adopt a royal Victorian traditional style similar to other recent redevelopments in the nearby area, including no. 7 Parkside Avenue to the north of the site.
- 3.2 The proposed dwelling is split into three main sections with the main bulk of the dwelling located centrally with two projecting side wings each side.
- 3.3 Alterations are also proposed to the existing vehicle access, with closing one and re-opening another one on the south-western end of the site.
- 3.4 The proposal includes comprehensive re-landscaping, including provision of semi-mature trees at the front of the site following removal of trees.

Amendments

- 3.5 In response to feedback from the Tree Officer and to address concerns raised by neighbours, the applicant made the following physical alterations to the proposal during the application:
- Replacement of two dormers at 2nd floor level with a single dormer with obscure glazing on both side elevations.
 - Relocation of western plant room to the rear of the proposed house.
 - Omission of eastern plant room

4. PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 20/P1464 - PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE FOR EXISTING DWELLING HOUSE AND ERECTION OF DETACHED SINGLE DWELLING HOUSE - Pre App Complete - 24/06/2020
- 4.2 MER18/76 - ALTERATIONS TO DETACHED HOUSE AFFECTING REAR AND EAST ELEVATION – GRANT PERMISISON - 13/12/1976
- 4.3 MER65/80 - EXTENSION TO HOUSE AND ERECTION OF DOUBLE GARAGE – GRANT PERMISSION – GRANT PERMISSION SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS – 28/05/19980
- 4.4 WIM6426 - ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING HOUSE INCLUDING DOUBLE GARAGE, STUDY AND BEDROOM – GRANT PERMISSION SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS – 28/08/1962
- 4.5 WIM6503 - ALTERATIONS ON GROUND AND 1ST FLOORS FORMING A STUDY, BEDROOM, BATHROOM AND GARAGE - 23/10/1962

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1 Consultation was carried out through Conservation Area Site Notice, Press Notice, and letters sent to adjoining neighbours.
- 5.2 The following representations were received between 27th August 2020 and 26th September 2020. During this time a standard 21-day consultation ending 19/09/20 was administered. In addition, a re-consultation was administered ending 26/09/20 to consult on the amended plans.

External

Neighbouring Properties:

- 5.3 A total of five objections were received from neighbouring properties summarised below.
- 5.4 An objection was received from the occupier of 10 Peek Crescent noting the following concerns:
- The proposal is harmful to character and appearance owing to its overall siting, size, massing and landscaping. The proposal is considered contrary to the Conservation Area Character Assessment. The very reasons why the application site was included in the Conservation Area in the first place will be lost with the current proposal, namely the felling of the dense evergreen planting, the set-back of house from the road frontage and the resulting varied building line.
 - The proposed house is around 40m wide and extends more or less the full frontage onto Parkside Avenue. The proposed height of the central block would be 2.8m taller than the height of the existing house and taller than other buildings within the immediate vicinity. We consider the proposal is excessive in scale, bulk and massing and should not extend along the whole plot frontage.

- Concerns with regards to the loss of TPO trees. As set out in section 5.3 of the Tree Development Report, these trees are not actually required to be felled to facilitate the development footprint but rather to allow natural light into the garden and into the extremely large re-orientated new house. The comment in the Tree Development Report that the trees are starting to cause a nuisance to the footway and road is spurious.
- Concerns that there is no supporting material to supporting showing the immediate and wider context to help justify the overall scale, height and form of the development.
- Concerns the D&A and heritage statement has very little design or heritage content.
- Concerns the development would have a harmful impact on no. 10 from overlooking. It's noted the existing trees along the front boundary to number 5 screen the house and its main windows are angled away from the road and our property. The replacement house shows a total of 14 first and second floor windows facing our garden. Only one of these windows in the taller central block and two in the side wings serve bathrooms (and would presumably be obscure glazed).

5.5 An objection was received from the occupier of No. 2 Windy Ridge Close raising the following concerns:

- The proposed property is its enormous size and length across the plot - bigger than anything else in the area.
- The main central section of the house looks in keeping with the area but the additional single-story extensions on either end make it into something quite unprecedented and rather unsightly.
- The size of the property is disproportionate.
- Concerns over the loss of trees

5.6 An objection was the occupier of no. 10 Parkside Avenue noting the following concerns:

- Overall size of the development
- Loss of garden space.

5.7 An objection was received from occupier of 1 Parkside Gardens raising the following concerns:

- Loss of trees to the west of the site would result in a loss of privacy
- Scale and height of the new house is particularly worrying. With trees removed as planned, the new house would dominate our view, overlook our garden and have a significant impact on the privacy we currently enjoy.

5.8 An objection was received from the occupier of no. 3 Parkside Avenue raising the following points:

- The removal of a significant number of trees with tree preservation orders (TPOs) and the fact that this huge development significantly encroaches into the root protection areas (RPAs) of our trees with TPOs. In addition, no comprehensive tree replanting scheme has been provided that would mitigate the loss of privacy and amenity to the surrounding properties (especially 3 Parkside Avenue and 1 Parkside Gardens).

- The safety concerns of the addition of a new driveway so near to the junction of Peek Crescent and Parkside Avenue.
- The sheer scale and overdevelopment of the plot with no consideration to the street scene and amenity of the Wimbledon village area.

5.9 The occupier of 3 Parkside Avenue have provided a third party report written by Indigo Tree Survey to support their objection on trees. The report raising the following points:

- The Tree Report acknowledges that the scheme will have an impact on trees within and adjacent to the site, concluding that in order to facilitate the scheme and landscape proposals, the proposed tree removals include 5 x 'B' category trees, 11 x 'C' category trees and 4 x 'C' category tree groups, although the quality of some of these trees could be considered suitable for higher category retention as 'A'.
- The landscape scheme indicates locations and species of replacement tree planting, however, mitigation guidance is not included within the Tree Report, nor does the landscape scheme include details of volume, location, nursery stock size, planting design or process or maintenance as per BS8545 : 2020, i.e. the proposal is not commensurate to those being removed, and does not demonstrate suitable mitigation for the removal of 'B' moderate quality, and possibly 'A' high quality TPO protected trees.
- The landscape plan doesn't appear consistent with the tree report, showing some trees as absent which would raise concern as to additional tree felling proposals, or inconsistencies which may lead to additional tree losses and further negative amenity impact, i.e. T28.
- There is a discrepancy between the estimated measurement and the actual measurement of G32. The RPA is actually greater and more significant from both the proposed driveway and the proposed building footprint (garage elevation).
- The tree crown impact at s.5.4.2 of the tree report only identifies G2 as having proposed tree works. However, the canopy of G32 and the largest and closest of stems and canopies are noted as having 4.0m clearance from ground level over the site, with the proposed ridge height of the garage elevation being 7.0m, possibly beneath the canopy of G32.
- The proposed scheme results in the loss of TPO trees, and impacts directly on the RPAs and crowns of trees located on the property which is contrary to policy and guidance in consideration for trees, namely the Merton Planning Policy Guidance NE11 Trees: Protection, the Merton Core Strategy Policy CS13, and BS5837.
- The application should present the relevant and adequate detail to demonstrate that the proposed scheme considers the existing tree stock and constraints, accommodates retained trees, and mitigates for tree losses, compliant with planning policy and BS5837, of which the application fails.

Wimbledon Society:

- Concerns that that proposed development would have an adverse impact on protected TPOs.

- Concerns that the substantial width for the proposal will impair the ‘green feel’ of the street and the present feeling of spaciousness.
- The proposed development does not accord with Council Planning policies on Tree Protection and Conservation Area character and the application should therefore be refused.
- The submitted landscaping plan only shows a row of 11 Acer Campestre Elsrijk trees proposed along the whole plot frontage (with shrubs / hedging between). This level of landscaping does not mitigate the loss of 43 protected mature trees. It would result in a completely different and open feel to this section of road.

Parkside Residents Association

- Concerns that the proposal infills the front of the original garden and thus creates a very dominant profile in the street scene of both Parkside Avenue and Peek Crescent. The height is greater than other houses nearby and although there are shallower wings on each side of the 3 storey central block, the footprint extends almost to the full width of the plot. Whilst we note from the Design & Access Statement that the wings have been reduced in width from the original design we remain of the view that the building is overly large and its massing and bulk will be too dominant in this setting. This is contrary to Policy DM D2.
- Concern that the removal of such a large quantity of trees (at the front of the site) is to be permitted then this should be on the basis that a reasonable number of replacements are provided which are specimens of equivalent maturity so that screening for neighbours is maintained and the “green” contribution, visible from the street, is not significantly diminished. Looking at the proposed Landscaping Plan which has been submitted, this does not seem to be the case so a suitable planning condition would be required to address this. It’s noted there are there is a particularly attractive row of beech trees in the rear garden of 3 Parkside Avenue which are close to the application site boundary and are also visible from the street.
- Concerns with regards to the siting of the vehicular access point close to the boundary with no. 3 Parkside Avenue would be potentially dangerous.

Internal

Tree Officer:

- 5.10 Initial feedback from the Tree Officer raised no objections subject to conditions (F5, F8, F1 and F2). They note “it is proposed to remove a total of 16 individual trees and 5 groups of trees. Amongst this number are 5 ‘B’ category trees. Whilst this is a high number of trees, they have provided a landscaping plan that shows a number of Field Maple trees located on the new front boundary. These will be a welcome replacement for the unattractive Cypress trees that currently border the site.”
- 5.11 Subsequently the Tree Officer reviewed the third party report produced by Indigo Tree Survey. The main concern raised by Indigo was the impact upon the RPA’s to the row of Beech’s (G32) along the eastern boundary of No:3/5. The Tree Officer subsequently recommended amendments to the applicant to ensure there would be no harm to health and vitality of the trees in question.

This included reducing the extent of hardstanding a development in proximity to the row of Beech Trees.

Conservation Officer:

- The scale and massing is too large taking into consideration extensive width of the site at the front boundary. The house would be overly dominant with regard to the street scene in what is a visually prominent position.
- Generally it is an area of generous vegetation and trees. Although I agree with the Tree Officer that the existing trees on the front boundary are not good quality, the new front boundary should have more trees and hedging to soften it and make more sympathetic to the adjacent area.
- It is recommended to set the house further back, reduce the height, and reduce width of the side wings.

Transport Planner:

- The proposed crossover is sited on Parkside Avenue just to the east of the junction with Peek Crescent. The new vehicle cross over has improved visibility to that of the existing crossing sited to the east near to the bend Parkside Avenue.
- There is adequate area within the proposed car parking layout for cars to turn and approach the highway in forward gear.
- Recommends no objection subject to conditions.

5.12 The following representations were received following re-consultation period between 10th November 2020 and 26th November 2020.

External

Neighbouring Properties:

5.13 A further objection was received from no. 10 Peek Crescent noting the following points:

- The changes to the scheme are negligible and have not overcome our concerns relating to the siting of the house, the overdevelopment of the plot frontage, the extensive removal of mature trees and the adverse impact this will have on the street scene, conservation area and our amenity.
- The increase in vegetation does not compensate for the loss of 43 protected trees along the road frontage, as well as others on the plot.
- The proposal would still result in a completely different and open feel to this section of road, at odds with the existing 'sense of enclosure' that is considered a positive feature in the council's Character Assessment and indeed one of the very reasons why the site was included in the Conservation Area in the first place.
- The removal/relocation of the small single storey plant rooms (each measuring approximately 2.5m wide and set back from the front building line) on each side of this vast house makes no noticeable improvement to the scheme in massing terms.
- The proposed height of the central block would be 2.8m taller than the height of the existing house and taller than other buildings within the

immediate vicinity. We consider the proposal is still excessive in scale, bulk and massing and should not extend along the whole plot frontage.

- Concern that a heritage statement has not been submitted properly assessing the impact of the proposal on the significance of the Conservation Area and other nearby heritage assets.
- The combination of the siting, scale, bulk and massing, would still result in an over dominant development in the street scene that would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. The scheme also still has no regard to the council's Conservation Area Character Assessment document.
- We maintain that the excessive scale and number of windows would result in an adverse impact on our amenity. Even if the Separation Study drawing (5.11.20) is correct in terms of boundary tree heights and angles, the proposal would still result in a sense of perceived overlooking of our garden

5.14 A further objection was received from no. 3 Parkside Avenue raising the following grounds:

- The removal of a huge amount of mature trees with TPOs with limited plans to reinstate trees and the huge loss of privacy for 3 Parkside Avenue, 1 Parkside Gardens and 5 Parkside Avenue. Concern that the council is not pushing back on the removal of over 43 trees with TPOs. The "shrub border" alongside the boundary with 3 Parkside Avenue is lengthened by a small amount but there are no proposals for additional planting of mature trees to replace the loss of specimens protected by the MER18 TPO, or to maintain screening for neighbours and the "green" contributions visible from the street which the existing trees provide.
- The impact to the TPO protected beech trees at the bottom of 3 Parkside Avenue. The disregard for the root protection areas (RPAs) and the continuation of plans to develop a driveway over the RPAs. The driveway should be removed completely due to this issue.
- The addition of a new vehicular access point so close to the junction of Peek Crescent/ Parkside Avenue. The siting of the new access at the junction with Peek Crescent may be unsafe as cars heading east along Parkside Avenue do not slow down at this point and visibility for cars exiting the new driveway may be restricted
- The siting and sheer scale of the house in a conservation area and its lack of design sensitivity to the properties in the immediate vicinity. Whilst some minor amends have been made, we do not feel these go far enough. The huge design does not fit with the properties immediately surrounding it.

Parkside Residents Association:

- Maintains the view that the building is overly large and its massing and bulk will be too dominant in this setting. The plant rooms were relatively small and the frontages closest to Parkside Avenue remains unchanged. Accordingly the dominant profile of the new house and its negative impact on the street scene is largely unchanged.
- Maintain objection to the Loss of TPO trees and potential damage to beech Trees at the rear of 3 Parkside Avenue

- Maintains objection that vehicular access siting is unsafe.

Wimbledon Society:

5.15 Maintain objection to the loss of TPO trees along Parkside Avenue.

External

Council's Conservation Officer:

5.16 Acknowledges that increased vegetation is helpful but maintains objection that the dwelling is overly large detracting from the rural feeling of the Road.

Tree Officer:

5.17 The Tree Officer reviewed amendments made by the application to address previous concerns raised with regard to trees. The amendments made include:

- Relocation of western plant room to the rear of the building
- A decrease in area of hardstanding around the RPAs of the row of beech trees (G32) at the rear of no. 3 Parkside Avenue.
- Amendments to the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan

5.18 The Tree Officer is satisfied with the proposed amendments and raises no objection subject to conditions: F5, F8, F1 and F2.

6. POLICY CONTEXT

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

- Chapter 4 Decision-making
- Chapter 11 Making effective use of land
- Chapter 12 Achieving well-designed places
- Chapter 14 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- Chapter 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- Chapter 16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

London Plan (2016)

- Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
- Policy 5.12 Flood risk management
- Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage
- Policy 6.13 Parking
- Policy 7.4 Local Character
- Policy 7.5 Public Realm
- Policy 7.6 Architecture
- Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology
- Policy 7.15 Reducing and managing noise, improving and enhancing the acoustic environment and promoting appropriate soundscapes
- Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature

- Policy 7.21 Trees and woodlands
- Policy 8.3 Community Infrastructure Levy

Merton Core Strategy (2011)

- Policy CS 13 Open space, nature conservation, leisure and culture
- Policy CS 14 Design
- Policy CS 15 Climate Change
- Policy CS 16 Flood Risk Management
- Policy CS 20 Parking, Servicing and Delivery

Merton Sites and Policies Plan (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 D4 Managing heritage assets
- DM F1 Support for flood risk management
- DM F2 Sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) and; Wastewater and Water Infrastructure
- DM T2 Transport impacts of development
- DM T3 Car parking and servicing standards

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of development

- 7.1 The principle of development relates to the loss of the existing dwelling in favour of a new replacement dwelling and whether there is any harm resulting on the Conservation Area. SPP Policy DMD4 notes the loss of a building that makes a positive contribution to a conservation area or heritage site, should also be treated as substantial harm to a heritage asset.
- 7.2 In this instance the dwelling is located in the Wimbledon North Conservation Area. The prevailing character of the area is suburban with large detached dwellings with generously sized gardens. Parkside Avenue has been subject to intensification over the past two decades with 20th century houses being replaced with larger detached dwellings. The proposed development follows this trend and would result in the demolition of an existing 1950s dwelling and replacement with a larger detached dwelling built in a traditional style. The existing dwelling is of limited architectural value with neutral contribution to the Conservation Area. As such, the demolition of the existing property is considered acceptable in favour of a replacement dwelling with a high quality design and satisfying all other planning on considerations outlined below.

Character and appearance of the Wimbledon North Conservation Area

- 7.3 London Plan policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8, Core Strategy policy CS14 and SPP Policies DMD2, DMD3 and DMD4 require proposals to conserve and enhance

heritage assets, as well as respect the appearance, scale, bulk, form, proportions, materials and character of the original building and their surroundings.

7.4 Also relevant is the Wimbledon North Conservation Area Character Assessment (January 2007) makes reference to the stretch of Parkside Avenue where the site is located. It notes:

- The stretch of Parkside Avenue north of Peek Crescent (where the site is located) laid out in the mid-1950s. It gave access to the development at Deepdale, Margin Drive and Windy Ridge Close.
- The area forms a contrast to the older part south of Peek Crescent in that it is narrower, partly curved and partly almost parallel to Parkside and Parkside Gardens. The short, curving stretch of road up to the plot at No. 7 has a real sense of enclosure, despite being mostly fronted by the substantial side/rear gardens of No. 5 and No. 10 Peek Crescent. This is mainly due to the tall, dense, evergreen planting along both frontages, with only glimpses through to the treed gardens.
- The buildings to the west side of the road are more modern than most in the Conservation Area, dating from the 1950s to around 2000. However, they are a mix of mostly well detailed, substantial houses on varied, wide plots, mostly set back from the road frontage but with a varied building line. There are generous spaces between and around the buildings, offering a sense of spaciousness, views of the well planted gardens, (including those to the rear of Parkside Gardens properties), and glimpses of the rear facades of buildings in Parkside Gardens.

7.5 The proposal involves reconfiguring the layout of the site, positioning the dwelling further to the south with the front elevation directly fronting Parkside Avenue.

7.6 The dwelling itself comprises a principle core central block with two projecting side wings. The central block would measure roughly 23m long by 11m deep comprising three storeys and a ridge height of 11.63m. The western side wing would measure roughly 11.8m by 9.4m deep with a ridge height of 7m. The eastern wing would measure roughly 11m wide by 7.7m deep with a ridge height of 7m. The extensions either side are designed as such to appear subservient to central block as these are lower in height and set further back from the street.

7.7 As noted above, the ridge height of main block would be 11.63m. This would be roughly 3.65m higher than the ridge height of the existing dwelling (eaves 2.88m higher). 3 Parkside Avenue located to the west of the site by comparison has a ridge height of 10.15m. 7 Parkside Avenue to the east has a ridge height of 10.5m. 10 Peek Crescent opposite the development has ridge height of 12.5m. Overall, the proposed building would have a comparable height to dwellings in the surrounding area.

7.8 With regard to layout, the dwelling would be set back from the street by 7m and there would be gaps of 4.26m and 4.42m between the side elevations with the east and west boundaries respectively. A U-shaped garden would be maintained to the north of the site with a max depth of 28m. Comprehensive re-landscaping is proposed including provision of semi-mature trees fronting

Parkside Avenue.

- 7.9 The architecture would be in a traditional 'Royal Victoria Style'. High quality materials are proposed, including clay roof tiles, lead dormers and red stock brick and painted hardwood sash windows. It also adopts ornamental features, including brick headers and stone coping.
- 7.10 The layout of the site would unquestionably change character of this part of Parkside Avenue from a street enclosed by vegetation with rear gardens either side into road with a more active street frontage. However, this change doesn't by default equate to a negative impact. The existing cypress trees fronting Parkside Avenue are not of any particular merit, noted as 'unattractive' by the Tree Officer. The set back of the front elevation from the street by 7m and comprehensive landscaping at the front with semi-mature Field Maple trees would create a suitable level of spaciousness a greenery that accords with the wider character of the Conservation Area. The architecture is traditional in nature and includes a high level of detailing and ornamentation which would assimilate with the traditional character of the Conservation Area. The dwelling would have a wide width, but the width of the site is generous. The use of two 1.5 storey wings either side of the main body of the dwelling help reduce the bulk and massing down and owing to their angled orientations helps follow the curve of the frontage of the site. The height of the dwelling would be comparable to no. 3 Parkside Avenue and no. 10 Peek Crescent in the nearby vicinity and therefore is not considered to appear incongruous.
- 7.11 The Conservation Officer's raised concern that the scale and size of the dwelling is too great and that greater vegetation is needed. Following their initial comments, the applicant has amended the landscape plan to increase the maturity of trees fronting Parkside Avenue. The applicant also repositioned the western plant room to the rear and removed the eastern plant room. Following the amendments the Conservation maintained her view that the scale of the build is too large. Officer have carefully considered this consultation response, however, officers remain satisfied that the proposal can be accommodated on site without causing harm to the Conservation Area.
- 7.12 In view of the above, Case Officers do not consider the proposal to result in material harm to the Character and Appearance of the Wimbledon North Conservation Area.
- 7.13 Whilst Officers acknowledge the Conservation Officers concerns, Officers do not consider the proposal to cause material harm to the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area for the reasons above in preceding paragraphs. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in respect of Policies DMD2, DMD3 and DMD4 in this regard.

Neighbour Amenity

- 7.14 Sites and Policies Plan Policy DM D2 seeks to ensure that the potential impact of new development has regard for neighbour amenity.
- 7.15 The dwelling is surrounded 8 properties in total. These include no. 3 Parkside Avenue, no. 1, 2 ,3 and 4 Parkside Gardens and no. 7 Parkside Avenue located to the east of the site. In addition, opposite the front of the dwelling is no. 2

Windy Ridge Close and no. 10 Peek Crescent. The impact on these properties are considered in turn below:

3 Parkside Avenue

- 7.16 The proposal would result in some change in outlook for no. 3 Parkside Avenue as the side elevation would appear visible from the rear of this property. There is not considered to be material harm however, as the side elevation of main three storey block most visible would be positioned approximately 16m from the boundary of no. 3. The side dormer window at second floor level would be obscure glazed preventing any harmful overlooking.

1, 2, 3 and 4 Parkside Gardens

- 7.17 There would be some increased inter-visibility between the rear of the property and the gardens of nos. 1, 2, 3 & 4 Parkside Gardens. There would be a separating distance between the proposed dwelling and the adjoining boundary of 1, 3 & 4 Parkside Gardens of approximately 5.5m, 19m and 27m respectively. The proposed dwelling is oriented as such so that the sightlines would be predominantly northwards towards Nos. 3 & 4. Taking this into consideration with the said separating distances, as well as screening from trees retained along the north western boundary there is not considered to be material harm to the amenity of these properties through increased overlooking, increased sense of enclosure or change in outlook.

7 Parkside Avenue

- 7.18 There would be some inter-visibility between the first and second floor of the proposed dwelling and the rear garden of no. 7 Parkside Avenue which borders the site to the east. There is roughly 18m between first floor window of the proposed gym and the side elevation of no. 7 (6m to the boundary) and a distance of 18.5m to the rear elevation of no.7. There would be a distance of 22.5m from closest first floor window on the central block to the rear elevation.
- 7.19 In assessing the any harm, one must consider these distances as well as the difference between the current and proposed relationship with the neighbour. The existing dwelling has a first floor roof terrace and a number of rear windows facing no. 7 and therefore an existing level of inter-visibility between the two properties is already present. The proposed rear facing windows would be positioned comparatively further away from the boundary and orientate themselves more northward when compared with the existing dwelling. As such, the new development is not considered to increase this overlooking over and above the existing situation. Overall, case officers do not consider there to be a harmful impact on the amenity of no. 7 through loss of outlook, overbearing sense of enclosure or diminished privacy.

2 Windy Ridge Close and 10 Peek Crescent

No. 10 Peek Crescent and 2 Windy Ridge Close are located on the opposite side of Parkside Avenue to the site.

The occupiers of no. 10 have raised concerns over the overall scale of the development, the loss of TPO trees along the front boundary and the potential for increased overlooking. No. 10 is orientated as such that the side elevation

and side garden boundary faces the application site. There is one window located in the northern side elevation of no. 10 which serves a stairwell. A row of trees is located along the northern side boundary of the garden measuring approximately 6m high. There would be some inter-visibility between the 2nd floor dormer windows serving bedrooms 5 and 6 and the rear garden of no. 10. However, this impact is reduced by the wall of vegetation along the boundary of no. 10. Furthermore the dormer windows would be 16.5m from no. 10's boundary and the road being in-between. As a result, officers do not consider there to be a harmful overlooking relationship. The proposed development would result in a change in outlook for no. 10. However, again this impact is not considered harmful considering the set back of the front elevation from the street and the provision of new trees and hedging along the boundary which will preserve as far practically possible the green character of the street. It should be noted that applicant has increased the maturity of vegetation along the boundary in response to concerns raised by neighbours.

Similarly No 2 Windy Ridge Close has expressed concern over the scale of the development and the loss of trees. This property is currently being developed in accordance with planning permission 18/P2565. It is orientated as such that the side elevation and side garden boundary would face the development. There would be some inter-visibility between the 1st and 2nd floor windows of the subject site toward the garden of. 2 Windy Ridge Close but taking into account the re-landscaping the front boundary and the distance between the no. 2's side boundary and the front elevation of the proposed dwelling of 16.5m, there is not considered to be a harmful impact on the amenity of no. 2.

- 7.20 Overall, whilst the proposal would open up the site and result in a greater outlook from windows and a larger dwelling on the site, the proposal is not considered to cause material harm to the amenity of adjacent neighbouring occupiers and is compliant with SPP Policy DMD2 in this respect.

Biodiversity and Trees

- 7.21 London Plan Policy 7.1 and Policy 7.21, Merton Core Strategy Policy CS1 and Sites and Policies Plan Policy DMO2 require development proposals to conserve and enhance biodiversity and trees.
- 7.22 A preliminary ecological appraisal written by Andrews Wildlife Consultants was submitted support the application. The appraisal assesses the site for potential for important protected species. Importantly the appraisal found there is limited potential for bat roosting. Three trees to be retained were found to have low roosting potential for bats. The report makes recommendations for the protection of hedgehogs, bats and reptiles which are attached as a condition to this planning permission to avoid harm to important wildlife.
- 7.23 With regard to trees, a blanket TPO has been applied to the site as it is recognised the tree coverage in this area contributes to the visual amenity of the Conservation Area. That said, the trees on site are of varying quality and value.
- 7.24 An Arboricultural Impact Assessment produced by Connick Tree Consultants was submitted to support the application. The tree report concludes the proposed development will have an impact upon 16 individual and 4 groups

trees within and adjacent to the site, out of the total 37 arboricultural features identified. These trees are as follows:

- 4 individual category 'B' trees identified as T25, T30, T31 and T33 require removal to facilitate development.
- 4 individual and 2 groups of category 'C' trees identified as T1, G14, G15, T24, T26 and T29 require removal to facilitate development.
- 7 individual and 3 groups of category 'C' trees and 1 individual category 'B' tree identified as T16, T17, T18, T19, T20, T21, T22, T27, G34, G36 and G37 which require removal due to ongoing issues and to allow for natural light to enter the development.
- 1 group of category 'B' trees, G32 can be retained. However, the planned landscaping features will encroach upon the trees RPA by up to a maximum of 24.4% on G32c only (17% hard standing and 7.4% structure foundation). All remaining trees will have an impact less than 20% and be due to new hard landscaping only.

7.25 The Council's Tree Officer has reviewed the proposal raises no objection subject to conditions. They note that whilst there is a high number of category B trees to be lost, they have provided a landscaping plan that shows a number of Field Maple trees located on the new front boundary. These will be a welcome replacement for the unattractive Cypress trees that currently border the site.

7.26 The Council's Tree Officer is satisfied the proposal would not harm the health and vitality of the row of Beech Trees (G32) at the rear of no. 3 Parkside Avenue. This follows amendments made by the applicant in response to a contesting report produced by Indigo Tree Consulting on behalf of the occupants of no. 3. The amendments included:

- Relocation of plant room to the rear of the proposed house, reducing the footprint of the building in the RPA of G32c.
- Increasing the depth of the proposed planting bed by a minimum of 1.5m along the boundary with No:5 thereby ensuring that the hard standing covers less than 20% of individual specimens RPA in line with section 7.4.2.3 of the BS 5837 :2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations.
- Soil amelioration to be undertaken to improve the remaining uncovered shrub bed which is mentioned in the revised AIA.

7.27 Taking into consideration above, the proposed development is considered acceptable in respect of trees and biodiversity subject to conditions being met.

Sustainability

7.28 All new developments comprising the creation of new dwellings should demonstrate how the development will comply with Merton's Core Planning Strategy (2011) Policy CS15 Climate Change (parts a-d) and the Policies in outlined in Chapter 5 of the London Plan (2016).

7.29 As a minor development proposal, the development is required to achieve a 19% improvement on Part L of the Building Regulations 2013 and water consumption should not exceed 105 litres/person/day.

- 7.30 A supporting sustainability statement indicates the proposal would produce a 25.1 % reduction in CO2 emissions satisfying the 19% requirement. No information on water has been provided.
- 7.31 A pre-occupation condition is attached requiring evidence be submitted to show that the development has achieved CO2 reductions of not less than a 19% improvement on Part L regulations 2013, and internal water consumption rates of no greater than 105 litres per person per day.
- 7.32 The development is considered acceptable in respect of sustainability subject to conditions met.

Archaeology

- 7.33 Merton Sites and Policy Plan DMD4 seeks to protect the significance of designated heritage assets including Archaeological Priority Areas.
- 7.34 The site is within a Tier 2 Archaeological Priority Area and the proposed development would involve significant ground disturbance. The Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service (GLAAS) were consulted for this application and no representation was received. Tier 2 is defined by historic England as a local area within which the GLHER holds specific evidence indicating the presence or likely presence of heritage assets of archaeological interest. No supporting archaeological information has been provided with this application. As such, a standard condition for a watching brief to be submitted to ensure any potentially important archaeological remains are protected.

Standard of Accommodation

- 7.35 Policy 3.5 of the London Plan 2016 requires housing development to be of the highest quality internally and externally, and should satisfy the minimum internal space standards (specified as Gross Internal Areas –GIA) as set out in Table 3.3 of the London Plan. Table 3.3 provides comprehensive detail of minimum space standards for new development; which the proposal would be expected to comply with. Policy DMD2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan (2014) also states that developments should provide suitable levels of sunlight and daylight and quality of living conditions for future occupants. The London Housing SPG and Policy DMD2 of the Council’s Sites and Policies Plan, it states that there should be 5m2 of external space provided for private outdoor space for 1-2 person dwellings and an extra 1sqm provided for each additional occupant.
- 7.36 The proposed development is for a large single dwelling with 6 double bedrooms and a generous sized garden. The development comfortably satisfies the internal and external space standards noted above.

Transport and Highways

- 7.37 London Plan Policy 6.13 (Parking), Adopted Merton Core Planning Strategy (2011) CS20 (Parking, Servicing and Delivery), Sites and Policies Plan (2014) DM T2 (Transport Impacts of Developments), DM T3 (Car Parking and Servicing Standards) require developers to demonstrate that their development would not adversely affect pedestrian and cycle movements, safety, the

convenience of local residents or the quality of bus movements and/or facilities; on street parking and traffic management and provision of parking to the council's current standards.

- 7.38 The proposal provides for three parking spaces to the west which will form the principle means of accessing the site and a single space to the east which is intended to be used on an intermittent basis. This would be adequate parking provision for the size of this development. The single space to the east will be served by an existing vehicle crossover whilst it is proposed to create a new vehicle crossover and area of hardstanding to serve the principle parking area to the west.
- 7.39 The Council's highways department have been consulted for application and they raise no objections to the proposal. The Transport Officer notes the new vehicle cross over has improved visibility to that of the existing crossing sited to the east near to the bend Parkside Avenue. No objections are raised to the siting of the new access.
- 7.40 The proposal is acceptable in respect of Merton SPP policy DM T2 (Transport Impacts of Developments), DM T3 (Car Parking and Servicing Standards).

Local Financial Considerations

- 7.41 The applicant will be liable to Community Infrastructure Levy.

8. CONCLUSION

- 8.1 The principle of development is considered acceptable as the proposal will replace a 1950s dwelling which currently makes a neutral contribution to the Conservation Area with a larger dwelling in high quality architectural style sympathetic to the Wimbledon North Conservation Area. Officers have closely analysed the design of the development in respect of character and appearance and consider the proposal acceptable in this respect. The proposal would not appear incongruous with its surroundings and whilst there would be a change to the character of Parkside Avenue, this change is not considered to cause material harm to the significance of the Conservation Area. There would be no undue harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties and is consider acceptable in respect of all other planning considerations noted above subject to conditions being met.

9. RECOMMENDATION

- 9.1 Grant planning permission subject to conditions

Conditions

1. **A1 Commencement** of development (full application)
2. **A7 Approved Plans:** The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PO1 (Rev D); PO2 (Rev A); PO3 (Rev B) PO4 (Rev B); EW01 (Rev D); EW02 (Rev A); Tree Retention and Protection Plan (171901/TRPP/Rev 2);

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. **B3 External Materials as Specified:** The materials to be used for the development hereby permitted shall be those specified in the application form and Drawing EW02 unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS14 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and D3 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014

4. **D11 Construction Times:** No demolition or construction work or ancillary activities such as deliveries shall take place before 8am or after 6pm Mondays - Fridays inclusive, before 8am or after 1pm on Saturdays or at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the area and the occupiers of neighbouring properties and ensure compliance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.15 of the London Plan 2016 and policy DM EP2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

5. **Obscure Glazing:** Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied, the second floor dormer windows in the east and west side elevations shall be glazed with obscured glass and shall be maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities and privacy of the occupiers of adjoining properties and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS14 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and D3 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

6. **Demolition and Construction Method Statement:** No development shall take place until a Demolition and Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the demolition and construction period.

The Statement shall provide for:

- hours of operation
- the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
- loading and unloading of plant and materials
- storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
- the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative - displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate
- wheel washing facilities
- measures to control the emission of noise and vibration during construction.
- measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction/demolition

- a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works

Reason: To protect the amenities of future occupiers and those in the local vicinity.

7. **Construction Logistics Plan:** Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a Construction Logistics Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved measures shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted and shall be so maintained for the duration of the use, unless the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority is first obtained to any variation.

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 and 6.14 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM T2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

8. **Sustainability:** No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until evidence has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, 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 consumption rates of no greater than 105 litres per person per day.

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 2016 and Policy CS15 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011.

9. **Tree Protection:** The details and measures for the protection of the existing trees as specified in the hereby approved document 'Tree Development Report BS5837:2012 Arboricultural Impact Assessment' reference '171901/PRO/REV3' dated 16th November 2020 shall be fully complied with. The methods for the protection of the existing trees shall fully accord with all of the measures specified in the report and shall be installed prior to the commencement of any site works and shall remain in place until the conclusion of all site works.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing retained trees in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS13 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and 02 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

10. **F01 Landscape/Planting Scheme:** No development shall take place until full details of a landscaping and planting scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved before the commencement of the use or the occupation of any building hereby approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include on a plan, full details of the size,

species, spacing, quantities and location of proposed plants, together with any hard surfacing, means of enclosure, and indications of all existing trees, hedges and any other features to be retained, and measures for their protection during the course of development.

11. **F02 Landscaping (Implementation):** All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved landscaping plan in accordance with condition 9. The works shall be carried out in the first available planting season following the completion of the development or prior to the occupation of any part of the development, whichever is the sooner, and any trees which die within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased or are dying, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of same approved specification, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation. All hard surfacing and means of enclosure shall be completed before the development is first occupied.

12. **F8 Site supervision:** The tree works and measures set out in the approved document Tree Development Report BS5837:2012 Arboricultural Impact Assessment' reference '171901/PRO/REV3' dated 16th November 2020 shall be supplemented by the retention of an arboricultural expert to monitor and report to the Local Planning Authority not less than monthly the status of all tree works and tree protection measures throughout the course of the demolition and site works. A final Certificate of Completion shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority at the conclusion of all site works. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing retained trees in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS13 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DMO2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

13. **K2 Archaeology (Watching Brief):** No development [including demolition] pursuant to this consent shall take place until an on-site watching brief, which ensures the presence of a suitably qualified and experienced archaeologist during construction work, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. In the event of important archaeological features or remains being discovered, which require fuller rescue excavation, then construction work shall cease until the applicant has secured the implementation of a further programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to provide the opportunity to record the history of the site and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.8 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS14 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM D4 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

14. C02 No Permitted Development (windows and doors): Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no window, door or other opening other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed in the side elevations without planning permission first being obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities and privacy of the occupiers of nearby properties and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS14 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and D3 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

15. Construction Times: No demolition or construction work or ancillary activities such as deliveries shall take place before 8am or after 6pm Mondays - Fridays inclusive, before 8am or after 1pm on Saturdays or at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the area and the occupiers of neighbouring properties and ensure compliance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.15 of the London Plan 2016 and policy DM EP2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

16. E06 Ancillary Residential Accommodation: The first floor 'annexe' located within the western side wing of the development hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as 5 Parkside Avenue, Wimbledon, London, SW19 5ES

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of neighbouring residents, to prevent the unauthorised introduction of an independent use and to ensure compliance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS14 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and D3 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

17. Informative: The implementation of the proposed vehicle crossover will be subject to a separate Vehicle Crossover Application with the Council.

18. Informative: No surface water runoff should discharge onto the public highway including the public footway or highway. When it is proposed to connect to a public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required (contact no. 0845 850 2777).

19. Informative: No waste material, including concrete, mortar, grout, plaster, fats, oils and chemicals shall be washed down on the highway or disposed of into the highway drainage system.

This page is intentionally left blank