

# Agenda Item 5

## PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 10th July 2014

### Item No:

### UPRN

### APPLICATION NO.

### DATE VALID

14/P1159

27/03/2014

### **Address/Site:**

37 Edge Hill, Wimbledon, SW19 4NP

### **(Ward)**

Hillside

### **Proposal:**

Demolition of existing single storey house and erection of replacement part single/part 2-storey house with basement

### **Drawing Nos:**

Site Location Plan (00)01, Existing Site Plan (00)02, Existing Ground Floor Plan (00)03, Existing Front Elevation (00)04, Existing Street Elevation (00)05, Existing Section A-A (00)07, Existing Street Elevation (00)13, Proposed Site Plan (01)02B, Proposed Basement Plan (01)03B, Proposed Ground Floor Plan (01)04B, Proposed First Floor Plan (01)05B, Proposed Roof Plan (01)06B, Proposed Street Elevation (01)07B, Proposed Front Elevation (01)08B, Proposed Rear Elevation 09C, Proposed Side Elevation (01)10B, Proposed Side Elevation (01)11B, Proposed Section A-A (01)12B, Proposed Section B-B (01)13B, Proposed Street Elevation (01)14, Demolition and Excavation drawings 0374(01)15 and 16A, Design and Access Statement, Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement 17 April 2014, Tree Protection Plan, Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey, Bat Roost Potential Survey, Preliminary Code for Sustainable Homes Assessment, Energy Statement, Construction Method Statement.

### **Contact Officer:**

Sue Wright (0208 545 3981)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**Grant Planning Permission subject to conditions**

---

## **CHECKLIST INFORMATION**

- Heads of agreement: None
- Is a screening opinion required: No

- Is an Environmental Statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Impact Assessment been submitted: No
- Press notice: Yes
- Site notice: Yes
- Design Review Panel consulted: Yes
- Number of neighbours consulted: 43

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The application is brought before the Planning Applications Committee due to the number of objections received and at the request of Councillor Williams.

## **2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 The application site comprises a single storey mid- 20<sup>th</sup> century house and garden, built in red brick with a roof form made up of a number of mono-pitched sections. The house sits behind a high red brick wall on the front boundary.
- 2.2 Two striking trees protected by TPO Merton 439, a Corsican pine and a Deodar cedar, sit within the front curtilage of the site. Further significant trees sit alongside the side and rear boundaries, within the grounds of neighbouring properties.
- 2.3 The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character with the notable exception of Wimbledon College and Donhead Preparatory School.
- 2.4 The site is within Sub-Area 25A Ridgway Gardens and Edge Hill (North) of the Merton (West Wimbledon) Conservation Area.
- 2.5 To the north of the application site, Hannah Court is a modern brick built 3-storey 3 bay block of 18 flats in attractive landscaped grounds. Further north, Tina Court is a single flatted block of identical design. To the south is Beaumont Court, also a relatively recent flatted block. All the flats are set well back from the road frontage, well behind the existing house on the application site. Beyond Beaumont Court to the south is Donhead Preparatory School. The main building on the street frontage is locally listed.
- 2.6 Wimbledon College sits directly opposite the site. The 2 entrance buildings and other buildings within the grounds are statutorily listed. To the north of Wimbledon College are 3 locally listed neo-vernacular houses built in the late 19<sup>th</sup> Century.

## **3. CURRENT PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 The proposal is to demolish the existing single storey house and garage and replace it with a part single part two storey dwelling with a basement underneath the building footprint.
- 3.2 The proposed replacement house is flat roofed and of an overtly modern design, with front and rear elevations principally comprising frosted and clear glazing and timber clad panels with a white render surround and white render flank elevations punctuated by glazing.
- 3.3 It would comprise a cinema/family room, gym, bathroom, plant room and bedroom lit by a rear lightwell at basement level, main living areas at ground floor level and 3 bedrooms at first floor. The first floor is recessed away from the southern boundary with Beaumont Court.
- 3.4 The maximum two storey height of the building would be 6.767m (the existing building's maximum height is 4.1m), the single storey height is 3.3m and the basement has a floor level 3m below ground. In comparison, the adjoining flats at Beaumont Court are 10.621m to ridge and 7.554 to eaves, and Hannah Court is 11.162m to ridge and 7.896 to eaves.
- 3.5 It has a gross internal floor area (GIA) of 431 square metres - 147 square metres each at ground and basement level and 137 square metres at first floor level. It would have a private rear garden area well in excess of 100 square metres

#### 4. **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 WIM5195 Erection of single storey dwelling house fronting Edge Hill granted 1960
- 4.2 87/P1024 erection of first floor extension, single storey side extension and rear extension granted 1987
- 4.3 88/P0202 erection of single storey side extensions (modification to 87/p1024) granted 1988
- 4.4 97/P0633 erection of 2.1m high brick wall and gate to highway boundary and 2.4m brick wall to rear boundary granted 1997
- 4.5 97/P0998 erection of single storey rear extension granted 1997
- 4.6 14/T0343 TPO Merton No.439 1x pine tree – deadwood removed and crown cleaned  
1x cedar – deadwood removed, crown cleaned and reduce long lower branches by approx. 2m

#### 5. **POLICY CONTEXT**

5.1 Adopted Core Planning Strategy (July 2011)

CS8 – Housing Choice  
CS9 - Housing Provision  
CS14 - Design  
CS15 - Climate Change  
CS20 - Parking, Servicing and Delivery

5.2 Policies within the Draft Sites and Policies Plan Feb 2014.

The London Borough of Merton draft 'Sites and Policies Plan' was considered by the independent Planning Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State at a public hearing in January 2014 and the final report was published on 4 June 2014. No changes are required to the February 2014 version 'Sites and Policies Plan (including all modifications) and the Plan is due to be formally adopted on July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014, superseding all remaining saved UDP policies.

5.3 Relevant policies are

DM D2 (Design Considerations in all developments)  
DM D4 (Managing heritage assets).  
DMF2 (SUDS)  
DM 02 (Nature Conservation, trees, hedges and landscape features)  
DM H4 (demolition and redevelopment of a single dwelling house) is a completely new policy, requiring CSH Level 5 for CO2 emissions and fabric efficiency which would fundamentally affect the design of a new house, it has been agreed by the Planning Policy and Development Control Managers that it will apply to new applications submitted after formal adoption of the Sites and Policies Plan on July 9<sup>th</sup> 2014.

5.4 West Wimbledon Conservation Area Character Assessment (2004)

**6. CONSULTATION**

6.1 The application has been publicised by means of a site notice and letters to neighbouring occupiers.

6.2 12 objection letters have been received of which 9 are from residents of Hannah and Beaumont Court, 1 from another property in Edge Hill, 1 from Wimbledon Society and 1 from Ward Councillor David Williams. The main concerns are as follows:

- Entirely inappropriate flat roof design, harsh rectilinear verticals and horizontals and large areas of glass and render in contrast to brickwork and pitched roofs of surrounding buildings, out of character with Conservation Area, visually intrusive, will weather badly. Existing house is very unobtrusive. Fails to comply the Council's design policies.
- Not opposed to replacement of existing house but replacement needs to blend in, not stand out
- Fails to provide adequate privacy, surrounding trees do not completely screen and lose their leaves in winter.

- Fails to provide Construction Method Statement in relation to basement, could affect drainage
- Fails to comply with climate change and sustainability policies
- Concerned if there is any impact on trees which provide privacy
- Concern about disruption and traffic during construction

Wimbledon Society – retain the good trees at the front, protect from basement excavation, don't introduce hard paving over the root protection area, basement information required as Policy DMD2 (b) & (c), risk of new 1<sup>st</sup> floor bedroom windows overlooking adjoining properties, should be Code 5 (policy DM H4) and not Code 4.

6.3 Future Merton Transport – no objections subject to informative about any works affecting the highway

6.4 Design Review Panel (28<sup>th</sup> May 2014)

The Panel were clear in their liking and appreciation of the design of this house. They particularly welcomed the render finish and were quite clear that an alternative use of brick would not be appropriate and would severely undermine the effectiveness of the architecture and the quality of the design.

It was felt that the building and site clearly stands on its own, and is not strongly related to the surrounding buildings. Therefore the render is considered to be not inappropriate. It is clearly a pavilion building and therefore appropriate for it to be unique. The Panel were also clear in their view that the quality appearance of the drawings must be seen through in the actual building.

It was felt that the building clearly stood alone – such as a pavilion or gatehouse – and did not form part of a discernable terrace. It was, however, questioned whether the building was a little too high when seen from the road, although this was not a significant point. The effectiveness of the PV panels was questioned, given the amount of tree cover and it was stressed that Code 5 needed to be achieved. The Panel also recommended the production of a model to help the Committee to understand the building and its context. Given the large basement, it was considered important that appropriate care was taken to ensure there was no loss of trees.

Overall, the Panel were clear in their opinion that this proposal would be an enhancement to the conservation area.

**VERDICT: GREEN**

## **7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

7.1 The main planning considerations relates to the impact of the proposed new house on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area

and the streetscene, including trees; impact on neighbouring properties (including the basement), construction issues and sustainability.

7.2 Design and Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area

The site is within Sub-Area 25A of the Merton (West Wimbledon) Conservation Area. The Council has a duty to ensure that proposals within designated Conservation Areas preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area as set out in Policy CS14 (Design) of Merton's adopted Core Planning Strategy. Sites and Policies Plan Policy DM D3 contributes towards the delivery of policy CS14 by setting out detailed requirements for development proposals affecting a heritage asset.

7.3 The existing house is of no great architectural merit and is stated within Merton's West Wimbledon Character Assessment to have a neutral impact on the character of the Conservation Area, therefore there is no in principle policy objection to its demolition subject to the acceptability of the replacement dwelling.

7.4 One of the principal concerns of objectors relates to the suitability of the design, massing and materials of the proposed replacement dwelling. They are concerned that a modern 'cube' flat roofed design with large expanses of glass and the use of white render and timber would be inappropriate and discordant, given that the surrounding buildings have pitched tile roofs and brick facades.

7.5 The existing dwelling occupies a unique position, sitting a long way in front of the flatted developments either side at Hannah and Beaumont. The mature landscaping to the front curtilages of the flatted developments further reduces any visual link between these buildings and the application site.

7.6 Officers consider the uniqueness of the site's location relative to other buildings offers an opportunity for good quality modern design which does not need to utilize the same palette of materials as its neighbours. This view is endorsed by the Design Review Panel, who gave the proposal a GREEN verdict and whose comments in this respect were as follows:

*The Panel were clear in their liking and appreciation of the design of this house. They particularly welcomed the render finish and were quite clear that an alternative use of brick would not be appropriate and would severely undermine the effectiveness of the architecture and the quality of the design.*

*It was felt that the building and site clearly stands on its own, and is not strongly related to the surrounding buildings. Therefore the render is considered to be not inappropriate. It is clearly a pavilion building and*

*therefore appropriate for it to be unique.*

- 7.7 Although the proposed house has a first floor element and is therefore clearly taller than the existing single storey building, this is considered to be acceptable relative to the scale of buildings in the street, which is significantly greater. With its flat roof form, it is still only 6.76m at its highest point and it is reduced to single storey adjacent to the Beaumont Court boundary.
- 7.8 The existing trees would be retained with suitable protection measures being put in place as set out in more detail below, including the two significant and striking trees within the front curtilage.
- 7.9 The proposed design is considered to be of a suitably high quality and conditions will be imposed in relation to sample materials and 1:20 drawings of typical details to ensure that the quality currently shown in the submitted material translates into the completed development. It is considered that the building will be an enhancement to the streetscene and would therefore accord with development plan design policies.

7.10 Trees

An Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement has been submitted which examines the impact on trees within the site and also the trees on the site boundaries to the rear and side within the grounds of the adjoining flats. No trees are required to be removed as a consequence of the proposal. One of the TPO'd trees (T1 and T2) at the front of the site would require limited pruning to its longer branches and this was approved by the tree officer as part of normal good tree management earlier this year. The existing house will have acted as a barrier to root growth due to its foundations and the inhospitable rooting environment created under the house. The new house will not extend any closer to T1 and T2 than the existing house and the pruning works to tree T2 creates sufficient separation between the branch ends and proposed new house. Due to the revised house footprint at the rear, 1- 4 square metres (less than 5%) of the root protection area of trees G4 and G6 on the rear and side boundary within the grounds of Hannah Court would be affected. The area and % of the r.p.a. affected is so small, it is not considered likely to affect the long term health of the trees, subject to the tree protection measures outlined in the method statement. The tree officer is happy with the contents and conclusions of the report and suitable conditions relating to tree protection will be imposed..

7.11 Impact on neighbours

As noted above, the trees which sit on the rear and side boundaries within the curtilages of Beaumont Court and Hannah Court would not be adversely affected by the development and would still afford a reasonable degree of screening and a softening of views of the proposed house, particularly in summer. In relation to Beaumont House, the first floor element has been recessed 4.4m away from the

boundary and of the two windows facing across the front curtilage of Beaumont Court at a distance of 4.4m, one would be to an ensuite bathroom and the other would be a secondary window to a bedroom.

- 7.12 The northern side elevation of the proposed house does not extend in front of the flank of Hannah Court, set some way behind. The rear boundary of the application site adjoins the parking area for the flats. Nonetheless, in order to prevent any sense of loss of privacy, the plans have been amended at officers' request to replace the clear glazed windows to bedroom 2 that might be considered to be looking obliquely across towards windows in Hannah Court with fixed frosted glazing, as is the case for the 3 windows in the flank elevation facing the front curtilage. Bedroom 2 would maintain adequate outlook from a clear glazed window facing south.
- 7.13 It is considered that the proposal has been designed to be respectful of the amenities of neighbouring residents, avoiding impact on adjoining trees and on privacy, and is at a sufficient distance to have no impact on daylight or sunlight. Any impact on outlook of adjoining flats is not considered to be sufficient to warrant refusal given that neither façade directly faces the site, but looks across obliquely at a distance of over 13 and 17m respectively.
- 7.14 Impact of the Basement  
The proposed basement sits under the footprint of the proposed building and does not extend into the rear garden area except for the rear lightwell and has been designed to take account of adjacent trees. It is considered to comply with the criteria for basement development set out at part (b) of Policy DM D2 of the Sites and Policies Plan. As required by part (c), a comprehensive Construction Method Statement has been submitted which covers ground conditions, impacts on structural stability, drainage and ground water, and is based on borehole investigation on site.
- 7.15 The report advises that a secant pile technique is the most appropriate technique for the basement construction, and the sequencing deals with any issues relating to impact on adjoining properties and overall structural integrity, ensuring no instabilities are created. A site investigation has been carried out which suggests that the underlying soil is made ground (up to 1m) over sandy gravels (1-3.5m) overlying the London clay formations.
- 7.10 From the site investigations, the water table would appear to sit at 3.3m -3.5m and this has been considered in the design. Given the minimal intrusion during construction, it is concluded that there would be no adverse effects on the local hydrology of the area. The site is on generally level ground and therefore slope stability is not an issue. The sub-stratum is London clay and some perched water could be expected on site. Due to the hydrological status of the site, no adverse impact on ground water is anticipated. It is advised that in relation to



surface water, the new drainage layout will be designed in accordance with best practice and the SUDS framework. A suitable condition will be imposed.

7.10 In relation to construction, it is advised that small excavators/conveyor belts will be used to convey excavated soil into skips kept within the confines of the site and its hoarding, and that public rights of way will be maintained and the footpaths and adjacent street cleaned every evening. The demolition and excavation drawing submitted indicates the position of skips, site office and welfare.

7.11 Sustainability

Within the Sites and Policies Plan, due to be adopted on July 9<sup>th</sup> 2014, DM H4 (demolition and redevelopment of a single dwelling house) is a completely new policy, requiring CSH Level 5 for CO2 emissions and fabric efficiency instead of Code 4. This has a fundamentally impact on the design of a new house and would need to be taken into account from the outset. In light of this, it has been agreed with the Planning Policy Manager that this policy will only be applied to new applications submitted after formal adoption of the Sites and Policies Plan on July 9<sup>th</sup>. In this instance, therefore, given that the application was submitted in March 2014, the requirement will be for the proposal to meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4.

7.12 A preliminary assessment for the Code for Sustainable Homes was submitted with the application. They demonstrate that all mandatory Code Level 4 issues are met including the requirements under the Energy and Water sections and that a score with a score of 71.41, can be achieved. The development will also meet all 16 Lifetime homes criteria. The Construction Method statement indicates that materials will be salvaged from the demolition process and recycled where possible.

8.0 CONCLUSION

8.1 Although the design is overtly modern and differs from the traditional form and materials of surrounding buildings in Edge Hill, the positioning of the site within the street is unique and the building would not have a direct visual relationship with adjoining properties. The modern high quality house design is considered to enhance the streetscene and the Conservation Area. There is not considered to be an unacceptable impact on neighbours and Members are recommended to approve the application.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:**

1. A.1 (Commencement of Development)

2. A7 Approved plans
3. sample materials
4. 1:20 details
5. arb impact assessment
6. tree protection measures
- 7a. hard and soft landscaping
- 7b- completion of hard and soft landscaping
8. construction method statement - adherence
9. drainage details
10. pd rights removed
11. construction management – deliveries, dust etc
12. hours of demolition and construction
13. lifetime homes
14. obscure glazing- specified windows