

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
11th December 2014

Item No:

UPRN
VALID

APPLICATION NO.
14/P1146

DATE
11/12/14

Address/Site Land between 2 Dawlish Avenue and 49 Haslemere Avenue,
Wimbledon Park, London SW18 4RW

(Ward) Wimbledon Park

Proposal: Erection of 1 x 2 bedroom dwelling between 2 Dawlish Avenue and
49 Haslemere Avenue

Drawing No's: 1100-A-GA-EL-11 Rev D, 1100-A-GA-PL-11 Rev B, 1100-A-GA-PL-12 Rev B, 1100-A-GA-PL-13 Rev B, 1100-A-GA-PL-14 Rev B, Block Plan and Site Location Plan.

Contact Officer: David Thompson (0208 545 3116)

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- Heads of Agreement: No
- Is a screening opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental Statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Statement been submitted: No
- Press notice: No
- Site notice: Yes
- Design Review Panel consulted: No
- Number of neighbours consulted: 7
- External consultations: No
- Controlled Parking Zone: Yes (CPZ3)
- Area at Risk of Flooding (1 in 100 year flood zone) - No
- Within an Archaeological Priority Zone - Yes
- Sites and Policies Plan Proposal Designation - No
- Public Transport Accessibility Level – 3 (Average)
- Trees – Not Protected

1. **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This application is being brought to the Planning Applications Committee due to the number of objections that were received.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The host site is a rectangular plot of land that is at the far north eastern end of Dawlish Avenue at the junction with Haslemere Avenue near to the northern borough boundary with LB Wandsworth. The land has a site area of 200 sqm and is at the head of a narrow 'T' shaped alley way that extends south eastwards into the Haslemere industrial estate. The alley way is 7.5m at its widest point, which is adjacent to the footway on the site frontage; it becomes narrower towards the rear of the site, having a pinch point of 3.6m. The land is bounded by 2 Dawlish Avenue, a two storey end of terrace property to the south of the site and across the existing alley way to the north of the host site by 49 Haslemere Avenue, a two storey end of terrace property that is on the northern boundary.
- 2.2 The area is predominantly residential, comprising short terraces with long, narrow gardens that appear to be from the inter war period. The site is not in a conservation area and it is bounded to the south and east by the large buildings of the Haslemere Industrial Estate and beyond that by railway lines, as Earlsfield station is within short walking distance to the north east of the site. The site is not in a conservation area and the proposed development would not affect the setting of a listed building. The site is in an Archaeological Priority Zone (Wandle Valley Alluvium) and it is also in CPZ 3 (Controlled parking Zone).

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two storey dwelling that would infill the land that is either side of the respective flank walls of the two adjacent properties. The dwelling would be built over the passage way at first and roof level, which would be gated and maintains a right of way for residents. **NB:** This is a revised version of a similar proposal that was refused last year and that has been submitted together with two applications for roof extensions at the adjacent properties at 49 Haslemere Avenue, which is in the ownership of the applicant's Mother and at 2 Dawlish Avenue, which is in the ownership of the applicant himself. The applicant proposes to use the development as a separate dwelling, but the newly created garden would be shared by the family of the three properties.
- 3.2 The proposed dwelling would have a height of 8m, a depth of 9.3m and a width of 6.5m. Access to the proposed dwelling would be behind the gate at a side entrance. The proposed dwelling would be two storeys in

height and it would be approximately the same height as the two adjacent properties in the road. The proposed dwelling would have a mono pitched roof line on the street frontage and a flat section at the rear. The entrance to the proposed dwelling would be at the side of the property on the southern boundary with 2 Dawlish Avenue, exploiting the splayed configuration of the plot. This section of the property would be set back from the street frontage by 1.4m, which is in line with the front bay of 2 Dawlish Avenue and is set back from the front building line of houses on Haslemere Avenue that extend northwards where the front building line turns the corner. A key difference between the proposed development and the previous scheme that was refused is that in the new proposal does not have the off street parking space. The alley way will become part of the shared garden.

4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 13/P4080 - Erection of 1 x 2 bedroom dwelling with associated parking - Refused 03/0314.

4.2 Reasons for Refusal –

1. The proposed development of an infill site by reason of its poor siting, excessive scale, cramped layout, unsympathetic design and use of external materials would have a visually obtrusive and incongruous impact on the streetscene and would introduce a discordant form of development to the area that is contrary to the requirements of Merton Adopted Unitary Development Plan (October 2003) policies BE16 and BE 22 and Adopted Core Planning Strategy (July 2011) policy CS14.
2. The proposed infill development provides no amenity space for future occupiers and along with the poor siting of the undercroft and the noise and fumes that are associated with it, would result in a sub-standard form of residential accommodation, contrary to the requirement of Adopted Merton Unitary Development Plan (October 2003) saved policy HS1.
3. The proposed development by reason of inadequate manoeuvring space on the site frontage and the inadequate width of the undercroft that would not meet the Council's minimum standard for off street parking of vehicles, could give rise to unsafe conditions for pedestrians and users of the highway, contrary to the requirements of policies CS18 and CS20 of the Adopted Merton Core Planning Strategy (July 2011).

5. **CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 The application has been advertised by a site notice and letters of notification to occupiers of seven neighbouring properties. Eight representations have been received that are summarised below:
- Infilling of the gaps between terraces is out of keeping with the townscape of the area and would encourage over development of other sites. Visual gaps and setting would be lost if these sort of developments are encouraged and would result in high density housing, loss of skyline and loss of green spaces.
 - The design of the proposed development is not in keeping with the inter war character of the local townscape and the use of glazed panels on the rear roof extensions will have a visually intrusive impact on neighbouring residents.
 - There is a right of way to the service road at the rear of the site for other residents in the area which will be blocked if the development is approved. This would set a precedent and encourage other infill sites to be redeveloped similarly.
 - An undercroft is again proposed even though it was refused previously and it is justified as a means of access to the rear of the site as the existing alley way to the service road is redundant.
 - The parking space in the previous scheme was impracticable, but its removal in this proposal would result in increased on street parking. This would worsen the existing crowded traffic conditions in the area.
 - The proposal to create a shared garden between the host site and the adjacent end of terrace properties is untenable, given that it would be built across a right of way to the service road and it would also be contrary to Merton's Unitary Development Plan policy BE18 that developments that result in loss of front or side gardens will be resisted.
 - The overall development of the host site and the roof extensions to the two adjacent end of terrace properties that is proposed could lead to the enlarged site being redeveloped for flats, which would result in an increase in on street parking in the area.
 - The claim in the design and access statement by the applicants that the proposal respects the front building line at the junction of Dawlish Avenue and Haslemere Avenue is wrong, as the proposed first floor drawing that has been submitted shows clearly that the front corner of the proposed dwelling extends in front of houses on Dawlish Avenue, which would have an ungainly and discordant impact on the streetscene.

6. **POLICY CONTEXT**

- 6.1 The relevant policies contained within the Adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014) are

DM O2 (Nature conservation, trees, hedges and landscape features)

DM F2 (Sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDs) and; wastewater and water infrastructure.

DM T1 (Support for sustainable transport and active travel)

DM D1 (Urban design and the public realm)

DM D2 (Design considerations in all developments)

The relevant policies contained within the Adopted Merton Adopted Core Planning Strategy (July 2011) are

CS14 (Design)

CS15 (Climate Change)

CS18 (Active Transport)

CS 20 (Parking, Servicing and Delivery)

NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) (2012)

- 6.2 The following Supplementary Planning Guidance Notes are also relevant;
- New Residential Development (December 1999)
 - Design (September 2004)
 - Waste and Recycling Storage requirements for Commercial and Residential Premises in the London Borough of Merton – Guide for Architects (LB Merton Waste Services)

- 6.3 The relevant policies in the London Plan (July 2011) are:

3.5 - Quality and Design of Housing Developments

5.1 - Climate Change Mitigation

5.2 - Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions

5.3 - Sustainable Design and Construction

7. **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 7.1 The principal planning considerations related to this application are the principle of the redevelopment of the site, the design and layout of the proposed dwelling, the impact they it would have on the streetscene of Dawlish Avenue and Haslemere Avenue, the standard of

accommodation provided and the impact upon neighbouring residential amenity, trees and parking/highways.

7.2 Principle of Development

The London Plan and both the Council's Adopted Core Planning Strategy and Adopted Sites and Policies Plan seek to increase housing provision where it can be shown that an acceptable standard of accommodation will be provided that will provide a satisfactory mix of housing types. The London Plan published in 2011 sets Merton a target of 3,200 dwellings within the borough between 2011 and 2021. The proposed development of the site would create a net increase of one family house on the site. The principle of development is considered to be acceptable, as the proposal makes a modest contribution to providing housing choice and meeting housing targets.

7.3 Design and Layout

7.4 The essential differences in design terms between this proposal and the scheme that was refused recently is that in the new scheme the roof ridge line treatment of the proposed infill dwellinghouse has been designed to include the end of terrace roof ridge line of 2 Dawlish Avenue and the semi-detached roof ridge line of 49 Haslemere Avenue, whereas in the previous proposal the proposed dwellinghouse had a flat roof that abutted the gable end roof of 49 Haslemere Avenue resulting in a disjointed and discordant form of development. Furthermore, the cramped off street parking space and the undercroft arrangement has been removed, instead a gated entrance is proposed, with the entrance to the first and second floor, which is reached by a staircase, concealed behind it. The contemporary, lightweight design of the previous scheme has also been superseded by a more conventional form of development in which the two storeys are served by top hung windows that replicate the predominant fenestration in the streetscene and which will have timber frames set in rendered brick walls and a ceramic tiled roof.

7.5 It is considered therefore that the redesign has overcome the adverse impact that the previous proposal had on the streetscene. The visual break in the existing sequence of buildings will be offset by the new building, which though narrower in width than the adjacent properties in the streetscene, will not be visually obtrusive and the development will be provided with adequate setting and relief by the spacious shared garden that will extend across the rear of the host site. This important change compared with the previous proposal overcomes the second reason for refusal, which was the failure to provide amenity space for a family sized dwelling.

- 7.6 It is concluded that the proposed infill property, taken together with the roof alterations to the two adjacent buildings will result in a seamless form of development that turns the corner of the junction in this part of the road and that will respect the regular pattern of the existing roofscape in the locality. Infill development is not in itself a negative example of land use planning if it is designed sensitively and provided it does not have a harmful impact on the townscape of the area and on the amenities of neighbouring residents.
- 7.7 As such, it is concluded that the revised proposal overcomes the first of the reasons for refusal of the previous proposal on the grounds that the siting, scale, layout, design and external materials were unacceptable and that the fresh proposal complies with the requirement of Sites and Policies Plan policy DM D2 for development to relate positively to the siting, rhythm, scale, density, proportions, height, materials and massing of surrounding buildings and existing street patterns.
- 7.8 Standard of Accommodation
- 7.9 Excluding the gated passage way ground floor level, the proposed dwelling has a GIA (Gross Internal Area) of approximately 89.28m², which exceeds the minimum figure in table 3.3 of London Plan policy 3.5 for a two bed x person house of 83m². The shared garden would provide 70m² of individual amenity space for the dwelling, along with 25m² on the frontage of the property, which exceeds the minimum requirement of policy DM D2 of 50m² as a single, usable regular shaped amenity space. The internal layout of the property is satisfactory and the stacking of rooms is acceptable. The proposed houses would provide a satisfactory standard for future occupiers in accordance with policy DM D2.
- 7.10 Neighbouring Residential Amenity
- 7.11 The proposal would not have any adverse impact on the living conditions of the two adjacent properties to the host site, as the dwelling would be built up to the party walls and would not extend significantly beyond the front and rear building lines of the two neighbouring houses. The removal of the undercroft, which was a negative feature of the previous scheme, has been made in recognition of the noise and disturbance that would occur for future residents and because no off street parking is proposed in this development. This measure overcomes the second and third reasons for refusal of the previous scheme. The proposed frontage would be in line with the bay windows of houses on neighbouring houses in Dawlish Avenue, to the east of the host site and it would be set back at ground floor level by a depth of 1.4m from the front bay of 49 Haslemere Avenue, on the

western boundary. Here a gate is provided leading to a passage where there is a staircase to the upper floors of the property.

- 7.12 The property has an overall depth of 9.3m, whereas the existing adjacent properties have a depth of 8m. However both of these properties have substantial single storey rear extensions. 49 Haslemere Avenue has a single storey rear extension that is 3m in depth and 3m in height and is the full width of the rear wall, beyond which there is a timber built lean to canopy with a veranda. At 2 Dawlish Avenue, a single storey extension has been built that is set in from the common boundary with the hoist site by 2m at its widest point and by 700mm at the pinch point further into the garden, which is dictated by the splayed junction of the two properties. This extension has a height of 2.9m and a depth of 3.5m and it has a flat roof with a slightly overhanging canopy. The rear building line of the proposed infill development would stop short of both of these extensions and it is concluded that neither of the adjacent properties would suffer undue loss of amenity as a result of the proposed infill development. No other properties could suffer any adverse impact as a result of the infill proposal and the remainder of the rear of the site is open land that includes the alley way and extends eastwards towards the blank flank wall of the industrial buildings. This would become part of the shared garden of the three properties that will have a generous area of 210m².
- 7.13 The proposal has attracted a number of objections from neighbouring residents, the strongest of which is to the loss of a right of way over the alley way that leads to the narrow highway that runs north - south along the rear boundaries of houses in Dawlish Avenue and Haslemere Avenue parallel to the industrial building, However, the applicants have shown the alley way as being within their domain and they have completed Certificate A of the application form, indicating that they are the sole owners of the site, which is in accordance with the requirements of planning law. In any event, rights of way are a civil matter that is not governed by planning legislation.
- 7.14 The other main objection that has been raised is that the infilling of the gap between the two terraces will have a visually intrusive and incongruous impact on the streetscene. This view is not shared as the proposed infill development would follow the contour of the road at the junction of the Dawlish Avenue and Haslemere Avenue, while the gap between the two terraces is not great. Furthermore, a number of infill developments have been permitted elsewhere in the surrounding area. Objections have also been received stating that on street parking would result due to the absence of any off street parking provision and that the creation of an infill development, when combined with the enlargement

of the properties either side of it, could then be converted into flats. On street parking is subject to Highway Authority restrictions and the conversion of any single dwelling into flats would require planning permission.

- 7.15 An objection has also been made to the inclusion of an undercroft in this proposal, even though such a feature was a reason for refusal in the previous scheme. The entrance to the proposed dwelling is a gate, behind which is a passage leading to the right of way at the rear of the site and a staircase for the upper floors of the proposed dwelling.

8.0 Transport and Highways Impact

- 8.1 The removal of the off street parking space has to some extent overcome the reasons for refusal of the previous proposal as there will no longer be direct conflict of the car parking with access to the rear. This part of the borough was developed in the inter war period and none of the frontages in the immediate area were designed to provide off street parking. The site has a PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) of 3, which is average. There are a number of bus routes nearby and Earlsfield main line station is a short distance to the east of the site. It is considered therefore that the amended proposal is in keeping with the aim of Merton Core Strategy policy CS20 to reduce car borne dependency and to encourage sustainable development in the borough, in line with national and regional policy.

9.0. Sustainability and Environmental Impact Assessment Requirements

- 9.1 The proposal is a minor residential development and an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required in this instance.
- 9.2 The application does not constitute Schedule 1 or Schedule 2 development. Accordingly, there are no requirements in terms of an EIA submission.
- 9.3 To ensure that the aim of policy DM H4 to promote sustainable development is met and to ensure that the development will include LZC (Low Zero Carbon) and other energy saving measures so that the property can achieve Code 4 level with a view to then achieving Code 5, a planning condition is recommended.

10.0 Other Planning Considerations

- 10.1 A refuse and recycling strategy for the new development will be secured by a condition that is recommended.

- 10.2 The proposed development will be required to comply with Lifetime Homes standards, which will be dealt with by a planning condition that is recommended.

Local Financial Considerations

- 11.0. The proposed development is liable to pay the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy, the funds for which will be paid by the Mayor towards the Crossrail project. The CIL is non-negotiable and planning permission cannot be refused for failure to agree to pay CIL. The proposal would also be liable for payment of the Merton CIL at the rate of £220 per square metre, due to the additional floor space that is proposed in the redevelopment of the site.
- 11.1 Core Strategy Policy CS8 (Housing Choice) requires that all sites capable of providing between 1-9 units (net) will be required to make provision for affordable housing as an off-site financial contribution. However, this policy has now be superseded by the Governments announcement that as of 28 November 2014, the NPPG was updated setting out that planning obligations (section 106 planning obligations) should not be sought from small scale and self-build development.

12.0 CONCLUSION

- 12.1 The proposal will provide a new residential unit of satisfactory design, size and appearance that will relate well to the appearance and character of the area. The development has been set out to achieve an acceptable relationship with neighbouring properties. The standard of residential accommodation proposed is considered to meet the needs of future occupiers, with appropriate levels of amenity space and room sizes with reasonable levels of outlook and light. There would be no undue impact upon neighbouring amenity, trees, and traffic or highway conditions. The proposal is in accordance with adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan, Core Planning Strategy and London Plan policies.
- 12.2 Accordingly, it is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

(1) 14/P1146

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION.

Subject to the following conditions:

1. A.1 Commencement of Development (Full Application)
2. A.7 Approved Plans

3. B1 External Materials to be Approved
4. B4 Details of Surface Treatment
5. B5. Details of Walls/Fences
6. B6P Levels
7. C6 Refuse and Recycling (Details to be Submitted)
8. D11 Construction Times
9. F1 Lansdscaping/Planting Scheme
10. J1 Lifetime Homes
11. L2P Code for Sustainable Homes - Pre Commencement (New Build Residential)
12. K1P Archaeology
13. K2P Archaeology (Watching Brief)
14. H6P Cycle parking – Details to be Submitted
15. Non - Standard Condition: Notwithstanding the information shown on the approved drawings, details of a revised layout of the shared garden for the existing dwellings and the proposed apartment that includes a dedicated right of way to the alley way at the rear of the site shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the first occupation of the apartment.

Reason: To safeguard the living conditions of existing and future occupiers of the development in accordance with Adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014) Policy DM D3, Adopted Merton Core Planning Strategy (July 2011), Policy CS14 and Supplementary Planning Guidance Note - Residential extensions, Alterations and Conversions (November 2001).

- 16, Before any part of the development that is hereby approved commences, details of a fence or wall to enclose the front garden at a maximum height of 600mm and a minimum height of 300mm shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall be retained thereafter. The enclosing wall or fence shall not be removed without the prior approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard highway and pedestrian safety in accordance with adopted Merton Core Planning Strategy Plan (July 2011) Policy CS 18.

17. Informative 1 – Party Wall Act

