

Appendix 11 – (14/P4361) Wimbledon Stadium Committee Report

Comments from Future Merton regarding education, open space, biodiversity and play space

Education

1. Future Merton has worked closely with Tom Procter, the council's Contracts and Schools Organisation manager, in the assessment of the application and the comments you receive from Tom Procter (dated January 2015) represent the co-ordinated council comments on education.

Open space

2. It appears that the proposals include sufficient on-site amenity space and do not include the provision of new parks as public open space.

Biodiversity

3. The methodology, findings and recommendations in the submitted Ecological Appraisal by BSG Ecology, are acceptable.
4. The proposals present an opportunity to secure net gains in biodiversity on this brownfields site.
5. If you were minded to approve the application, I would recommend that the following planning conditions and informatives be attached:
 - A suitably worded planning condition should secure the delivery of sedum and substrate green roofs as shown in part 01.04.09 of the submitted Design and Access Statement.
 - A suitably worded planning condition should secure the provision of bat boxes and bird nesting features as recommended in paragraph 5.35 of the submitted Ecological Appraisal by BSG Ecology.
 - The standard informative which refers to the developer's responsibilities under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.
 - A suitably worded informative should advise that any detailed landscape plan, which is likely to be secured by means of a planning condition, should be informed by the advice of an ecologist, as recommended in paragraph 5.27 of the submitted Ecological Appraisal by BSG Ecology.
 - A Japanese Knotweed Management Plan is listed as one of the 'Key Duties and Deliverables' in Table 3.1 of the Environment Statement, Volume 1. It

should therefore be addressed as part of a planning condition securing a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).

Play Space

6. The submitted Planning Statement refers to the policies in Merton's Core Planning Strategy (CS 13) and The London Plan (3.6), which require housing proposals to provide play spaces for the expected child population, and to the Mayor of London's 'Play and Informal Recreation' SPG, which provides detailed guidance on this matter.
7. It was agreed during pre-application discussions that the child yield calculator for the Mayor's Play and Informal Recreation SPG (2012) will be used for this application.
8. In October 2014, the GLA published a population calculator which can be used to estimate the number of people of different ages that might live in a new residential development. The GLA state that estimates derived using this calculator should be referenced as 'GLA Experimental Statistics'. The calculator only uses one site in Merton as a sample for geographic reference and is not considered sufficiently robust. Therefore, in this case, I advise that the calculator in the Mayor's Play and Informal Recreation SPG 2012 is used to assist with play space calculations for this scheme.
9. This calculator considers different ownership and housing types but the appendices to the SPG provide no guidance with regards to the classification of the proposed duplex units.
10. The viability report proposes that 10% of the 602 units will be (intermediate) affordable units and that all (60) units will be in Block B. I could find no further details with regards to the affordable units.
11. The Design and Access Statements clarifies (on page no. 184) that Block B consists of the following mix of units:

| | |
|-----------|----------------|
| 30 | 1-bed flats |
| 35 | 2-bed flats |
| 25 | 3-bed flats |
| 1 | 2-bed duplex |
| 3 | 3-bed duplexes |
| 1 | 4-bed duplex |
| 95 | TOTAL |

12. For the purposes of child yield calculations, it would be acceptable to consider all the units as flats and assume a proportionate distribution of affordable units amongst the different dwellings types' in Block B, as follows:

| | Proposed | % | Affordable |
|--------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| 1-bed | 30 | 32 | 19 |
| 2-bed | 36 | 38 | 23 |
| 3-bed | 28 | 29 | 17 |
| 4-bed | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| TOTAL | 95 | 100 | 60 |

13. The child yield calculations for the current proposals are therefore as follows:

| Number of FLATS | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|----------|----------|------------|
| | Studio | 1 bed | 2 bed | 3 bed | 4 bed | 5 bed | Total |
| Social rented/affordable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Intermediate | 0 | 19 | 23 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 60 |
| Market | 13 | 193 | 222 | 110 | 4 | 0 | 542 |
| Total | 13 | 212 | 245 | 127 | 5 | 0 | 602 |

| Number of HOUSES | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | | 1 bed | 2 bed | 3 bed | 4 bed | 5 bed | Total |
| Social rented/affordable | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Intermediate | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Market | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Proportion of children | | |
|------------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | Number of children | % |
| Under 5 | 39 | 57% |
| 5 to 11 | 20 | 29% |
| 12+ | 10 | 14% |
| Total | 69 | 100% |

| Play space requirements | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| GLA benchmark (sqm)* | Alternative local benchmark (sqm)** | Total (sq m play space) required |
| 10 | | 688.2 |

<5 year olds

14. In paragraphs 7.183 - 7.187 of the Planning Statement and part 01.04.07 (on p.100 - 101) of the Design and Access Statement, the applicant clarifies that the proposed 900sqm of residential courtyards have been designed to be

multifunctional spaces which allow for areas of doorstep and incidental play opportunities which would be suitable for under 5 year old children.

15. This would be acceptable and the submission of further details needs to be secured by means of a suitably worded planning condition.

5-18 years olds

16. In the above referred parts the submitted documents also clarify that:
“There are no ‘prescribed’ play facilities on site with equipment, such as swings and slides, due to space restrictions and the requirement to create a balanced environment for all residents.

...

The total child play space provision including off site provision will be 1,680 sqm which significantly exceeds the planning policy requirement by approximately 1,000 sqm and will result in an extremely high quality development that is usable by residents of all ages.

The play space is provided as 900 sqm on-site for under 5s, 490 sqm off site for 5-11 year olds and 290 sqm off site for 12+ year olds. Please refer to the Design and Access Statement for further details.”

17. The Design and Access Statement, on p.101, states (and shows on a plan) that:

“There are a number of Local Playable Space areas within 400m of the site that offer spaces with equipped play facilities. The site also falls within 800m of two Neighbourhood Playable Space areas which include kick about spaces and MUGA’s which also include basketball hoops.

The diagram also shows sites of open recreational space, which provide areas of open green space suitable for football and other incidental play opportunities, but are not specific play areas.”

18. This might be technically correct but this is a large development site and the 400m radius for the ‘Local Playable Space with area of equipped play for 0-11 years’ only just meets the northern and eastern boundaries of the site.
19. There are no play spaces within 400m actual walking distance from the site within Merton.
20. Although Garratt Green, in Wandsworth, is approximately 400m (straight-line) from to the site, the walking route to the park is convoluted and longer than 400m.

21. The nearest park, which is most likely to be used by children residing on this site, is Garratt Park in Wandsworth. The shortest actual walking distance between the northern boundary of the site, via St. Martin's Way and Maskell Road, to the nearest entrance gate to the park is approximately 270m. It is a further 115m actual walking distance across the park to the entrance of the 0-8 year old equipped play space. Therefore, 6 or 7 year old children living in the southwest tower in Block C would have to walk (350m+270m+155m) 735m to the nearest equipped play space and 620m to the park.
22. My site visit showed that the most direct route to Garratt Park, via St. Martin's Way and Maskell Road, has much scope for improvement to be suitable for children and disabled people (see Appendix 1 below for my site photographs). A safer but longer route would be via Summerstown and Garratt Lane.
23. At the pre-application meeting held on 10 September 2014, I expressed concerns about the suitability of the routes to the nearest parks and play spaces but I could find no evidence in the submitted documentation that address this matter. I therefore recommend that a Pedestrian Environment Review System (PERS) audit be carried out to identify the quality of the route(s) to the play space and any barriers that may exist.
24. Subject to the agreement of Wandsworth Council and the findings of the PERS audit (*see officer's comments on this matter in response to the 2nd consultation – Appendix 1 not necessary to be reprinted for this report*), I would recommend that an appropriate off-site contribution be sought for the provision of improved play space facilities for 5-18 year olds and pedestrian and cycle improvements to the highway between the site and Garratt Park, along St. Martin's Way and Maskell Road.
25. Refer to Appendix 2 for relevant extracts from the SPG (*not necessary to be reprinted for this report*) regarding the distance and accessibility requirements for play spaces, and off-site contributions.

This page is intentionally left blank