

## PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

16<sup>th</sup> June 2016

<b>UPRN</b>	<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<b>DATE VALID</b>
	16/P0882	16.03.2016
<b>Address/Site</b>	Morden Park Pool, London Road, Morden	
<b>(Ward)</b>	Canon Hill/St Helier	
<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of a new leisure centre with access, parking, landscaping and ancillary work together with change of use of a parcel of land from recreational land to car parking for disabled users, and the demolition of existing Morden Park pools, reinstatement of landscape and transfer to Metropolitan Open Land (MOL).	

**Drawing No's** A7 Build to plans; Site location plan and drawings; Site location plan and drawings; (20)001, (20)101, (21)001, (21)002, (22)001, (27)001, (90)001, (90)002,(90)003, (08)001, (08)101 (08)101, (08)900, GTA1230.GA.100, . GTA1230.GA 101 PL02, GTA1230.GA 102, GTA1230.GA 103, GTA1230.GA 104, GTA1230.GA 105, GTA1230.L.300, GTA1230.PP.400, GTA1230.PP.401, GTA1230.PP.402, DS24091401.01, DS24091401.02 , DS24091401.03 & DS24091401.04. Documents; Great Crested Newt Assessment and Reptile Survey 2015 to 2016 compiled by GPM Ecology, Crime Prevention Plan, Rev A compiled by GT Architects, Disabled Access Statement Compiled by GT Architects, Framework Travel Plan JH/11182 Compiled by DHA Transport dated Feb 2016, Framework Delivery and Servicing Management Plan Compiled by DHA Transport dated Feb 2016, Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan Compiled by DHA Transport dated Feb 2016, Phase 1 Ecological Survey report Compiled by Furesfen dated August 2014, Ecological Mitigation Plan compiled by Furesfen, Landscape Management Plan by Oobe Ltd dated Feb 2016.

**Contact Officer:** Leigh Harrington (020 8545 3836)

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**  
**GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS.**

---

### CHECKLIST INFORMATION.

- S106 Heads of agreement: No
- Is a screening opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental Statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Impact Assessment been submitted –No
- Design Review Panel consulted – Yes, twice
- Number of neighbours consulted – 371, twice
- Press notice – Yes (Major)
- Site notice – Yes

- External consultations: Seven; GLA, Sport England, Historic England, Transport for London, Metropolitan Police, Friends of Morden Park Playing Fields, Morden Park Playing fields Community Trust
  - Number of jobs created – n/a (staff to be transferred)
- 

## **1. Introduction.**

1.1 The matter is brought before Members as this is a Council application.

## **2. SITE DESCRIPTION.**

2.1 The application effectively includes two sites, the existing Morden Park swimming pool and leisure centre and an area of open grassland located on the north side of the service road for the college, pool and Register Office, opposite South Thames College and adjacent to the existing car park.

2.2 The site is located within a number of designations being in the Upper Morden Conservation Area, within the Morden Hall and Park Archaeological Priority Zone and adjacent to the Stane Street APZ. The new site is within Metropolitan Open Land and adjacent to meadow which is managed and funded under Natural England's Higher Level Stewardship programme. The site is within a Green Corridor and is within the 500m foraging range of Greater Crested Newts, a protected species. Morden Park is Grade II listed and is in close proximity to the Grade II listed Morden Park House (Register office) and the Grade I listed Church of St Lawrence. The swimming pool building is considered to make a positive contribution to the Upper Morden Conservation Area.

2.3 The area is not at risk from flooding. The site is within a Controlled Parking Zone (M3) and it has Public Transport Accessibility level of 3 which is medium but is well served by bus links, Thameslink services out to Sutton and north into Merton and Morden Underground station is a five minute walk away.

## **3. PROPOSAL**

3.1 The existing swimming pool complex is coming to the end of its operational lifespan and is currently beyond economic repair. The proposed new leisure centre will replace this facility and once opened the existing leisure centre will close and be demolished. When cleared the land will be replanted as open grassland with an orchard and will be designated as Metropolitan Open Land to counter the impact of losing the land for the new leisure centre, resulting in no net loss of MOL.

3.2 The existing leisure centre provides a 36 station Wellness Health and Fitness room, a 33m swimming pool, a teaching pool and a sauna.

- 3.3 The new leisure centre will provide a 25m 6 lane short course competition pool, a separate small pool (15mx13m) with a variable depth floor that can also be used as a diving pool including 5m board, a four court sports hall, a 100 station fitness suite, a 30sqm spinning studio and combined 200sqm studio/community room. As well as related changing facilities there will be café at ground floor level with a sitting out/plaza area. The building will be surrounded by some limited landscaping work to provide drainage systems. The maximum height of the building is 12.5m.
- 3.4 The existing car parking area will be revamped to provide 162 car parking spaces including 5 electric bays, active from the commencement of use with a total of 34 being made compatible for use later as demand dictates with an additional 10 new disabled bays adjacent to the leisure centre entrance.

#### **4. CONSULTATION**

- 4.1 As detailed in the accompanying Statement of Community Involvement the proposals have been the subject of lengthy pre-application consultations with local residents and community and faith groups through roadshows, newsletters and dedicated pages on the Merton website and in My Merton Magazine. There were also protracted pre application meetings between officers, councillors and with organisations such as the Greater London Authority and Sport England.
- 4.2 For the application a Conservation Area site notice was posted and 371 residents whose properties border or overlook the site were notified. In response to the resident consultation one objection was received raising concerns relating to building on MOL and suggesting that the existing car park be built on and an underground car park be provided.
- 4.3 Following confirmation of Great Crested Newts being on site a further consultation was undertaken. No responses were received to that consultation.
- 4.4 The **Greater London Authority** were consulted as the application was referable to the Mayor and they confirmed that the Council may proceed to determine the application without further reference to the GLA, they raised no objections to the proposals subject to the imposition of various conditions.
- 4.5 The **Greater London Archaeological Advice Service** at Historic England were consulted due to the location within an Archaeological Priority Zone. They approved the findings in the Written Scheme of Investigation compiled by MOLA and raised no objections to the proposals subject to appropriate conditions designed to protect any archaeology in the area.

- 4.6 **Sport England** raised no objection subject to the imposition of a condition requiring the new leisure centre to be operational before the existing one closed.
- 4.7 **Transport for London** raised no objections and found that the proposals were compliant with relevant policy and requested that the travel plan and Framework Construction Management Plan and Delivery and Servicing plans be secured by condition.
- 4.8 The **Metropolitan Police** Safer by Design Officer was involved in pre application discussions with the architects for the project and those discussions evolved into the Crime prevention strategy that was formulated to accompany the application.
- 4.9 The **Wimbledon Society's** planning committee wrote a letter commenting on the need for appropriate landscaping and requesting conditions be attached relating to the removal of the existing building.
- 4.10 **Transport Planning.** The proposals have been developed in cooperation with Council transport planners who are satisfied that the proposals will have no expected detrimental effect on highways operations whilst the Travel plan will help mitigate against any potential adverse impacts by promoting sustainable transport alternatives such that no objections are raised to the proposals subject to the imposition of suitable conditions.
- 4.11 **Trees Officer.** No objections subject to conditions.
- 4.12 **Future Merton - Open Space policy officer.** Commented; "My comments will only relate to the following planning policy matters: social infrastructure, open space and biodiversity.

#### Social Infrastructure

Subject to an assessment by others of the design, transport, amenity and open space criteria tests in the Development Plan policies, the proposed replacement leisure facility is in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.19, Merton Core Planning Strategy Policy CS13 and Sites and Policies Plan DM C1.

#### Metropolitan Open Land (MOL)

The need for a replacement facility is set out in chapter 5 of the Planning Statement and it should also be noted that it is listed in Table 27.2 'Infrastructure projects' in Merton's adopted Core Planning Strategy (2011) as Strategic Requirement 5H, which would meet Objective 5: 'To make Merton a healthier and better place for people to live and work in or visit'.

The methodology and conclusions regarding the development options, the site selection and the development options for the preferred site, that are set out in the Site Selection Assessment, are acceptable.

The Very Special Circumstances regarding need and site specific matters, as set out in paragraphs 5.4.1 to 5.4.21, are accepted. I would suggest that much *weight* should be awarded to the fact that the 6560sqm area of existing designated MOL, on which the building and its surrounding ancillary space is proposed, could be replaced on the undesignated land surrounding the existing building, with the next review of the Policies Map. A suitably worded planning condition should ensure appropriate landscaping in the location of the existing building.

The impact of the proposals on the openness of the MOL is essentially a design matter which others will comment on.

#### Designated Open Space

A suitably worded 'landscaping' condition, as referred to above, should ensure that the proposals meet the criteria test in paragraph 74 of the NPPF and Merton's adopted Sites and Policies Plan Policy DM O1 Open space Part b)ii. :

*"the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location;"*

Others will comment on the design and transport criteria tests parts c) and e) of Policy DM O1.

#### Biodiversity

The site is within a Green Corridor, is within the 500m foraging range of Greater Crested Newts, a protected species, and it would affect a meadow which is managed and funded under Natural England's Higher Level Stewardship programme.

The methodology, findings and recommended mitigation measures that are set out in Furesfen's August 2014 Phase 1 Ecological Survey Report, Furesfen's Ecological Mitigation Plan and GPM Ecology's 11 May 2016 Great Crested Newt Assessment and Reptile Survey report, are accepted.

The most up-to-date landscape plan (GTA1230.GA 101 PL02) postdates the Furesfen reports and shows that there is now a 0.248ha shortfall in the quantum of space to mitigate against the loss grassland habitat. To ensure that the proposals achieve net gains in biodiversity, a planning condition should secure the restoration of Pond 2 in accordance with the mitigation measures proposed in the GPM Ecology report, where these works are described as desirable but not essential.

The proposals will not destroy or impair the integrity of the Green Corridor.

With suitably worded planning conditions that secure the delivery of the mitigation measures, the proposals would be in accordance London Plan Policy 7.19, Merton's Core Planning Strategy Policy CS.13 and Merton's Sites and Policies Plan Policy DM O2."

- 4.13 **Flood Risk engineer.** No objection to the scheme but commented ;  
"While the above SuDS measures will offer several benefits and is acceptable in flood risk terms, the report does not fully consider how the design of the swales and pond could be used to maximise benefits for biodiversity, water quality and amenity, as per my previous comments. The planting mix for instance of the 'dry pond' will need further consideration at detailed design phase. At this stage, there has been no consideration as to whether some surface water flows could be diverted to pond 1 to help ensure higher water levels within the pond.

To ensure that the network is in appropriate condition and to establish whether surface water flows from the development feed into pond 1, a full CCTV of drainage network is required and this should cover the upstream pipe network feeding into the pond". The officer recommended the imposition of suitable conditions to achieve this.

- 4.14 The pre-application design was submitted to the January 26<sup>th</sup> 2016 **Design Review Panel** who commented;  
"The Panel struggled with a number of issues relating to this proposal and felt that it needed considerably more thought before it became the high quality development everyone clearly wanted it to be. At the larger scale, the Panel noted the background that resulted in the site location and did not have a problem with this.

The Panel were very concerned that the building had been designed and the precise location decided, before any specialist heritage, ecological, landscape etc. assessments had taken place. It was the Panel's view that this work should have been done earlier in the process and have been used to inform the design and siting. The process was being done the wrong way round and the assessments ran the risk of being simply used to justify the pre-decided design.

This was particularly important, the Panel felt, as a balanced assessment of a range of specialist studies could help the applicant build a strong case for a particular design, location or arrangement that may have previously been considered difficult or inappropriate for a range of reasons.

The conservation assessment was important in this respect, as the proposal appeared to be trying to disassociate the building from the listed house, yet there appeared to be no explanation of how this approach was arrived at or why it was the right approach. A similar issue existed in relation to ecology. The habitat at the entrance to the

site had been considered as an inappropriate place to build, yet the ecological study had not been done.

The design needed to be informed by the ecological study and the conservation assessment. It was not clear whether the new building was visible from the listed house. For example, it may be considered preferable to harm an area of ecological value than to harm the setting of a high value heritage asset (Grade II\*). These decisions and thought processes needed to be undertaken to inform and justify the building position, rather than hope they could be used to justify the currently proposed position.

The Panel struggled to see this clear thought process as to how the current proposal had emerged. It was also critical to get this right when making the argument about building in the MOL, rather than taking a simplistic approach about quantity of land taken and returned. The removal of the old pool building, and the returning of its site to open MOL needs to be an integral part of the proposals, and should allow an improved setting for the listed building.

This general issue of developing a rationale for the design, informed by specialist assessments was relevant to all aspects of the proposal, being equally true for the siting and the internal layout and organisation of the building. For example, the applicant stated a desire for the building to be highly visible from the main London Road, this being the reason for the bright green corner element, yet they also said that the existing vegetation would prevent views from this road.

The building was stated to be sited adjacent to the college buildings, yet the design did not show how the relationship between the buildings, and the space between them, was to be handled in a positive way, and there were no elevations provided to show this relationship. The Panel suggested that if this could not be made to work, or the building could not be sited close to London Road, then the applicant may like to consider siting the building more into the park as a true pavilion building.

The Panel had concerns about the orientation of the building - despite the reasons given by the applicant for it – the Panel were not convinced. In essence they felt it was wrong and not very legible to have to go past the building before being able to enter it. The pedestrian route was also considered poor, people being guided under the projecting roof alongside a blank wall.

The entrance was also considered confused in its legibility when it should be an obvious point of arrival. The emphasis created by the feature of a large expanse of bright green cladding suggests an arrival point whereas the entrance is to one side of this feature and the doors underneath are not the building entrance.

The Panel felt that the general design of the building did not work as well as it should. It felt like it was more an assembled kit of parts for a leisure centre, which could be anywhere, rather than something that was designed specific for the location. There were 7 -8 different materials shown, which was considered too many and this showed a lack of architectural language. It was felt to be an awkward and uncomfortable building with some basic errors of arrangement and planning. The café was tiny and separated from the rest of the building by the entrance draught lobby. It was unclear where parents would go while their children were swimming etc. It felt that, despite the large swimming hall there was little in the way of natural light penetration into the building and that would affect the quality of the internal space as well as increase energy demands for lighting.

It was felt that the roof form, as it met the ground did not need to be so chunky and there were too many columns. The whole assembly could be made to be far more elegant. On the park side, it would be better to land the columns directly into a planted area or green space to better link with the park.

The Panel felt that the applicant needed to thoroughly critique themselves to resolve these issues and work better with the context, where the design was a clear response to the site. The elements of the brief needed to be coherently integrated into an overall logic. The relationship to the college needed to be clear and to explore how the gaps between the buildings could become a threshold into the park.

There also needed to be a landscape architect input into the design from the offset – a clear omission when working in a park setting – which could identify possibilities to utilise the landform to good effect and deal with issues like the service yard. It was even questioned whether a large service yard was even needed.

The Panel urged the applicant not to simply design around a set of constraints, but to develop a strong case for a design that has evolved out of a thorough understanding of the context. If the design and public benefit is good enough, harm can be justified in terms of ecology, conservation or MOL”

**VERDICT: RED**

- 4.15 The design undertook some modifications in response to the comments and the application design was submitted to the March 15<sup>th</sup> 2016 Design Review Panel who commented;  
“The Panel acknowledged the additional information that had been provided since the January review. However they felt that in its essentials the proposal had changed little. The Panel acknowledged that there had been further work on the landscaping. However they felt that a bespoke design for the leisure centre was needed that was driven by contextual anchors such as the wider landscape of the park,



the listed house and potential archaeology in the Roman road – it needed to be rooted in ‘what is already there’ and be better ‘anchored into the site’. Currently the proposal could be anywhere. This was not acceptable for a building that would be highly visible from within the park.

The Panel were clear that a design needed to emerge from the contextual analysis and that a landscape strategy or masterplan for the wider site – the new building, the listed house and the old leisure centre site - was key to this. It was also important that the car park was considered as part of the landscape strategy and not simply avoided or left as it is. There were germs of this appearing in the landscaped area of the old building but they had not yet become a whole landscape plan that knots together all the buildings and spaces. The Panel recommended that the applicant also identify all the relevant parameters and assign them relative weighting of importance, to aid them in the design process. There had to be a design process that allowed for originality and placemaking, which was currently missing.

The Panel felt that the applicant was relying heavily on advice from a range of expert fields to arrive at an acceptable solution. It seemed the applicant was being pushed and pulled in different directions and arriving at an unsatisfactory compromise, a bit like a ‘tick box’ exercise. The result of this was a functionally efficient building internally but a very unsatisfactory experience externally. The Panel felt that the building felt closed, heavy, unwelcoming, uninviting, a muddle to look at, not uplifting, placeless and simply did not ‘ooze’ quality.

An example of where this was being approached in an unimaginative way was with regard to the ecological area and the oak tree. The ecological area seemed to be ‘fenced off’ as sacrosanct rather than being extended, enhanced and integrated into the new context. This can also be said of the approach to the oak tree, where its presence is forcing the building further into the park. Was the value of one tree being given more weight than the added loss of open space needed by its retention? The rationale for this was not clearly expressed. A new tree could be replanted, but the green space could not be ‘unbuilt’ upon.

The impact of the building onto the park is always going to be strong, so it was important to have a quality building. It was stated that the building was at the top of a hill and couldn’t be hidden ‘let it celebrate’. Irrespective of the MOL land swap, it was stressed that the building still needed to be of the highest quality because it would be interpreted as being within the park and therefore the MOL. The building however, seemed to be trying to hide itself and not doing it well. It was suggested that a more linear form for the facilities could be explored so the building did not project out into the park so much. This was currently being prevented because the car park was not seen as part of the proposal or able to be changed. It was clear to the Panel that the

car park, the wider context of the house, and the old leisure centre site, were all part of the proposal.

It was considered that the layout and arrangement of the building, with the entrance facing the car park, would encourage people to drive, rather than use the bus, walk or cycle. It was considered legitimate that the design and layout of the building could and should encourage walking, cycling and public transport, and this was still clearly lacking in the layout. People will come from London Road and the entrance should be convenient and easy to find from this route. It was suggested that there was potential to share parking provision with the college, to reduce the number of spaces. If this application was from a private operator then the Council would be seeking transport improvements through a S106 that accorded with planning policies aimed at promoting sustainable travel and reducing car use. The Panel still felt that the entrance was unconvincing.

The Panel still struggled with the rationale for the roof form, even though it had been changed at the edges. They were not quite sure of the need for the curved roof over the sports hall or of the concept in general, as this was linked to the unresolved issue of whether the building proclaimed itself or tried to blend into the park. Different elements of the building did not necessarily need to have the same character or form. The Panel also suggested that the building should be designed so as it could successfully adapt and be added to in the future. This included the possibility for accommodating changing rooms for people using the outdoor sports pitches in the park.

Overall the Panel felt that little of substance had changed from the original proposal reviewed in January and it was essentially the same scheme. It was described as an achievement of efficient space planning and cost-effectiveness at the cost of good placemaking, where the two equally important aims are in discord, when they need to be in harmony, and the building needs to be in harmony with its context. This was currently not the case.

VERDICT: **RED**

4.16 Responses to these comments are found in section 7 of this report

## **5. PLANNING HISTORY.**

5.1 Proposal site No relevant history

5.2 Within Morden Park

96/P0903 Planning permission granted for erection of two-storey pavilion comprising changing facilities, ancillary social facilities and caretakers flat, installation of all-weather pitch enclosed by 3 metre high weld mesh fence and 8 x 15 m high floodlighting columns,

formation of internal access route, surface parking for 128 cars and localised re-levelling and landscape works.

- 5.3 03/P2222 Planning permission refused for removal of all existing pavilions and hardstanding (except 4 tennis courts); provision of golf driving range involving the erection of new part single/part two storey pavilion building providing changing facilities, golf equipment shop, refreshment lounge, storage/office areas, caretakers flat and 55 driving range bays, installation of synthetic grass surface, erection of safety fencing and flood-lighting; provision of car park; enhancement of remaining open areas and landscaping.

## **6. RELEVANT POLICIES**

### 6.1 London Plan (2015)

Relevant policies include:

- 3.19 Sports facilities
- 3.16 Protection of social infrastructure.
- 5.1 Climate change mitigation
- 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- 5.7 Renewable energy
- 5.10 Urban greening
- 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs.
- 5.13 Sustainable drainage
- 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
- 6.9 Cycling
- 6.10 Walking
- 6.11 Smoothing traffic flow and tackling congestion
- 6.12 Road network capacity
- 6.13 Parking
- 7.2 An inclusive environment
- 7.3 Designing out crime
- 7.4 Local character
- 7.5 Public realm
- 7.6 Architecture
- 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology
- 7.14 Improving air quality
- 7.15 Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes
- 7.16 Green Belt
- 7.17 Metropolitan Open Land
- 7.18 Protecting open space and addressing deficiency
- 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature
- 7.21 Trees and woodlands
- 8.2 Planning obligations

### 6.2 Merton Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011)

Relevant policies include:

- CS 11 Infrastructure
- CS 13 Open space and leisure

CS 14 Design  
CS 15 Climate Change  
CS 18 Transport  
CS 19 Public transport  
CS 20 Parking servicing and delivery

6.4 Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014)

Relevant policies include:

DM C1 Community facilities  
DM D1 Urban Design and the public realm  
DM D2 Design considerations  
DM D4 Managing heritage assets  
DM F2 Sustainable urban drainage systems  
DM O1 Open space  
DM O2 Trees, hedges and landscape features  
DM T1 Support for sustainable travel and active travel  
DM T2 Transport impacts from development  
DM T3 Car parking and servicing standards  
DM T5 Access to the road network.  
DM R5 Food, drink, leisure and entertainment uses

6.5 NPPF 2012

Paras 87 & 89 Green belt  
Paras 32, 36 & 39 Sustainable transport, travel plans & parking standards  
Paras 58, 59, 61 & 75 Design  
Paras 70 & 73 Community facilities  
Para 74 Open Space  
Para 132 Heritage assets  
Para 14 & 15 sustainable development  
Para 123 Noise  
Para 125 External lighting

6.6 Merton Open Space Study 2010

6.7 Morden Park Vision 2009

6.8 Affordable Sports Centres 2013

7. **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS.**

7.1 The key issues for consideration include the selection of the site, the impact of the proposal on Metropolitan Open Space, the Upper Morden Conservation Area and the Archaeological Priority Zone (APZ), the natural environment including protected species, the provision of sporting facilities, the design of the leisure centre, transport and parking.

7.2 **Site selection**

As detailed in the Site Selection Assessment document that accompanied the application the Council undertook an extensive study of potential sites for the new leisure centre in 2007 when a list of 14 potential sites was compiled. Each site was considered for the positive and negative impacts of location, planning, ecology, archaeology, timeliness, continuity of service, costs, land ownership, risks, ancillary features, regeneration opportunities, utilities and impact on other council services. The results were then shortlisted down to four sites.

- 7.3 From that shortlist, the application site, site 6, was chosen in 2014. The site benefits from being the one with the least impact on the APZ, is the only site not adjacent to a SINC although it will involve the temporary loss (although replaced) of MOL and will impact on some mature trees. The site is open for building, the existing pool can remain open during construction with no loss to service users, the existing car park can be used and disabled parking facilities improved whilst the site benefits from excellent transport links.

Metropolitan Open Space.

- 7.4 Policy 7.17 of the London Plan 2015, Policy DM O1 of the SPP 2014 and Policy CS 13 of the Core Strategy 2011 all set out a commitment to protect MOL and designated Open Spaces from inappropriate development. Policy allows for the development of land within MOL for sports and recreational provision where the loss would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quality and quantity in a suitable location which could be considered 'very special circumstances'. The need to increase sporting participation nationally is a government initiative to bring health, economic social and cultural benefits to communities. Whilst the proposal itself is considered to meet the very special circumstances criteria, this proposal has the added benefit that the building of the new leisure centre will be off-set by the creation of new open space where the existing leisure centre is located (currently outside the MOL) which will then be designated as MOL, thereby resulting in no net loss of MOL. The new leisure centre has also been positioned so that it will reduce its impact upon the openness of the MOL, a point praised by the GLA in its assessment of the scheme.
- 7.5 The GLA commented on the issue; "Whilst the proposal is considered to be 'inappropriate' development on MOL, the applicant has provided a robust special circumstance case for the proposals. In this instance, the proposed development on this site, is in accordance with London plan policies 7.16 and 7.17
- 7.6 **Impact on Open Space**  
The site is also within designated Open space. Such land is 'protected' in policy terms by London plan policy 7.18 and SPP policy DMO1 which require an assessment to be made to show that the site is either surplus to requirements or the loss will be replaced by better or equivalent

provision or the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the need for which clearly outweighs the loss. This proposal is considered to replace the lost space with sports facilities of a much greater quality and quantity in a suitable location within the park. The scheme has been designed to a high standard that will not harm the character, appearance or function of the Open Space or the visual amenities of the Open Space, whilst improving connectivity through the creation of new and more direct foot and cycle paths.

### **Conservation Area and Heritage assets**

- 7.7 As well as being with a listed park and the Upper Morden Conservation Area the site is also in close proximity to Morden Park House, (the Register office) and the Church of St Lawrence which are both listed buildings as well as being situated within an Archaeological priority Zone due to proximity to the Roman Road, Stane Street. Consequently concerns relating to the impact of the proposals on heritage assets have been a very important consideration throughout the development of the scheme. London Plan policy 7.8, SPP policy DM D4 and Core Strategy policy CS 14 require high quality design to conserve and enhance the conservation area and to protect heritage assets and their setting.
- 7.8 The positioning and orientation of the leisure centre has been developed in order to mitigate any impact on the nearby listed buildings and for the development to sit attractively within the listed park. The Council commissioned Museum of London Archaeology (MOLA) to undertake a site assessment. In their document 'Built Heritage Statement' they noted that the existing swimming pool building is considered to make a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area and that whilst its demolition would involve the loss of an undesignated Heritage asset in its own right and therefore have a moderate adverse impact, the demolition of the site as a whole would have a minor positive impact on the setting of Morden Park, although the construction of a new leisure centre would be considered to have a moderate adverse impact on the character of the Upper Morden Conservation Area and the setting of listed Morden Park. MOLA considered however that the design was such that it would have a neutral impact on the CA. They recommended the imposition of suitable conditions to undertake a phase of archaeological standing building recording to Historic England Level 3 in advance of the commencement of works
- 7.9 MOLA also provided an Archaeology Assessment document setting out the archaeological context of the site and its potential history. The study found that although the site does not contain any designated heritage assets there is a marked difference between the north and south sides of the site with generally a far higher potential for archaeological finds in the north with very low potential in the south. Consequently their report recommended further archaeological investigation should be undertaken prior to any construction starting.

From the findings of the study a proposed Written Scheme of Investigation was drawn up in April 2016 and submitted to Historic England GLAAS who approved the wording and recommendations in that WSI.

### **Biodiversity and protected species.**

- 7.10 Given the sensitive environmental considerations surrounding this site the Council has commissioned a number of environmental studies and surveys for the proposed site and its wider setting. As a result it has been established that Great Crested Newts have been found in the park, nesting around pond 1 and foraging up towards the site. Great Crested Newts GCN are a European Protected Species (EPS) and a priority Biodiversity Action Plan species. Whilst pond 1 has been found to have a population of around 7 GCN, pond 2 was not found to support them because of the poor quality of the environment at this pond. Because the proposals are considered to be a medium or High impact on the GCN population a mitigation scheme is required and a condition to that effect is recommended.
- 7.11 In addition to features such as the planting of the existing pool site as grassland and an orchard, an outline mitigation plan has been formulated by consultants and includes features such as a grassland maintenance regime, a Newt-exclusion fence around the site during construction plan, supervised hedgerow maintenance, a Pond Management Plan and monitoring period. The Pond Maintenance Plan includes replacing the fencing around pond 1, thinning of young trees, deepening the ponds and increasing water flow to them. The Council will be required under separate legislation to obtain an EPS licence prior to any works commencing.
- 7.12 An extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey was also undertaken to address the potential impact of the development on other fauna species including bats, birds, badgers and reptiles as well as species of flora. Trees of medium to high roost potential as well as parts of the existing leisure centre have the potential for roots but none were confirmed although there was evidence of potential foraging by bats in the area around the site. The survey recommended full bat emergence surveys be undertaken prior to demolition of the buildings and that works that may impact nesting birds be undertaken outside of the March to August nesting season.

### **Layout, scale and design**

- 7.13 Policy 7.6 of the London Plan sets out a number of key objectives for the design of new buildings including that they should be of the highest architectural quality, they should be of a proportion, composition, scale and orientation that enhances, activates and appropriately defines the public realm, and buildings should have details that complement, but not necessarily replicate the local architectural character. Policy CS14 of the adopted Core Strategy states that all development needs to be designed to respect, reinforce and enhance local character and

contribute to Merton's sense of place and identity. Policy DM D2 of the SPP requires the use of appropriate architectural forms, language, detailing and materials which complement and enhance the character of the wider setting.

- 7.14 The design and scale of the proposal has undergone a number of changes in response to comments from officers, the leisure operator GLL, the GLA and from the DRP at pre application stage before submitting the current proposal.
- 7.15 The building design has been influenced by a number of considerations, not the least of which is the requirement to accommodate the desired sporting facilities. In order to mitigate against the size of the building it has been designed to flow and curve into the landscape, dropping down along both the north and south elevations whilst providing an active frontage on the A24 and approach road elevations, keeping the entrance near the car park and retaining views out across the MOL from the interior.
- 7.16 In response to the RED received from the DRP in March 2016 the design team made a number of detailed comments set out below; Site location; The planning proposals seek to demonstrate a mini-landscaping master plan to link the access road to the new Morden Leisure Centre, Morden Park car park, Morden Park House and the new landscaping for the area of the demolished Morden Park Pools. This plan seeks to knit and join together the buildings on the site of the college, leisure centre and Morden Park House using the access road as a link which flows and draws them to interlink most appropriately for public uses within a naturally formed landscape. The ability to plan more comprehensively to include more significant improvements to the car park and to the route in between would require an extension of the scope and the redline area. The area for mitigation required for the development on the MOL grassland has meant that the area was kept to a minimum.
- 7.17 Orientation of the building; A site visit took place with Sustainable Communities management team at the Council to review the layout and orientation of the building.  
It was clear on that visit that a building would not be seen if it was closer to the London Road and that a building in this proximity to a main road could have operational issues for the users, especially the young. The building aligns with the rear of the main college building which sits comfortably within the two building masses either side of the access road and the distances between the buildings are conducive with ensuring an open, roomy and welcoming approach to Morden park and its facilities.
- 7.18 This alignment also serves best in the new leisure centre's relationship with the Grade 2\* listed Morden Park House, in that the sight lines from



the house across the park towards the centre ensure that only the Plaza and the glazed frontage of the building are within view at the edges. The orientation to link the entrance of the leisure centre with the park would encourage families to use the park as well as the new leisure centre.

7.19 The entrance has also been positioned based on the sun path meaning that from mid-afternoon to evening, the plaza and entrance space will enjoy a good degree of sun, which helps to create a more welcoming aspect. If the entrance was positioned to the east, the plaza and entrance would be in shade for most of the day. The pools have been positioned to the north to ensure they have a degree of privacy from the plaza, enjoy views across Morden Park and also have little or no glare aspect on the pool water

7.20 There are 4 bus stops within walking distance on the main A24; Morden South, St Helier and Morden Tube Station all within walking distances and cycle and walking routes already exist within Morden Park. All of these are existing parameters according with Planning Policies and these will be supplemented in this development with cycle racks, designated disabled parking and the introduction of charging points within the car park. Early discussions have already been held regarding shared use of the college car park should this be required.

Whilst public transport, cycling and walking to the centre have been considered as part of the building and landscape design, we also recognise through the transport assessment, that the majority of users of the facility will still drive. From an operation perspective (a point which has to be considered when reviewing the success of the design), the entrance and car park must have a linkage and easy access from one to another. Locating the entrance to the east will create a disconnect between the two and discussions with the operator have been clear that the relationship (visually and physically) is very important to them.

7.21 Design in relation to specialist studies e.g. landscaping, ecology, heritage, etc.

The building has been designed as a bespoke solution to its setting and also around budget restraints. We have discussed and illustrated to the panel why the building has been located where it is and the necessary links to the car park.

We have been designing leisure centres for many years and it is important that the design progression is done inside out. The operational functionality of the internal spaces is key and the organisation and design of the space meets the design brief and operator requirements. This arrangement also includes the positioning of glazed openings and where transparency is important to the facility. Key spaces such as the pool hall, fitness suite, studio spaces and the

café should command transparency. This is where the glazing has been provided in each case to create lively, active frontages and welcoming routes around the building:

- Pool Hall – 50 % glazed on the north façade and gives open views to the park (and visa versa). We have at the same time been mindful that the operator wanted privacy to the teaching water and as such, the glazing area reduces to this zone.
- Fitness suite – Its location at first floor and targeting towards the entrance approach from London Road is perfect and we have introduced glazing to this aspect to ensure the connection is made.
- Studio – This has been arranged around the coloured “pod” which overhangs the main entrance and draws the eye towards it. The glazing will highlight the activity and people movement.
- Café – Is fully glazed enjoying aspects over the park, the pool hall and out onto the entrance plaza.

7.22 When designing these spaces the temptation is to add a great deal of glazing, however by doing this, it compromises the operation of the space and useable solid wall area. We have worked with the operator to this end and have arrived at a solution which provides this transparency where required, but maintains the space as an area which is both flexible and useable for the classes and events that they are meant for.

7.23 The buildings position has been arranged around a number of aspects, including the location of the internal components, entrance location and the connection to the car park, plaza and its approach. A series of design studies were drawn up which analysed the impact of sun path, prevailing wind, ecology and tree routes, massing effect on MOL land, connection to the car park and the approach from Morden Park House and the new landscape setting around the current Morden Park Pool. The building is set back slightly from the road which allows us to soften the edge between the park and the existing pavement and create a new threshold into the park. This threshold connects to the plaza behind why the building is positioned where it is. The effects of tree root zones and ecology have merely enforced our reasoning for the building position and its elements and by working with the various consultants, we have arrived at a solution which provides the operator and our team with a good solution to the design and layout, whilst at the same time, provides the ecologists, planning team, green spaces and local community groups with a solution that protects the existing habitat and vegetation. This isn't a solution which has fenced off ecological areas, rather it integrates with it and we are disappointed that the comments from DRP suggest this hasn't happened. Equally this has not been a tick box exercise. The solution and building position has been a co-ordinated approach.

- 7.24 With respect to the DRP comments on providing a weighting on parameters, etc. this is what we have been doing throughout the design process from the very start and is a key reason why the building has been positioned where it is and why various spaces are positioned on plan around their use and requirements.
- 7.25 There is as suggestion from the comments presented, that the sports hall could be re-positioned. This has been discussed previously with the operator and client team and various options were put forward early in the design process to look at aligning the hall next to the café (for example) to create a more linear building. Clearly this can be still done if the majority feel this is the right solution, but a key reason for not doing it was circulation and control of the space. All current public sport activities are arrived at through the entrance control barrier. It was felt that positioning the sports hall alongside the café, compromised this circulation and control.
- 7.26 The roof form over the pool hall curves for a number of reasons, which we had thought were illustrated:-
- The height of the pool hall has been driven by the diving facility and connecting the pool hall space to achieve visual connections from the fitness suite at first floor. This doesn't mean this volume needs to be accommodated across the full width. If this was the case and the "cathedral aspect" was adopted (which was suggested by the panel), the volume of the pool hall would be excessive for no reason and heating and energy costs would double.
  - Much of the pool use will be for teaching water at various stages of the day. This is not a competition pool. Our experience of designing these facilities has found that most children feel large "cathedral like" spaces very daunting. Most children between the ages of 0 – 10 are in a period of getting confident with water and swimming in general. By lowering the building height as we have done, through the curve, allows us to create a more domesticated space which allows us to maintain the height for diving, yet at the same time reduces the building height and creates a less intimidating space.
  - The building curve works with the flow of the landscape. This is not an attempt to hide itself in the park. Indeed we feel the form of the roof will create a striking aspect to this higher vantage point from approach on the north side towards the building. Indeed the colour of the roof could quite easily change to improve this striking aspect if it was felt that the copper colour blended in with its setting too much. This is an exercise which we have been looking at.
- 7.27 The roof curve over the sports hall has been created to create an illusion that the building is lower than it is. The building height has to be a minimum 7.5m internally and changing the form of the building, for example, to a 9m box externally will be quite oppressive. Through lowering the eaves as we have done, helps to reduce this impact.

- 7.28 Building in the MOL; The building is not trying to hide itself. See above comments on why the form of the building is such. It is more about the quality and use of the internal spaces which has informed the form and curved roof. At 10m high, the building is not going to be of a mass which will hide itself.
- 7.29 Regarding the position within the park, the comment seems at odds with the original suggestion of pushing the building further into the parkland. The building is situated within an accessible distance from the existing public realm and car park.
- 7.30 Despite the comments of the DRP the GLA were 'very supportive of the design, height, scale and massing of the building. Increasing the permeability of the park from the access road is strongly supported and will improve access to Morden Park from the South Thames College campus. The new leisure centre has been designed to minimise the impact on the openness of the MOL, and where possible improve the quality of the open space'. 'The proposal is supported in strategic urban design terms and is in accordance with London Plan policies 7.1, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5 & 7.6". Officers consider that the design team has set out a logical and reasoned response to the DRP concerns.
- 7.31 **Accessibility to facilities**  
Making the facilities accessible to all members of the community has been a very important influence in the design of the leisure centre to ensure that disability does not prevent anyone from enjoying the full range of activities that will be offered. The application was accompanied by a Disabled Access Statement which sets out in detail all the various design features to be incorporated into the building and its surrounds in order to improve accessibility. The GLA supported the proposals and welcomed the level of detail provided. A condition requiring those features to be incorporated into the construction and maintenance of the site is recommended.
- 7.32 **Crime Prevention and public safety**  
SPP policy DM D2 requires proposals to offer safe and secure layouts and whilst leisure centres are traditionally subject to low levels of crime incidents do occur and the proposals have been developed in association with helpful guidance from the Metropolitan Police Safer by Design Officer into a revised Crime Prevention Plan for the site. This has included measures for CCTV coverage, external lighting, access control systems as well as design details for the roof, all of which are intended to provide a well designed, safe and welcoming environment for visitors and staff. A condition requiring Safer by Design principles to be utilized is recommended.
- 7.33 **Provision of sporting facilities**

Policy 3.19 of The London Plan and SPP policy DM C1 encourage the provision of sporting and community facilities. This proposal will replace the existing leisure centre with a modern state of the art facility that has been designed to increase the level of use and type of facility currently available in a more accessible manner suitable for the whole community. The GLA and Sport England are supportive of this and the phasing of the proposal has been designed to provide a seamless transition between the existing and proposed facilities.

**Neighbour Amenity.**

- 7.34 The site is completely separated from residential neighbours by parkland and South Thames College. Consequently it is considered that there will be no negative impacts on neighbour amenity from loss of light or outlook, noise or disturbance and there have been no objections on grounds of amenity.

**Parking, servicing and deliveries.**

- 7.35 London Plan policies 6.3m& 6.12, Core Strategy Policy CS 20 and SPP policies DM T2 and T5 consider the impact of proposals on the road network and matters of pedestrian movement, safety, servicing and loading facilities for local businesses and manoeuvring for emergency vehicles as well as refuse storage and collection.
- 7.36 The application has been accompanied by an in depth Transport Analysis which has been considered by TfL as the access road joins the A24, a road for which they are responsible. Whilst it is anticipated that the new leisure centre will have an increased attendance and therefore increased vehicular traffic, the modelling has shown that the junction will be able to accommodate the increased traffic without a negative impact on the road network.
- 7.37 London Plan policy 6.13 and SPP policy DM T3 address issues of parking. The scheme will see a reduction in available parking spaces from 190 spaces to 162 plus 10 disabled bays. The transport analysis determined that the existing car park was rarely used anywhere near its full capacity, (the average weekday occupancy being 33% and less than 25% at weekends, even allowing for visitors to the Register Office who also use the car park) and that the new layout would still provide more than sufficient parking for the users of the new facility.
- 7.38 London Plan policies 6.9 & 6.10, SPP policy DM T1 and Core Strategy policies CS 18 & CS 19 are all concerned with encouraging active transport modes and the use of public transport. The proposal will provide Sheffield Stands cycle storage for 44 cycles and a Travel Plan has been formulated to encourage sustainable transport modes. The site will have a Travel Plan Co-ordinator who will take a leading role in overseeing the implementation of the plan supported by a transport steering group. The proposals are supported by TfL.

7.39 The Transport Steering Group will also have a key role during the construction and demolition phases ensuring that all works are undertaken in accordance with the guidance set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan. A condition requiring the works to be undertaken in accordance with this document is recommended

7.40 Once constructed and operational the leisure centre will need to be serviced and receive deliveries. A method of ensuring this take places without a negative impact on any stakeholders has been formulated in a Delivery and Servicing Management Plan and supporting drawings within that document demonstrate through tracking diagrams that this can be physically achieved on the proposed layout. A condition requiring the site to be serviced in accordance with this document is recommended

#### **Refuse and recycling**

7.41 The refuse and recycling facilities will take the form of bin stores located adjacent to the service area.

#### **Trees**

7.42 Core strategy policy CS 13 expects development proposals to incorporate and maintain appropriate elements of open space and landscape features such as trees which make a positive contribution to the wider network of open spaces whilst SPP policy DM 02 seeks to protect trees that have a significant amenity value as perceived from the public realm. The application was accompanied by a Tree Survey report, Tree Survey Plan, Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Constraints Plan which surveyed and classified 106 trees on site and whilst there will be some removal of trees along the access road, none of the highest quality category A trees will be removed or affected by the proposals and the reports demonstrate how they will be protected during construction. Three trees along with a section of hedging will need to be removed to facilitate the development but the trees are category C trees.

#### **Sustainable design and construction.**

7.43 The proposals have been developed to ensure high levels of sustainability and energy efficiency. When considering the application details the GLA were satisfied the proposals broadly followed the energy hierarchy with a range of passive design features and demand reduction measures proposed to reduce carbon emissions. Both air permeability and heat loss parameters will be improved beyond the minimum backstop values required by building regulations and they welcomed the use of efficient lighting and high efficiency boilers. New buildings must comply with the Mayor's and Merton's objectives on carbon emissions, renewable energy, sustainable design and construction, green roofs, flood risk management and sustainable drainage. Conditions to this effect are recommended.

## **8. SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS**

- 8.1 The proposal does not constitute Schedule 1 or Schedule 2 development. Accordingly, there are no requirements in terms of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).

## **9. CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 The existing leisure centre and swimming pool has come to the end of its operational life and requires replacement. The proposed site was chosen after lengthy consideration and consultation. Although situated on Metropolitan Open Land there will be no net loss of MOL because once the new leisure centre is opened the existing centre will be demolished and the land returned to grassland and orchard and designated as MOL. Through extensive mitigation measures the proposals will not have an adverse impact on biodiversity and the scheme has been designed to have no negative impact on, designated heritage assets, neighbour amenity or traffic and parking whilst the building design was supported by the GLA and with the exception of the Design Review Panel and one resident there have been no objections to the proposals. The proposed design is considered appropriate for this sensitive setting. For the reasons outlined in this report the proposals are considered to accord with relevant planning policies and are recommended for approval subject to conditions.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

### **Grant planning permission subject to planning conditions**

#### **Conditions**

1. A1 Commencement of works
2. A7 Build to plans; Site location plan and drawings; Site location plan and drawings; (20)001, (20)101, (21)001, (21)002, (22)001, (27)001, (90)001, (90)002, (90)003, (08)001, (08)101 (08)101, (08)900, GTA1230.GA.100, . GTA1230.GA 101 PL02, GTA1230.GA 102, GTA1230.GA 103, GTA1230.GA 104, GTA1230.GA 105, GTA1230.L.300, GTA1230.PP.400, GTA1230.PP.401, GTA1230.PP.402, DS24091401.01, DS24091401.02 , DS24091401.03 & DS24091401.04. Documents; Great Crested Newt Assessment and Reptile Survey 2015 to 2016 compiled by GPM Ecology, Crime Prevention Plan, Rev A compiled by GT Architects, Disabled Access Statement Compiled by GT Architects, Framework Travel Plan JH/11182 Compiled by DHA Transport dated Feb 2016, Framework Delivery and Servicing Management Plan Compiled by DHA Transport dated Feb 2016, Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan Compiled by DHA Transport dated Feb 2016, Phase 1 Ecological Survey report Compiled by Furesfen dated August 2014, Ecological Mitigation Plan compiled by Furesfen, Landscape Management Plan by Oobe Ltd dated Feb 2016.

3. Non standard condition; Prior to the demolition of the existing Morden Park Pools, the replacement new leisure centre shall be built, made fully operational and available for use. Reason to ensure satisfactory replacement sports facility provision is provided and to accord with London Plan policies 3.19 & 7.17 and Merton Sites and Policies Plan policy DM C1.
4. B3 Amended The materials for the leisure centre as well as site and surface treatments and boundary walls and fences shall be those as stipulated on the approved drawings 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 2015, policy CS14 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and D3 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.
5. D10 Amended Any external lighting shall be positioned and angled to prevent any light spillage or glare beyond the site boundary and shall comply with BS 5489:2013
6. Non standard condition No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision of surface water drainage has been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Before these details are submitted an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) to ground, watercourse or sewer in accordance with drainage hierarchy contained within the London Plan Policy 5.13, Merton's Policy DM F2 and the advice contained within the National SuDS Standards.

Where a sustainable drainage scheme is to be provided, the submitted details shall:

- i. provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the rate of surface water discharged from the site to no more than 5l/s and provision of no less than 330m<sup>3</sup> of storage and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;
- ii. include a timetable for its implementation;
- iii. provide a drainage management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.
- iv. a CCTV of the drainage network, including tracing and survey of the pipes feeding into the existing park ponds and all existing connections.

Reason:



To ensure satisfactory means of surface water drainage, to reduce the risk of flooding and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 5.13 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS16 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM F2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

7. D11 Construction times.
8. F1 Amended 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. 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, measures for their protection during the course of development, and shall clearly indicate the extent of the landscaping and planting that will be completed prior to the occupation of the new leisure centre building and the planting season when the rest would be completed. These works shall be carried out as approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority

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.

Reason: To enhance the appearance of the development in the interest of the amenities of the area, to ensure the provision sustainable drainage surfaces, to ensure the provision of sufficient replaced MOL and Open Space in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location, to protect and promote nature conservation and biodiversity, and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies 5.1, 7.5, 7.17, 7.18, 7.19 and 7.21 of the London Plan 2015, policies CS13 and CS16 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2, F2, O1 and O2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

9. H2 Vehicle access provision
10. H4 Provision of parking spaces.
11. H7 Cycle storage implementation
12. Non standard condition. The applicant shall, for the existing Morden Swimming Pool Building, undertake a phase of archaeological standing building recording to Historic England Level 3 in advance of the commencement of demolition.

Reason: To preserve the details of the historic significance of the building and its setting in accordance with London Plan policy 7.8 and policy DM D4 of the Merton sites and Policies Plan 2014.

14. H8 Travel Plan in accordance with Framework Travel Plan JH/11182 compiled by DHA Transport dated Feb 2016
15. The construction and demolition phases of the development hereby approved shall be undertaken in accordance with the details shown in the approved document 'Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan Compiled by DHA Transport dated Feb 2016' Reason
16. F13 Amended The landscaping shall be maintained in accordance with the details in the Landscape Management Plan by Oobe Ltd dated Feb 2016 unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

To ensure the appearance of the development is maintained in the interest of the amenities of the area, to ensure the maintenance of sustainable drainage surfaces, to protect and promote nature conservation and biodiversity and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies 5.1, 7.5, 7.19 and 7.21 of the London Plan 2015, policies CS13 and CS16 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2, F2 and O2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

17. No development shall take place until details of the enhancement works for Pond 1 and Pond 2, as set out in part 6.2 of GPM Ecology's 11 May 2016 report and the areas of compensation grassland, as set out in paragraphs 4.13 - 4.16 of Furesfen's 'Ecological Mitigation Plan', has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include a programme setting out when each aspect of the pond enhancement works will be carried out and the compensation grassland will be established, in relation to the construction and demolition programme for the approved works. The works shall be carried out as approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect and promote nature conservation and biodiversity and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.19 of the London Plan 2015, policies DM D2 and DM O2 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan 2014, and policy CS 13 of the Core strategy 2011.

18. No demolition works to the existing Morden pool buildings shall take place until a bat presence survey has been carried out by a suitably qualified person in accordance with paragraph 4.15 of Furesfen's 'Ecological Mitigation Plan'. A written report, which might include mitigation measures, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and any demolition works shall be carried out in accordance with any

mitigation measures, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect and promote nature conservation and biodiversity and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.19 of the London Plan 2015, policies DM D2 and DM O2 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan 2014, and policy CS 13 of the Core strategy 2011.

19. L6 BREEAM – Pre-Commencement (New build non-residential)
20. L7 BREEAM - Pre-Occupation (New build non-residential)
  
21. Non standard condition Unless otherwise agreed in writing the new leisure centre shall operate in accordance with details set out in the approved document 'Framework Delivery and Servicing Management Plan Compiled by DHA Transport dated Feb 2016', 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 2015, policy CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM T2, T3 and T5 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.
  
22. The development hereby approved shall be undertaken having regard to the recommendations in the approved document, Crime Prevention Plan, Rev A compiled by GT Architects. Reason, To provide a safe and secure layout in accordance with policy DM D2 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan 2014
  
- 23 The development hereby approved shall be undertaken having regard to the recommendations in the approved document, Disabled Access Statement Compiled by GT Architects. Reason to ensure the highest practical standards of access and inclusion and to be accessible to people with disabilities in accordance with policy DM D2 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan 2014
  
24. F5 Tree protection amended. The development hereby approved shall be undertaken in accordance with the details shown in the approved Arboricultural Impact Assessment and drawing DS2409140.03 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 policy O2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

---

To view further Plans, drawings and documents relating to this application please follow this [link](#):

Please note that this link, and some of the related plans, may be slow to load.

This page is intentionally left blank